

Of course, if necessary, the State board of education should submit a plan for the use of the money. Just as State moneys are audited, so should Federal moneys be audited. However, the word of a State auditor should be sufficient.

Instead of a simple general Federal aid law, what do we now have?

Today we have a multiplicity of "programs," each with a Federal grant. There is no overall approach to financing instruction: the basic purpose of schools. The result is that we have a multiplicity of "little U.S. offices of education" in Washington, and now area offices are springing up, all of which have mushroomed into existence generally as special-interest groups have been able to pressure Congress.

Nowdays, financially, in Washington, "The wheel that squeaks the loudest gets the grease."

Now, don't let me mislead you. There are some excellent school people in the U.S. Office of Education. However, generally speaking, they have become administrators over fiscal affairs, reports, and guidelines for programs. They are not personnel who offer consultative assistance in instruction development, except as they attempt to control the use of Federal money.

Let's strengthen this local-State-Federal partnership through financial assistance to instruction, rather than through a multiplicity of programs, each having a confusing set of rules and regulations, guidelines, and directives. I personally feel that this "program approach" of Federal assistance is the basic cause for much of our dissatisfaction.

Without having time to thoroughly research our records, I found our Department of Education has coded 32 individual Federal programs. Many of these programs, of course, will have one or more titles or subsections, which will add to this number. However, the July-August 1965 issue of the "American Education" magazine of HEW lists 65 grant programs financed by the U.S. Office of Education for 1966.

Our records show that program administrators of the Department have made 52 trips to Washington to get Federal interpretations and instructions since January 1, 1966—and I might ad lib that the year is not over. The total travel expense was over \$7,000. I did not try to determine the number of telephone communications made.

Every new program necessitates new personnel at all three levels, and new administrative expenses.

I would like to point out some experiences we have had that seem to indicate little acquaintance with local and State operations.

Decisions are made in the U.S. Office of Education to initiate a specific activity that does not lend itself to sound administration of State and local school systems.

A specific example is a telegram from N. Karsh, Assistant Commissioner for Administration, Office of Education, dated June 16, 1966, to Mr. E. B. Davis, State auditor, relative to withdrawals of Federal funds by letter of credit:

Current reports indicate the use of letter-of-credit is operating in a manner that appears contrary to intent of the system. Funds are being withdrawn at a rate which makes it appear that payments are being made to LEA's and others considerably in advance of the actual need for cash. To enable us to determine actual need, no further withdrawals of Federal funds shall be made until further