

Mr. ACKERMAN. Yes. The added cost is the planning and the administration of the operation of the fund itself within the State.

Mr. QUIE. Why isn't it good that the State at least do this much?

Mr. ACKERMAN. I think in many instances it is. But when you come and foist a big program upon the State when they have not been really prepared for it in some cases it does overload your administrative staff and you are not equipped administratively to handle it.

Mr. QUIE. I think in title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, there was an amount set aside for administrative costs.

Mr. ACKERMAN. This year?

Mr. QUIE. Right from the very beginning. The problem that came up is that the State didn't receive its funds until they had approved projects and therefore, they didn't have any money in order to analyze whether they would approve them or not, so it came late. Yet they had the assurance of the money coming, so it is not that they would be out of it entirely.

The only criticism I have gotten so far was when we shifted adult education from OEO to the Office of Education. Prior to that the Office of Education was still administering it for the OEO and then they provided some money for the States to administer it.

Now, I understand no money was made available to the States for that purpose so I could see a valid criticism for the transition. Other than that I have always had a strong feeling that you would have more independent administration of this legislation if it is paid by the State for the most part. With Federal help you get it started.

In fact, I would like to see all administration money cease after the program gets going and have it all picked up by the State and local communities. Then nobody could claim they are being told how they can administrate their program.

Mr. BRADEMAS. It may be so I say to my friend from Minnesota it will be interesting to see to what extent the militant advocates of State and local control of education are willing to invest some State and local money in the administration of these programs once they have that opportunity.

Mr. ACKERMAN. I certainly feel there needs to be a great deal of involvement. In fact, as far as I am personally concerned I would like to see the State provide the majority of funds. I would like to see a minimum of Federal support. In many instances, it will require some State legislation, however, in order to change some of your revenue laws.

Well, the final concern that I would like to mention here today is this provision of financial assistance directly or indirectly to nonpublic schools. In the view of NSBA, such assistance violates the principle of church-state separation.

This assistance to nonpublic schools is a matter of practical concern as well because public schools will surely be weakened if multiple tax-supported school systems are permitted or encouraged to develop. In the testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee on March 10, 1966, NSBA emphasized that some provision must be made for the church-state question to be resolved by the Supreme Court of the United States so that Congress may be guided in passing future education legislation.