

2. Our science, remedial, and industrial art departments at the high school have been expanded. For the first time we have been able to care for those who are in need of extra help.

3. Our elementary art is now covered more thoroughly due to one of these teacher's art preparation.

4. These teachers, three being colored, have had a tremendous influence on the colored children in guidance and disciplinary matters.

5. Clubs, churches, and civic groups have utilized the services of the Corps to the fullest extent.

I recommend this program very highly to any system who will take the time to work with these people the same as with any beginning teacher.

Sincerely,

O. J. ALLEN,

Superintendent, Breckinridge County Schools.

Mr. SPARKS. I wish to make the following comments or recommendations in reacting to the proposed amendment:

First the 4-year extension clause through fiscal year 1971 should be accompanied by a realistic authorization and spelled out for a minimum of 3 years. Minimum anticipated funds at all levels of the budget process will, at least, contribute to a sound planning base.

Second, I strongly support sections 113 and 114 requiring (1) "approval of the State educational agency"; and (2) "clarifying authority of local educational agency." An administrative impasse through multiadministrative direction is always possible in divided authority.

You may see the two quotes from Breckenridge County and the city of Hopkinsville.

2. COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

In my way of thinking, the most unique "package" of educational legislation that has been formulated and enacted into law in behalf of American education is incorporated in Public Law 89-10—the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

I hasten to add that it is not the ultimate Federal aid to education measure that I should like to see enacted. However, it contains so many fine qualities, including mutual reinforcement of its several parts, that I will continue to support it as is, and without what I consider crippling amendments, until a better total "package" can be produced.

As I see it, the scope and breadth of educational planning that is required to strengthen State departments of education and to support quality programs in education, including "comprehensive" educational planning are now included in title V. Further amendments to title V, such as is proposed in "Part B—Comprehensive Educational Planning," is not a desirable reinforcement of title V and should be requested through some other more appropriate channel.

A careful reading of title V as now written, and part B as proposed, would seem to indicate:

1. Planning and projections for higher education programs are now covered under title V. State administering higher education may do so under existing legislation.

2. It may be inferred from part B that planning grants may be administered through the Governor's office or other designated State agency. This could result in two agencies carrying out the functions of the department of education.

3. Present efforts to strengthen State departments of education may be impaired in proportion to the extent that the original authorization for title V is reduced by special amendments.