20

STAFF DATA WITH RESPECT TO SOCIAL SERVICES

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE UNITED STATES SENATE RUSSELL B. LONG, Chairman



MAY 24, 1972

Prepared by the staff and printed for the use of the Committee on Finance

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE WASHINGTON: 1972

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

RUSSELL B. LONG, Louisiana, Chairman

CLINTON P. ANDERSON, New Mexico HERMAN E. TALMADGE, Georgia VANCE HARTKE, Indiana J. W. FULBRIGHT, Arkansas ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, Connecticut FRED R. HARRIS, Oklahoma HARRY F. BYRD, Jr., Virginia GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconstn WALLACE F. BENNETT, Utah CARL T. CURTIS, Nebraska JACK MILLER, Iowa LEN B. JORDAN, Idaho PAUL J. FANNIN, Arlzona CLIFFORD P. HANSEN, Wyoming ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Michigan

TOM VAIL, Chief Counsel

(II)

CONTENTS

Background
Rapid Rise in Federal Funds for Social Services
H. Ř. 1
Allied Services Act
Services for Participants in the Employment Program
Closing the End on Federal Funds for Social Services
Foster Care and Adoption:
A. Grants to States
B. National Adoption Information Exchange System
(Griffin Amendment No. 411)
Table—Estimated Federal Share of Social Service Costs
\mathbf{A} ppendi \mathbf{x}
Memorandum Prepared by the Congressional Research Service
on Proposed Allied Services Act
• .
(III)

SOCIAL SERVICES

Background

Before 1962, services provided to welfare recipients were subject to the same 50% Federal matching as was available for administrative expenses. In order to encourage States to provide social services designed to prevent and reduce dependency on welfare, the Congress in 1962 enacted legislation increasing the Federal matching for social services to 75% while leaving Federal matching for administrative costs at 50%. No definition of social services was included either in the 1962 bill or in the Committee reports on the legislation; defining the scope of services was left to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the States.

Under HEW regulations (45 CFR 220), States are required to

provide:

1. Services to assist all appropriate persons in a family to achieve employment and self-sufficiency.

2. Child care services for children of mothers in training or

employment.

3. Foster care services.

4. Services to prevent and reduce births out of wedlock.

5. Family planning services.

6. Services to meet particular needs of families and children in order to:

(a) Assist children to obtain education in accordance with

their capacities.

(b) Improve family living through assisting parents to overcome homemaking and housing problems.

(c) Assist in reuniting families.

(d) Assist parents in money management, including consumer education.

(e) Assist parents in child rearing.(f) Offer education for family living.

(g) Evaluate the need for, and in appropriate cases provide for, protective and vendor payments and related services.

7. Protective services for children found to be in danger of or

subject to neglect, abuse, or exploitation.

8. Services to help families meet their health needs.

In addition, the regulations permit 75% Federal matching for any services considered by the State as assisting members of a family "to attain or retain capability for maximum self-support and personal independence." It is under this provision of the regulations that New York State justified its claim from 75% Federal matching for treatment of alcoholics and drug addicts.

In 1971 the Congress enacted legislation increasing to 90% the Federal share of services needed in order for an AFDC recipient to

participate in the Work Incentive Program.

Rapid Rise in Federal Funds for Social Services

Like Federal matching for welfare payments, Federal matching for social services under present law is mandatory and open-ended. Every dollar a State spends for social services is matched by three Federal dollars. In the last two years particularly, States have made use of the lack of definition of social services under the Social Security Act and the Act's open-ended 75% matching to pay for many programs previously funded entirely by the States or funded under other Federal grant programs at lower than 75% matching. For example, the State of California formerly operated day care centers under its Department of Education entirely with State funds. Thanks to the social services provisions under the Social Security Act, the State was able to convert a portion of the program to a 75% federally matched basis. Similarly, New York State was able to receive 75% Federal matching for the previously 100% State program of treatment for alcoholics and drug addicts.

A 1971 study on the purchase of social services conducted by Booz, Allen and Hamilton for the Department of Health, Education, and

Welfare reported:

[An] innovative procedure which is now becoming widely practiced is to use contracting as a device to take maximum advantage of Federal funding and reduce State and local expenditures. The usual pattern is for one State agency operating a Statefunded program to contract with the Welfare Department for performance of the program under contract * * *. The States are only just beginning to take advantage of the terms of the 1967

Social Security Act amendments to purchase services.

The greatest impetus for the use of purchase of service has come about through the termination or reduction of other Federal funding streams, primarily Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) funds. In Pennsylvania, both in Pittsburgh and Philadelphia, the Head Start programs were severely curtailed, and the Department of Public Welfare has absorbed the contracts and the contractors, at the same time converting them to full day care programs and enriching them by requiring observance of the Federal Interagency Day Care Standards and other Department of Public Welfare standards with reference to day care. Pennsylvania has also converted a number of other service programs previously funded by OEO to Title IV funds through contracting both with other public agencies and directly with the original Community Action Program (CAP) agencies.

A second major impetus has come from efforts to convert existing ongoing State-funded programs to Federal-State shared funding. For example, in Wisconsin the legislature transferred funds from the Department of Health and Social Services, Division of Mental Hygiene, to the Division of Family Services (the single organizational unit) to obtain day care services for the mentally retarded and take advantage of the 25/75 matching ratio. Previously, the State had supported a mental health day care program 40% from State funds and 60% from local county funds. Under the new intended arrangement, 12½% will come from the county, 12½% from the State, and the remaining 75%

from the Federal Government under Title IV-A.

Other similar examples can be cited such as the California Children's Center Program which initially was a State-funded

activity.

Taken together, these two factors of the termination of existing Federal programs and the desire to convert State-funded programs to maximize the use of Federal matching funds account for the

majority of purchase of service contracting.

The observation of the Booz, Allen and Hamilton report that States were only just beginning to take full advantage of the open-ended 75% Federal matching has proven prophetic. The growth in Federal expenditures for social services under Aid to Families with Dependent Children is shown in the table below:

Year	Amount (in millions)
1969	\$354
1970	
1971	
1972 (estimated)	1, 363
1973 (estimated)	1, 450

If no change is made in Federal law, it can be expected that these costs will continue to rise rapidly as States exploit the open-ended 75% Federal matching.

H.R. 1

H.R. 1 contains several provisions affecting Federal payments for social services. These are discussed below.

Social services for Federal welfare recipients.—The Federal Government would arrange for and pay 100% of the cost of supportive services to allow welfare families to participate in work and training programs, as well as 100% of the cost of vocational rehabilitation services for

incapacitated recipients of family assistance.

Grants to States for social services.—H.R. 1 would replace the present open-ended 75% matching for social services with a program of grants to States for social services. Only child care and family planning services would continue to be federally matched on an open-ended basis. Under H.R. 1, \$800 million dollars would be authorized for social services expenditures in fiscal year 1973 (excluding child care, family planning, and foster care and adoption services). Amounts for future years would be determined by the Congress on the basis of its evaluation of the needs and priorities for each year, and allotment of amounts appropriated among the States would be on the basis of (1) the State's share for services in the previous fiscal year; (2) \$50 million to help raise the services levels of States below the national average closer to the national average; and (3) the balance would be apportioned to each State according to its proportion of the recipients under the Opportunities for Families Program, the Family Assistance Plan, and the programs of assistance to the aged, blind, and disabled.

The bill would set a Federal definition of which services would be subject to 75% Federal matching under the Social Security Act. For

families, the services would be:

(a) services to unmarried women who are pregnant or already have children, for the purpose of arranging for prenatal and postnatal care of the mother and child, developing appropriate living arrangements for the child, and assisting the mother to

complete school through the secondary level or secure training so that she may become self-sufficient;

(b) protective services for children who are (or are in danger

of) being abused, neglected, or exploited;

(c) homemaker services when the usual homemaker becomes ill or incapacitated or is otherwise unable to care for the children in the family, and services to educate appropriate family members about household and related financial management and matters pertaining to consumer protection;

(d) nutrition services;

(e) services to assist the needy families with children in dealing with problems of locating suitable housing arrangements and other problems of inadequate housing, and to educate them in practices of home management and maintenance;

(f) educational services, including assisting appropriate family

members in securing available adult basic education;

(g) emergency services made available in connection with a crisis or urgent need of the family. Fires, floods, accidents, desertions and illnesses can all be disasters to people which may lead to institutionalization and dependency unless immediate response can be brought to bear on the problem;

(h) services to assist appropriate family members to engage in

training or secure or retain employment;

(i) informational and referral services for individuals in need of services from other agencies (such as the health, education, or vocational rehabilitation agency, or private social agencies) and follow-up activities to assure that individuals referred to and eligible for available services from such other agencies received such services; and

(j) services to meet problems of drug addiction and alcoholism.

For the aged, blind and disabled, the services would include:

(a) protective services for individuals who are (or are in danger of) being abused, neglected, or exploited, such as institutional services for those aged or physically or mentally disabled who are

unable to maintain their own place of residence;

(b) homemaker services, including education in household and related financial management and matters of consumer protection, and services to assist aged, blind, or disabled adults to remain in or return to their own homes or other residential situations and to avoid institutionalization or to assist in making appropriate living arrangements at the lowest cost in light of the care needed;

(c) nutrition services, including the provision, in appropriate case, of adequate meals, and education in matters of nutrition

and the preparation of foods;

(d) services to assist individuals to deal with problems of locating suitable housing arrangements and other problems of inadequate housing, and to educate them in practices of home maintenance and management;

(e) emergency services made available in connection with a

crisis or urgent need of an individual;

(f) services to assist individuals to engage in training or securing

or retaining employment;

(g) informational and referral services for individuals in need of services from other agencies (such as the health, education, or

vocational rehabilitation agency, or private social agencies) and follow-up activities to assure that individuals referred to and eligible for available services from such other agencies received such services; and

(h) services to meet problems of drug addiction and alcoholism.

Adoption and foster care services.—In addition to the provisions outlined above, the House bill includes a separate authorization for grants to States for foster care and adoption services, beginning with \$150 million in fiscal year 1972 and rising to \$220 million in 1976 and thereafter. Payments for foster care would include payments for medical care not otherwise available, and adoption services are defined in the bill to include payments to adoptive parents to provide them with assistance in meeting the medical or remedial needs of a child who is hard to place because of a physical or mental handicap.

Allied Services Act

On April 18 of this year the President submitted to the Congress a proposed Allied Services Act designed to aid States and communities in coordinating service programs on the local level. The President does not expect action on the measure this year; the bill was submitted to the Congress for study and comment. The bill would affect the distribution of some \$9.6 billion in Federal funds, \$6.1 billion of which represents funds authorized under the Social Security Act. More information on the proposal is included in the appendix to this pamphlet.

Services for Participants in the Employment Program

The Committee has already agreed that, under its workfare program, services for participants in the employment program would be arranged for by the Federal Employment Corporation to the extent that they are necessary in order to permit the participant to work. Other social services would not be provided by the Federal agency, but by the State welfare agency on the same basis as they are provided to other low-income families.

Closing the End on Federal Funds for Social Services

As described above, H.R. 1 would close the open end on Federal matching for the social services program (with the exception of child care and family planning services), and the bill would specify the kinds of social services for which Federal matching would be available.

Staff suggestion.—It is recommended that the provision of H.R. 1 closing the open end on Federal matching for social services be adopted.

In addition, it is recommended that the list of social services for which Federal matching would be available be adopted with the deletion of the following items:

1. Educational services; and

2. Services to meet problems of drug addiction and alcholism.

Foster Care and Adoption

A. Grants to States

Under present law, grants are made to States for child welfare services (including foster care, adoption services, and protective services for children). In 1967 the authorization for Federal grants for child welfare services was raised to \$110 million; however, the appropriation for welfare services has remained at \$46 million since 1967.

H.R. 1 would retain the child welfare services program under present law but would add an additional separate authorization of \$150 million for adoption and foster care services, eventually reaching

a level of \$220 million annually.

Elements of consideration.—Foster care represents the largest single child welfare expenditure on the county level; foster care expenditures by counties now amount to about \$350 million, with the Federal Government paying about 8 percent of the total. While foster family care is less expensive than institutionalizing a child that has no suitable home, providing services to keep a family together is even less ex-

pensive than foster care.

In a recent study published by the Child Welfare League, David Fanshel and Eugene B. Shinn found the cost of foster care to be very high in New York City. They were particularly critical of the fact that in New York funds were more readily available for foster care than on services to help keep families from breaking up, even when it is obvious that foster care would be far more expensive. Finding that "too many children slip into long-term foster care careers and their status becomes frozen through default rather than through a consciously arrived decision that alternatives to placement are not feasible," Fanshel and Shinn recommend that cases be screened in order to identify the ones in which foster care may be avoided through preventive services. If services can be provided to help the family to stay together, substantial savings in public funds will result.

Staff suggestion.—If the Committee wishes to authorize an additional amount for adoptions and foster care, as H.R. 1 proposes, it is recommended that this be done by increasing the authorization for child welfare services rather than by authorizing a separate grant for foster care. For example, a \$200 million authorization for child welfare services would be \$154 million higher than the amount included in the President's 1973 budget for child welfare services, an increase of about the same amount as proposed by H.R. 1. The advantage of not earmarking amounts specifically for foster care would be that States and counties could use the child welfare services grant money to expand preventive child welfare services with the aim of avoiding the

need for foster care wherever possible.

It is also recommended that the Committee report urge States to make greater efforts to work with families wherever appropriate in order to prevent the need for placing children in foster care.

B. National Adoption Information Exchange System (Griffin Amendment No. 411)

Senator Griffin's amendment No. 411 to H.R. 1 would authorize \$1 million for a Federal program to help find adoptive homes for hardto-place children. The amendment would authorize the Secretary of HEW to "provide information, utilizing computers and modern data processing methods, through a national adoption information exchange system, to assist in the placement of children awaiting adoption and in the location of children for persons who wish to adopt children, including cooperative efforts with any similar programs operated by or within foreign countries, and such other related activities as would

further or facilitate adoption."

This program is patterned after the Adoption Resource Exchange of North America (ARENA), which was established by the Child Welfare League of America in 1967. Its purpose is to bring together for adoption those children for whom public and private adoption agencies in the United States and Canada can find no adoptive families, and families for whom agencies have no children. A particular objective of ARENA has been to find more homes for children of minority groups, mixed racial background, and children with physical or psychological handicaps. Agencies register children who are waiting to be adopted, and families who are waiting to receive a child. Thus, ARENA makes the adoption agencies of North America a part of a large network of adoption resources. This effort helps to overcome uneven availability of homeless children and suitable adoptive families.

The Griffin amendment is aimed at making the program more effective by providing for the utilization of computers and modern data processing methods. Such a computerized system would encourage and make possible many more registrations of children and families than is presently possible.

Staff suggestion.—It is recommended that the Griffin Amendment

be approved.

8

1844 18 112 18 113 18 114 18 114 18 115 18		10	1,307,960	11,050 4,988 4,447 4,923 227,353	15,855 13,285 6,813	8,000 60,223	24,400 3,100 3,100 104,638
		Closed-end social services	800,000	2,800 4,160 1,760 2,000 158,080	8,960 6,240 5,280	5,920	15,920 80 2,000 480 83,040
E COSTS ¹	R. 1)	Family planning	16,454	185 36 62 29 3,295	202 140 40	103 407	251 34 1,181 1,181 69
AL SERVICE	Fiscal 1973 (H.R. 1)	Child care (State matched)	200,689	2,808 201 602 602 31,907	4,012 1,404 456	802 20,665	1,404 100 200 201 802
OF SOCIAL		Adoptions and foster care	164,946	2,834 263 1,408 1,513 15,458	1,828 2,358 456	530 4,941	3,814 86 613 609 8,806
EDERAL SHARE O		Foster care under AFDC	79,817	1,412 202 27 27 203 15,285	300 2,626 464	480 797	1,801 8 48 193 10,000
) FEDERA	.	Child	45,100	1,011 126 498 576 3,328	553 514 172	165 1,413	1,210 100 221 258 1,021
—ESTIMATED FEDERAL SHARE		Fiscal 1972	1,439,035	16,122 9,985 5,314 4,134 258,232	17,680 13,144 8,387	9,819 33,180	36,510 2,417 1,784 175,820 7,307
TABLE 1.		Fiscal 1971	867,542	8,467 2,320 3,469 2,856 228,931	13,204 10,483 3,332	7,477 15,390	14,278 874 1,601 33,846 4,031
		State	Total	Alabama Alaska Arizona Arkansas California	Colorado	Columbia	Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois

		ð		
13,611 11,960 8,715 14,437 15,548	8,258 23,861 21,142 44,100 20,122	5,302 13,797 3,535 7,912 2,653	3,359 57,386 8,022 151,213 15,219	4,021 35,905 10,473 31,964 79,062
5,040 8,400 3,840 9,280 8,000	3,680 13,440 8,000 27,280 10,720	8,080 2,240 1,680	1,200 45,520 2,800 85,120 7,120	2,400 17,920 4,960 24,400 33,600
124 102 172 53	332 132 680 212 16	168 40 108 18 46	426 3,398 327 42	250 103 431 820 90
2,207 200 201 2,200 2,207	1,806 4,012 6,621 3,611	1,404 201 1,404 201	4,615 4,615 402 45,344 1,201	200 4,414 201 3,411 32,703
4,301 2,274 1,741 2,597 3,210	3,174 4,409 7,565 3,222	1,936 3,628 578 1,187 386	601 5,472 922 13,590 4,120	8,689 1,956 1,643 8,940
777 318 2,283 1,300 1,006	1,342 2,305 390 3,600 4,656	5560 556 168 438 188	499 480 145 1,385	2,541 2,272 1,188 1,386
1,162 666 530 888 1,072	307 798 1,042 1,832 906	754 1,038 240 385 152	231 1,243 355 2,807 1,351	2,238 2,238 653 502 2,343
12,577 9,930 22,779 15,166 5,868	23,321 10,245 53,192 21,640 3,255	13,707 3,605 8,767 2,382 3,544	34,724 7,085 196,400 26,462 3,876	27,780 13,660 33,789 63,621 5,087
8,035 8,108 9,002 11,375 5,073	18,288 9,740 20,917 19,726 2,385	13,557 3,035 6,536 1,546 2,418	33,081 4,510 97,698 15,420 3,252	14,062 9,205 25,960 39,445 4,840
lowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine	Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi	Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire	New Jersey. New Mexico. New York. North Carolina. North Dakota.	Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island

^{24,400} 33,600 200 820 820 ¹ Including social services under the AFDC program, foster care under AFDC, and child welfare services. 3,411 32,703 2,643 8,940 8 1,188 2,343 5,087 39,445 4,840 Ohio...Oklahoma...Oregon...Pennsylvania...Rhode Island...

9

TABLE 1.—ESTIMATED FEDERAL SHARE OF SOCIAL SERVICE COST—Continued [In thousands of dollars]

APPENDIX
Memorandum Prepared by the Congressional Research Service on Proposed Allied Services Act
(11)



Memorandum Prepared by Congressional Research Service on Proposed Allied Services Act

In order for a State to be eligible to participate in the program established by the proposed Allied Services Act, the designated State agency would have to provide reasonable assurance that the services provided pursuant to all plans of the State approved under part A or B of Title IV, or under Title I, X, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act would be coordinated with each other and with services under any other human services program for which Federal assistance is extended by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and

which the Secretary specified in regulations.

In addition the services provided under the Social Security Act would have to be coordinated with services provided under no fewer than three of the following programs: (1) section 314(d) of the Public Health Service Act; (2) Title V of the Social Security Act; (3) the Vocational Rehabitation Act; (4) Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; (5) Title III of the Older Americans Act; (6) Title I or III of the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968; (7) Title XIX of the Social Security Act; (8) the Vocational Education Act of 1963; (9) the Education of the Handicapped Act; (10) part B, C, D, or E of the Community Mental Health Centers Facilities Construction Act; (11) part C or D of the Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act; (12) the Adult Education Act; and (13) any other human services programs (regardless of whether they are supported with any Federal assistance) which the local agencies may wish to include.

Based on the President's budget request for 1973, the proposal would include \$6,138,015,000 in funds authorized under the Social Security Act and \$3,523,173,000 in funds authorized under other

authorities.

We have listed below the appropriations requested in the President's budget for fiscal year 1973 for each of the programs specifically cited by legislative authority. In cases such as Title XIX of the Social Security Act, Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, some funding is included which probably would not be considered to be included as "services money" in this legislation.

(13)

1. Programs which must be included:	
Program Appropriations requeste	ed for fiscal year 1973
Social Services under various titles of the Social	
Security Act Parts A and B of the Social Security Act:	\$1, 241, 348, 000
Parts A and B of the Social Security Act:	
Section 401—Child Care (Related to Work	1 07 000 000
Incentive Program)	¹ 85, 000, 000
Section 420—Child Welfare Services	46, 000, 000
Section 426—Child Welfare Research	8, 080, 000
Section 426—Research, Training, or Demon-	19 500 000
stration Projects	12, 500, 000
(Total	151, 580, 000)
Total	1, 392, 928, 000
1 Separate transmittal for budget to implement Public Law 92-223 will be made	
2. Any three of the following must be included:	
Program Appropriations requeste	d for fiscal year 1973
Section 314(d) of the Public Health Service Act:	
Grants for Comprehensive Public Health	
Services	\$90, 000, 000
Title V of the Social Security Act: Maternal and Child Health and Crippled	
Children's Services	267, 400, 000
Vocational Rehabilitation Act:	201, 400, 000
Section 2—Vocational Rehabilitation Services	610, 000, 000
	119, 206, 000
Section 4—Special Projects Section 7—Training and Rehabilitation Re-	, ,
search	1, 825, 000
Section 12—Construction and Staffing	550, 000
Section 13—Facility Improvement	12, 500, 000
Section 16—National Center for Deaf-Blind	600 000
Youths and Adults	600, 000
(Total	744, 681, 000)
Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education	124,002,000)
Act:	
Section 103—Basic grants	1, 565, 415, 210
Section 121—Special Incentive grants	7, 280, 737
Section 131—Special grants for areas with	
highest concentrations of children from low-	04 004 050
income families	24, 804, 053
(Total	1, 597, 500, 000)
(Total	100, 000, 000
Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act	200, 000, 000
(Title I or III)	¹ 0
¹ A separate budget transmittal will be made at a later date. The fiscal years	ar 1972 appropriation was

¹ A separate budget transmittal will be made at a later date. The fiscal year 1972 appropriation was \$10 million.

Title XIX of the Social Security Act (Medical Assist-	
ance Program) Education for the Handicapped Act:	\$4, 477, 687, 000
Education for the Handreapped Act:	0# KOO OOO
Part B—State grant programs Part C, Section 623—Early childhood pro-	37, 500, 000
orang	12, 000, 000
Part D, Section 631 and 632—Teacher edu-	12, 000, 000
	36, 960, 000
Part D. Section 634—Physical education and	
Part D, Section 633—Recruitment and infor-	700, 000
Part D, Section 633—Recruitment and infor-	
marion	500, 000
Part E, Section 641—Research and demon-	0 700 000
stration Part F, Section 642—Physical education and	9, 566, 000
recreation	350, 000
recreationPart C, Sectuion 621—Regional resources	550, 000
centers	7, 243, 000
Part C, Section 622—Innovation programs	
(Deaf-Blind Centers) Part F—Media services and captioned films	10, 000, 000
Part G—Special learning disabilities	13, 000, 000
	3, 250, 000
(Total	131, 069, 000)
Community Mental Health Centers Act:	, , , ,
Part B, Section 224—Staffing of Community	
Mental Health Centers	135, 100, 000
Part C—Alcoholic Abuse and Alcoholism———— Part D—Narcotic Addiction, Drug Abuse, and	26, 490, 000
Drug Dependence Prevention and Rehabili-	
tation	36, 732, 000
Part E:	30, 132, 000
Section 261—Construction and staffing of	
alcoholism, narcotic addiction, and drug	
abuser rehabilitation facilities, training,	
and evaluation, and direct grants for special projects	82, 659, 000
Section 264—Grants for consultation serv-	82, 039, 000
ices	100, 000
-	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
(Total	82,759,000)
Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act:	
Part C—Planning, Provision of Services, and	
Construction and Operation of Facilities	21, 715, 000
Part D—Initial Staffing	5, 000, 000
<u> </u>	-,,

Vocational Education Act of 1963:	
Section 102(b)—Programs for students with	
special needs	\$20, 000, 000
Section 104(a)—National Advisory Council	330, 000
Section 104(b)—State Advisory Councils	2, 690, 000
Part B—Basic vocational education programs_	376, 682, 000
Part C—Research—Grants to States	18, 000, 000
Part D—Innovation	16,000,000
Part F-Consumer and homemaking educa-	
tion	25 , 6 25 , 000
Part G—Cooperative education	19, 500, 000
Part Hwork-study	6, 000, 000
Part I—Curriculum development	6, 000, 000
	(490, 827, 000)
Adult Education Act	
Section 304(b)—Grants Section 309—Special experimental demonstra-	51, 300, 000
tion projects and teacher training	10, 000, 000
TotalAny other human services programs	(61, 300, 000)
Total	