

funds to be set aside for special projects to be approved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education either omitted or kept low. Omitted was the majority view; kept low the view of all others.

Mr. Chairman, there is no mistaking the position of the chief State school officers on this title III issue. Point 8 of the report of the Legislative Conference of National Organizations also shows that this proposed change has widespread support throughout the country.

We believe fundamental issues are involved in what is done about title III in 1967. There are emerging systems of modern regional service center units developing within many of the States under State and local auspices. There is great need for coordination of these emerging regional service centers within States, with all supplementary service centers established under title III.

We believe the new title III centers should not be allowed to develop in ways that will establish a Federal system of supplementary service centers supported primarily by Federal funds, paralleling and sometimes duplicating systems of similar centers established and supported by the States.

Continuation of the current title III program, with expansion to supplementary centers, may deny great benefits of title III to the States most in need of it. In a few selected States the U.S. Office of Education encourages informal State planning for title III centers. These States enjoy the special advantages that pilot States usually have, but with minimum or even negative results to others.

A majority of the States are exhorted to note what their stronger neighbors are doing, but are denied the means to experience progress of their own by a denial of the responsibility that is necessary for their progress.

As the neglected States stand by observing progress but remaining unsupported for engaging in it themselves, they are denied the administrative, psychological, and public reinforcement that they need. The neglected States lose ground in full view of their constituencies of citizens and State and local governments.

The Federal Government refuses, in substance, to use educational methods in education. It helps the strong, but denies it in title III, to the weak the things that would enable the weak to become strong. It is as though a classroom teacher overemphasized demonstrations by brilliant pupils while the disadvantaged pupils looked on without being given practice in and responsibility for improving themselves.

There need not be parallel State supported and federally supported service agencies for education within the States. It would be far better to combine State and Federal efforts and have comprehensive planning on a State basis. Such would enable the Federal Government to provide financial support on condition that the Federal objectives for which the Federal funds could be used would be carefully served.

A system of regional service centers administered on the State and local levels, supported by the Federal Government for its own defined purposes, and constituting a true partnership in the service of modern education, would provide a desirable system for the future.

Mr. Chairman, we have had access to the text of these amendments for only a few days. It is incomplete. There are probably errors and omissions. We will welcome further inquiries from the members of the committee.