

This child, I am sure, would have been really competent. But such frustration. What kind of money do you think is needed, and who is going to pay for this?

Representative CURTIS. I will tell you right off the bat, by training that child, you will save money in the overall picture.

Representative GRIFFITHS. I agree.

Representative CURTIS. And it does require the kind of structuring and income spreading which I have written about at great length—tried to, at any rate—so that you spread income up to meet the need at the age of 2, because you will recoup it later. I have also tried to urge us to treat money spent for education and training as a capital investment. We do not treat it as a capital investment in our tax law. It ought to be. It is the greatest capital investment we have. And you get more returns from it than practically any other investment.

So there are many ways, if we could identify them in this way, where we could get the money. In fact, you could do it in the private sector if we would change our tax laws around somewhat.

Representative GRIFFITHS. What about all the children in the ghettos of the inner city? As you are aware, one of my objections has been to leaving children at home with a mother who has only a 1,400-word vocabulary, because you are not teaching the children anything. You are not teaching the mother anything, and you are not teaching the children anything. There is good reason now to believe that, from those things now known about education, that those children should be taken out of that environment by the time they are 2, perhaps. They should be put in schools.

Here is a time when children learn, along with other children.

Representative CURTIS. This is the Headstart program which, incidentally, was not a Government program, and has been going on in communities around the country at least 15 or 20 years. The Government picked it up and publicized it, and probably that part of it was good, but then it drove out a lot of the people who had been doing the real work in Headstart originally. I do not know whether the net result has been good or bad. It certainly has been directing attention in the right way.

We had a reform which was unheralded in the 1967 Social Security law, which I hope will go a long way to meet this problem, but certainly will meet another, namely, the difference in Federal matching funds that used to exist between title IV children and title V. Title IV, if a child were with a relative or mother, we would match at around 80 percent. If they were title V, in an institution or foster home, the matching was even below 20 percent. So the communities were reluctant to do the best thing for the child's welfare, because even though they thought that, for every reason in the world, the child ought to be placed in a better atmosphere and climate for its own development, it meant that the community was going to have to dig up the extra money because it would lose the Federal matching funds.

Well, with the amendments in the 1967 act—and I really worked to get it in, but it is in there—we have about equalized our matching so that now, hopefully, in Detroit and St. Louis, the people who are concerned about children can go ahead and have them taken care of, whichever way is best for them, with the mother, or in a foster home.