

We have one additional suggestion—to amend new Section 153(a) (2) to eliminate the words “as the Commissioner may deem appropriate” and to substitute language that would leave the specific courses of training for Corpsmen to be agreed upon by the local educational agencies and institutions of higher education, in the same way as they will agree on the other details of each project. This should fit the courses of training to the needs of the particular community much better than courses of training prescribed for all local projects by the U.S. Commissioner of Education as the present law provides. State and local freedom in educational decision-making is deeply involved here, and should be regarded as a critical issue in connection this legislation.

The amendments to include services to Indian children under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Department of the Interior, to children of migratory agricultural workers, and to extend statutory provisions relating to schools for Indian children and to overseas dependent schools are laudable.

TITLE V—ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

There are two major omissions in the proposed amendments to Title V, both of which are extremely important to the state educational agencies.

The first is that the bill has no provision for extension of the current Title V beyond June 30, 1968, even though the proposed new Part B (Relating to planning grants for comprehensive educational planning) carries an authorization extending four years beyond the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. It is difficult to grasp why the current Title V should be left until next year for extension.

This involves lack of federal-state-local coordination of timing, as called for by the President in his message last Tuesday. It would bring the greatest of all deterrents to effective federal, state and local administration of federal education programs.

Postponed until next year, it will be impossible to prevent severe disruption of the Title V program for strengthening state departments of education under a law expiring on June 30, 1968. The time Congress consumes in extending the authorization and making appropriations must be followed by federal regulations, allocations and payments. All consume time, so state and local agencies are unable to develop their own program plans until far into the next fiscal year. The continuing authorization of an obsolete appropriation under an expired law does little to support state and local planning under a nonexistent new law with speculative authorizations and appropriations. State and local personnel cannot be retained or new personnel employed, state planning will be months in arrears, and local frustration about the delays will be detrimental to all federal-state-local programs. We ask that Part A of Title V be extended for the same period of time proposed for Part B.

A second serious omission is that although the authorization is \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 1968, the Administration proposes an appropriation of only \$22,000,000, the same as for the current year. The transfers of \$5 million from Title X and \$2,750,000 from Title III of the National Defense Education Act would carry continuing responsibilities for expenditures to continue the functions of a major part of these NDEA programs. We believe that the appropriation should be \$50,000,000, or at the very least \$40,000,000, and that there should be appropriations authorized for the three fiscal years after June 30, 1968.

The proposal in Section 142 for revision of the Title V formula for apportionment of funds for strengthening state departments of education is perhaps as satisfactory as can be devised. It is fixed at the point of nearest consensus expressed by Council members from 47 states and three territories. Within a range of perhaps \$20 million to about \$50 million for allocations among the states, it should operate with substantial, but necessarily never with exact, justice to all states and territories concerned.

The way the proposed formula will affect each state necessarily varies according to the amount appropriated. Mr. Chairman, I would like your permission to place these materials in the record of the hearings at this point.

There was a decline in the use of Title V funds for state planning from 19% of the funds in 1966 to 14% in 1967. As Commissioner Howe told you on March 2: “The state departments of Education have not lost interest in planning. Far from it. Other concerns were more pressing . . . The growing responsibilities thrust upon them by the growing Federal programs . . . requires all their existing resources, and more. They cannot afford to plan. Yet, they cannot afford to do so. Additional funds under the current Title V would enable them to do so.