

Title VI is directed toward critical unmet needs and has great potential for meeting these needs. It is hoped that the Appropriations Committee and administrative agencies can come to see more nearly eye to eye with the Committee on Education and Labor on realistic support levels for fiscal year 1968 and future years.

Adult Education Act of 1966—Public Law 89-750: Highly important to the Kentucky Department of Education is the new amendment—title III of Public Law 89-750—which helps the States to broaden and improve general adult education which is so imperatively needed in breaking the cycle of poverty.

Placing the administration of adult education in the U.S. Office of Education helps to provide unity and direction to a program now reporting to two separate agencies. In Kentucky, exemplary cooperative working relationships have been established with other State and Federal agencies in the administration of adult education programs. Inasmuch as the programs have been operational for several years, it is strongly recommended that the program be financed at or near the authorization level.

I am particularly concerned with the advancement of adult education in Kentucky in that the 1960 census showed us to be tied with South Carolina for the low end of average educational achievement throughout the State for our adults 25 years of age and older.

I hope that at some time the concepts of basic education can be extended to include high school training so that our adults may be trained for the passage of the general education development test or the equivalency program which will enable these men to secure jobs in modern industry. A program which is restricted to merely basic education takes a fellow about half away across the creek, Mr. Chairman, and lets him drown when he tries to apply for a position in modern industry.

Amendments to title I—Public Law 89-750: Two amendments are especially helpful to Kentucky in the administration of title I. They are (1) "clarifying the definition of average per pupil expenditure"; and (2) raising the low income factor after June 30, 1967, to \$3,000.

The revised 50-percent clause: This amendment penalizes no State in terms of the existing formula and at the same time assists low-income States with higher concentrations of economically disadvantaged youth to provide a higher level of education. Percentage formulas, in general, tend to produce inequities. While the new formula is a significant step forward, it is recommended that further study be given to various methods for determining an even more equitable basic grant formula for distributing title I funds.

The new low-income factor of \$3,000: The adoption of a more realistic family subsistence level will make it possible for many States to improve administrative and instructional practices for the disadvantaged child. Further, it will include many borderline children that are now excluded by the \$2,000 cutoff formula. In areas of heavy concentration of poverty, such as some counties in Kentucky, it will be possible to gear the total school program to the needy child.

Judicial review: It is recommended that Federal acts providing aid to education should provide for judicial review by local citizens through their courts.