

are designed to retrain adults so that they can be removed from the welfare roles and placed in productive jobs and become contributing members of the community. The program of the skill center in Watts, as well as our other skills centers in East Los Angeles and Pacoima, have been unable to function as planned because the equipment for many of the areas of training has not been forthcoming. The district has received letters and telegrams from the federal agency in charge of the program assuring us that government-furnished equipment would soon be on its way to the center. These programs were to have started in September, 1966, but today we are still waiting and the people who were to receive the training are still on the welfare roles. We know that many of these people, who were at first eager to become involved in the program, have lost their interest as a result of the discouraging delays.

In 1965 the Los Angeles Unified School District for the first time became eligible for funds from PL 874. This law, because of the flexibility it made possible by virtue of coming to us as general aid, has allowed the district to implement many meaningful programs for pupils who otherwise would not have been reached under the categorical aid type of legislation and who could not have been served within the existing financial limitations of the district.

The Los Angeles School Districts have been involved in federally funded educational programs for many years, beginning in the 1930's with the George Barden and the Smith-Hughes programs. In 1958, with the passage of the National Defense Education Act, the district became more involved in the process of federal aid. In 1964, under the provisions of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act, the district's first preschool programs were initiated. With the advent of the Economic Opportunity Act, additional programs for the educationally and economically deprived child were implemented. The VEA of 1963 allowed the district to provide more advanced programs of vocational education. In 1965 the school district was, for the first time, provided with sufficient funds to make an initial impact in the area of serving the educationally disadvantaged child. (We are presently able to provide saturation programs for only 65,000 of the close to 200,000 pupils needing these kinds of programs.) This became possible with the enactment of PL 89-10 (The Elementary and Secondary Education Act). Up to that time, programs providing special remedial and corrective classes for children with educational deficiencies were necessarily limited because available local funds were completely inadequate to support the kind of effort required. They became even less adequate each year in the face of relentless growth in enrollment. Additional expenditures for compensatory programs have been at the expense of a dilution of the overall educational program. The maintenance of substantial reserves to be drawn on in anticipation of a probable grant of financial support is no longer possible. Like other large school districts which must operate within the restrictions of their respective state constitutions and education codes, Los Angeles is in no position to commit personnel, supplies, equipment, and facilities in substantial amounts on the basis of oral promises.

The problem we face is that such commitments cannot be made on the basis of anything less than a binding legal contract between the school district and the federal government, completed, and signed well in advance of the commencement of a new program. This contract should include a complete recital of all terms and conditions that will remain unchanged, except by mutual consent, for the period of the contract.

The Los Angeles Unified School District, like every other school district in the nation, launched its Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I, programs during this current year on the basis of a continuing resolution passed by Congress, authorizing expenditures up to 85% of the first year's entitlement. This school district, like many other school districts in the nation, designed programs which would benefit the educationally deprived children of the district to the full extent of the funds we believed were committed by Congress in the continuing resolution. These programs begin operation in September, 1966. Twenty-one counties in the State of California and an unknown number of local school districts within these counties will receive an actual entitlement totalling less than the 85% figure that was seemingly guaranteed in the continuing resolution. What will happen to these districts? Will they now be forced to cut back their programs, lay off teachers, cancel commitments for supplies and equipment, and face the very delicate task of explaining to the local community why this has to be done? No organization can operate effectively under such conditions. Some-