

May I cite this example: In our State plan we reviewed the projects that came to Washington. In most of the cases, I should say, they approved the projects we recommended. In some instances they did not. In the instance where they exceeded our recommendations and went to the local agency and approved projects that we had not recommended, they were overlapping projects which already existed, and this is why I think this authority should be in the hands of the local State agency and not left up to Washington to approve, because they do not know all of the planning that goes on in the local agencies.

On title V, as has been mentioned, there are two very important items that I think need your consideration under title V. I will mention again that this title expires on June 30, 1968. It should be extended until 1970.

Of course, the appropriation of \$22 million, to my way of thinking, is only a drop in the bucket as to what is needed of the allocation of the \$50 million which was what we think we need and what we should have for this title.

Speaking on the amendment of part B of title V for educational planning, I join with my colleagues in saying this is very important, but I think the State agencies here are competent to carry out and be responsible for educational planning. Should the present amendment as it now exists be passed, I think it would lead to chaos and confusion.

The amendment, as I understand it, would allow the Governor to select either an institution of higher learning, a private agency or the State agency. I think this would be wrong and would not lead to educational harmony, but would, as I said, lead to chaos and confusion.

It would be much simpler to put this into title V, which already has the responsibility for educational planning. I join with my colleagues in hoping that this committee will leave it where it belongs and not set up a section B or a part B and set up a confusion among the State departments and with the Governor's office as to who administers this title.

On section VI, I agree with the previous speakers that adding title VI to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act could be one of the most important steps for American education.

But there are two serious omissions, in my opinion: One, an appropriation of \$2.5 million is very small and meager to meet the needs of Florida or the other States. We in Florida are only serving about 50 percent of the handicapped children. The \$2.5 million, or our share of approximately \$50 million, is really not enough to do the job.

The proposal to establish regional resources centers at \$7,500,000 is an important step, but I do not think it takes priority over adequate financing of the States for assistance in the education of handicapped children.

Finally, the Vocational Education Act. Here I would think that Congress is to be commended for the farsightedness in the amendments to title II of the Vocational Education Act.

In Florida we are planning vocational, technical, and adult centers to reach 95 percent of all the population in our State. We will have 29 centers that are to be completed within the next 2 years. More than half of these centers will open in September 1967 and the balance in 1968 and 1969.