

In Illinois, we were prudent with approvals and disbursed money when we were confident it could bring about educational achievement. We have insisted that the programs have quality and we did not disburse the money on a wholesale basis.

Illinois is being penalized for using good judgment because the U.S. Office of Education requested that we return any money that could not be used effectively by the local agencies according to the early guidelines.

We have now been advised that our allocation will be based on the amount of money disbursed for the first year.

We are administering in Illinois \$1,200 million of State and Federal money, and are responsible for the proper expenditure of \$5 billion of local funds every 2 years. It is remarkable that the U.S. Office of Education cannot respect our judgment on an allotment of \$44 million under the programs for Title I: Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

In conclusion, I would ask the members of this Committee for your consideration of these items. I would further welcome your analysis of our programs in Illinois. We are currently under some unnecessary duress concerning this program and hope that there will be an opportunity afforded us to provide for members of this committee the specific information concerning a preliminary audit report of the title I program in the city of Chicago. This report is a masterpiece of confusion. It may provide for you the specifics that are alluded to in my testimony.

Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you, Dr. Page.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to be very brief and summarize the nine pages of material which I have prepared.

There is entered into the record a report from six major national educational associations.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, for the record, may we have the gentleman's name?

Mr. FULLER. Edgar Fuller.

That group met in Chicago for 2 days last November and had a legislative workshop in this city in January, which formulated 17 priority points of Federal legislation recommended for 1967. This report was taken to the White House, where they met with White House officials, HEW officials, with the U.S. Commissioner of Education, and with the Bureau of the Budget representatives. Those 17 points are in the summary attached to the formal statement which you have.

Among those 17 points, the Council of Chief State School Officers' Board of Directors considered them for a half day in Atlantic City last month, and formulated some priorities among them for 1967 recommendations. These priorities, which were approved, and I am sure without any dissent, by the representatives of 23 States when reported on behalf of the board of directors last month in Atlantic City were:

1. Amendments to title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965—grants to strengthen State departments of education.

The second priority was amendments to title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—supplementary educational centers.