

The third was transfer of Headstart to the Office of Education for administration at the Federal level.

The fourth was a statement that the regional offices of the U.S. Office of Education should not be expanded for the purposes of elementary and secondary education at the State and local levels.

The fifth, which really is first in importance, but which has been emphasized so much that the board of directors placed it fifth here, is the timing of Federal authorizations, appropriations, and the presentation of the Federal regulations, knowledge about the allocations, and timing of the payments and reports, which have caused great hardship to the State educational agencies and the local educational agencies, because this is 6- or 8-month process.

Last year's amendments to Public Law 10 were signed by the President on November 3, 1966, 4 full months after the beginning of the year to which they apply. By the time you make amendments of that kind, and then the appropriations have to go through and be approved, then the regulations which often require several weeks in the Office of Education to write, have to be written, and then the allocations have to be made—by that time sometimes we find ourselves starting in January or February.

I believe Prince Georges County reported the other day that it didn't start the first year of ESEA administration until March following the July 1 of the previous year when it should have been started.

We want to emphasize these five points.

On title I, we want to express appreciation for the administration's recommended amendment to increase the minimum State administration allowance from \$75,000 a year to \$150,000 as an annual minimum for each State. The smaller States, especially the large in area but sparsely settled ones, will be helped greatly by this amendment.

On the amendments to the Teacher Corps which come in as an amendment to title I of ESEA, we appreciate the three or four amendments which have been made by the administration in its suggested bill.

We have one additional one to suggest. There are, in section 153 (A) (2) the words, in regard to the training program for corpsmen at the local level, "as the Commissioner may deem appropriate." We don't believe the U.S. Commissioner of Education should prescribe the teacher training program on each individual project at the local level which has Federal funds along with State and local funds to train corpsmen or any other teachers.

So we would like to substitute language there that would leave the specific courses of training for corpsmen to be agreed upon by the local educational agencies and the institutions of higher education concerned there, in the same way that they will agree under these amendments to all the other terms of the project.

We appreciate the amendment that will cause the approval of the State department to be required before the approval of the Commissioner of Education is made.

With all of those things, we will support the Teacher Corps. We would not have supported it without these amendments. It would have been almost universally opposed, in my judgment, if it had gone on the same way as before, where the Commissioner would tailormake and prescribe the training program on each project.