

APPENDIX D

Cost of administration of Federal aids to localities programs, fiscal year 1966-67

	Federal	State	Total
NDEA III, V, NFAH.....	\$105,823	\$92,484	\$198,307
Lunch milk and commodity distribution.....		189,151	189,151
Vocational education: Matched by State funds in department of vocational and adult education.....	80,785	80,785	161,570
ESEA: Title I.....	180,000		180,000
ESEA: Title II.....	72,462		72,462
Indian education including Public Laws 874 and 815.....	23,449		23,449
Crippled children funds A and B.....	290,000	(1)	290,000
Library Services and Construction Act.....	140,995	140,995	281,990
Administrative and staff services: Portion of State expenditures superintendent, business office, etc., which applies to the Federal aid programs above—			
Estimated $\frac{\$29,220,985}{\$165,658,661} = 17.6\% \times \$204,984 =$		36,077	36,077
Total.....	893,514	539,492	1,433,006

¹ All crippled children administration is paid by CC Federal funds. Federal amount includes everything in the way of consulting and supervising services it should plus some it shouldn't—only possible exception is L. Block, H. Donahue, and Secretary, but then there would have to be changes. The reverse of this of some of the Secretaries' time.

NOTE.—The following programs not counted: ESEA—title V—apps. 151, 451, and 851. Federal English language arts program. Surplus property charges. Lunch program handling charges. NDEA—title X.

Mr. BUCHMILLER. I believe I can summarize my statement, because many of the salient points have already been covered.

I might say it is a pleasure to be here. As you know I am the deputy State superintendent of public instruction and I speak for William C. Kahl who is the State superintendent in Wisconsin, Department of Public Instruction.

I want to emphasize that we are the agency for public elementary and secondary education in Wisconsin but do not represent the higher education or post-high-school vocational, technical, and adult education programs. Thus, my comments will have to be on the programs that relate to elementary and secondary and not the other areas. Also, I do not feel I am here to criticize either the Federal aid programs nor to arbitrarily take a negative position with respect to the U.S. Office of Education. Rather I hope that my comments might be reflective of some of our concerns, and that is about as far as I would like to go.

I would like to also emphasize the fact I have only been a State employee for 3 years and a superintendent of schools for 17, so, necessarily, some of my bias from my former employment will probably wash over.

Now, we are firmly convinced that the educational well-being of each State in the Nation as a whole can best be assured by strong departments of public instruction, by strong leadership, and by stimulation by the Federal Government in the development of comprehensive programs and that the primary interest of the Government ought to be the stimulation and development of programs, and not the operation and sustaining of those programs.

Now, also it seems to us that in the long run, significant improvement to education cannot be effective without financial assistance from the Federal Government, and it is necessary that there be some redistribution of some of the wealth to the States for educational well-being.