

Mr. WHITTIER. Well, that is the point, and you cannot underwrite any of our so-called basic programs.

Mrs. GREEN. We have instances in Oregon where economically poor areas have started a program, and they did not have the funds to carry it through. Title I came along, and because this particular school district had started the program, they were precluded from using title I funds for it, while an adjoining school district had not started a program in the preceding year, they could use title I funds for exactly the same thing.

We set up such artificial barriers, such tight guidelines, that we cannot say the money is always spent wisely. When we were having hearings across the country, we ran into some districts that admitted they spent 40 percent of the funds for equipment. Was that the figure?

Mr. OHRENBERGER. In the first year.

Mrs. GREEN. Yes. Why? Because there is a magical deadline the Federal Government imposes; if you do not spend all of the money by a particular date, you lose it.

This would not be true if you had general aid and all that it implies. You would be able to spend it and get a lot more "bang for the buck."

Mr. WHITTIER. Well, you have another problem, as you know, and that is if you are spending it for personnel, you had a carryover factor, and we had no assurance; and we could not buy in on that one, so that was one of the factors why you spend it on that kind of a program.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I have a question.

Assuming the situation that Mrs. Green has described, the school district submitting under title I an application for a specific program, is that not submitted to your State title I office? It does not come down here to Washington to get turned down, does it?

Mrs. GREEN. It is in the law.

Mr. FORD. We are not talking about one that is clearly in the law. We are talking about a situation where the people in a school district look at the law and feel in their opinion that this would be the kind of program that would be legal, or they obviously would not submit the application. But who makes the decision if a city school district wants to undertake a program under title I, after you have been given the guidelines, and then that program is kicked back to you, and they say, "No, you can't go ahead with the program." Isn't that done at the State level?

Mr. WHITTIER. Yes. This is screening.

Mr. FORD. So we are not here talking about a situation where after you have conceived the program and proceeded with it, you are thwarted in your efforts to carry it out by a decision made in Washington after the fact of the application.

Mr. WHITTIER. No, what we are talking about really is the extensive detailed prescriptions that initiate in the first place from the Federal.

Mr. FORD. I understand that, but there is a very important distinction between the two, because the discussion this afternoon up until now has been on the role, I take it, of the State and local educators in devising and directing these programs. I would not want the record to be left with the impression that these title I programs are being reviewed here in Washington, after they are devised.

We have had difficulty in our State as well, but our real test is between the local school districts and the State board of education, or the State education office, rather, on title I. That is where the friction has been.

Chairman PERKINS. The gentlelady from Oregon.

Mr. DAILARD. May I comment?

Mrs. GREEN. Let me just make it clear, I think the gentleman from Michigan did not understand me. I said that the law prescribes that you cannot do things under title I funds that you have been doing before. The programs must be above and beyond present programs. The district to which I referred a moment ago had been carrying on a particular program, very inadequately, due to limited finances. They were precluded from using Federal funds, because we had written that provision in the law, while the adjoining district could do it. This particular example was not about a State plan being turned down. It was a Federal restriction.

Mr. FORD. I am sorry. I misunderstood. I understood you to state before that they made application, and their application was rejected because—

Mrs. GREEN. I did not say that.

Mr. FORD. I am sorry.

Chairman PERKINS. The gentleman from San Diego.

Mr. DAILARD. May I comment on several points that have been under discussion here, and express an opinion?

We did have in California what might be regarded as a pilot program for compensatory education. In fact, if you look to the hearings held before the passage of 89-10, you will find a presentation, that happens to use the same picture that I used on the face of this today, of the three children, reporting on what could be done.

We were not precluded from the program. We could not replace those funds that we had had in the title program, but we were not precluded from extending that to all the rest of the area, and adding this above.

Since the enactment of this, there was an additional program aimed at the target areas. We referred to it as the Watts bill, for fairly obvious reasons, but it has made money, in which you have State funds available which we can use for prekindergarten programs, or housing, for class size reductions, within the target area. That is point No. 1.

The second point, I don't believe I could give you the firm assurance of being permitted from public pressure to continue the use of the funds if this were suddenly shifted to general aid. I would become aware within just a couple of weeks of requests from some of the most favored areas of our community to add certain kinds of services there, using the argument that this is what you are doing in the southeast areas, which happens to be our area, and I am sure those pressures would mount to spread this to get the reduced class size.

We have a class size in our target area now of seven pupils per teacher below the city average. The other areas would ask for that, so it is my feeling, so far as we are concerned, if there were any sudden turnover from this, we would not be permitted within the city to use them in the same way.

The third point that I question whether this is an either/or proposition. I think the present programs have been very productive. We are developing a new framework of Federal-local cooperation and effort that is useful. I think it would be catastrophic if this were suddenly upset and we moved to an altogether different base. I think we will move to the time that the Congress will find it appropriate to build the Federal aid, but in watching our building a general Federal aid program, in watching California State programs, we have had a strong foundation program, but we still have built into that a number of categorical aids to give emphasis for the teaching of the handicapped; to give emphasis even in this area, we had it. I cannot convince myself that there will not always be occasion and necessity for earmarking certain funds to accomplish certain purposes, even when we move in with Federal aid.

Mr. QUIE. This is true. We have tried to accomplish certain national purposes. We have gone along on the categorical aid program. The question is, Do we need that Federal direction forever? Is there such a lack of competence on the State and local level to pick up the ball and realize the necessity of it later on? I don't think you would ever find it if one year we had a full-blown title I program, and the next year changed to a general aid program. It is more a question of whether we could phase into it. Some of the men say that this sensitivity of the need is recognized.

Now we are talking about title I, about a program that is directed toward a certain group of children. What of the other two I asked about, the textbooks and equipment? Do you think we need Federal direction in both of those, in order for the schools to continue to spend the money that is needed?

I would be interested in Mr. Briggs answering that, since he kind of took the other approach on title I.

Mr. BRIGGS. I wish that title II would be similar to the NDEA on a per pupil basis. Cleveland would come out better. We do not get the State average per pupil that you distribute in the State of Ohio.

Mr. QUIE. How about title III? Do you think we still need the equipment title separate? Otherwise, you wouldn't be able to convince your board to buy the equipment.

Mr. BRIGGS. No; we have no trouble convincing the board. You misunderstand this. We have no argument with title III. However, it was attempting to do certain things, it was attempting, as I understood it, to better equip laboratories in this country, and you may be sure that the laboratories in this country are better equipped because of title III. There is no question about it.

Mr. QUIE. And you need this special program for all time in the future?

Mr. BRIGGS. No; I don't think so, and I am not—

Mr. QUIE. Would you be willing to give this one up to general aid, and, therefore, through general aid, be able to buy all the equipment that you could need, and also be able to set some priorities for use of the money?

Mr. BRIGGS. I have one reservation. I am not sure that the Congress of the United States is as enthusiastic about just giving general fund moneys to public schools across the country as it is in seeing that certain things are accomplished.

Mr. QUIE. Don't worry about the Congress here. We will take care of that. I would like to find out from the school superintendents what would be the wisest expenditure of Federal money, how you could best use the money. We will take care of the politics here.

Mr. BRIGGS. All right. Up to this time, the only moneys we have ever gotten from Congress have been those that have been earmarked; the only Federal money that we know is Federal money for certain national purposes. You have never given us any general aid for anything, except you have earmarked it for certain national purposes. We are not familiar with Federal money for general aid. I am not as optimistic as you might be about the generosity of Congress in this respect.

I think it sees certain problems that are not being met; it saw the vocational problem after World War I, and it moved in that direction.

It has seen the problem under NDEA, and has moved in that direction, and then the poverty problem. And I am certainly not against local autonomy, but I do not believe that you would have given as much, if it had been general. I am not sure that we would have used it. I am sure we would not have used it in the way that we have, if it had been general.

I would like to have more money for the children of the big cities, and if there were unlimited amounts of money, where we could bring the cities up somewhere near the general expenditure in the Nation, we would not have to, perhaps, earmark as carefully as we have.

I would like to see us facing in that direction.

Chairman PERKINS. If you will excuse us, we have to cast a vote. In about 10 minutes, we will be right back, and you can take a break in the meantime.

(A short recess was taken.)

Chairman PERKINS. The committee will come to order.

A quorum is present.

The gentlelady from Oregon.

I made the announcement when I came in today that every member would have 20 minutes until we got around the second time, and then the third crack would be unlimited.

Mrs. Green?

Mrs. GREEN. Yes.

Dr. Briggs, I was under the impression that this morning you said that you would prefer general aid to categorical.

Mr. BRIGGS. Oh, I think that all of us would, but the question this afternoon, I think, came about to the point that could we guarantee that we would be doing the same things with the money, if it became general aid. My answer was twofold: if it came through the State of the State that I am talking about, the State of Ohio, we would not get it in the first place. We would not have it to do these things with.

No. 2, the local pressures would be such that we would not be able locally to do exactly with it what we might.

Mrs. GREEN. If there were a fund that went to the State, and the formula stays the same as under title I, and it said: that this much will go to Ohio with this much to the city of Cleveland, you would get it.

Mr. BRIGGS. As long as we are sure that there is a way of getting it.

Mrs. GREEN. There is nothing to prevent us from doing it that way.

Mr. BRIGGS. You thought you were doing it with title II.

Mrs. GREEN. I come from a big city in Oregon. Portland. So I know exactly your problems, but I don't think it is fair for you to ask the Congress to do what you ought to be asking the State legislature to do in Ohio, and what the people in Portland ought to be asking the State legislature to do in Oregon.

The basic school formula in Oregon, I think, is unfair to the city, and from what you say in Ohio it isn't fair to Cleveland, but that isn't a congressional responsibility; that is a State responsibility.

Mr. BRIGGS. You must realize, I am sure, Mrs. Green, that my voice is being heard in Ohio relative to this on this very subject, yes.

Mrs. GREEN. Right, and I hope you can get the desired changes made.

Mr. BRIGGS. But this is a fact of life.

Mrs. GREEN. Let me ask you, if there were general aid, would it be spent in equally good ways, as far as the quality and equality of educational opportunity in Cleveland is concerned?

Mr. BRIGGS. I am afraid that the money that is now going 100 percent into poverty areas, if we got exactly that same amount of money in general aid, that it would not all go into poverty areas.

Mrs. GREEN. That isn't answering my question.

Mr. BRIGGS. Well, the answer is no, it would not all.

Mrs. GREEN. Would it be equally well spent?

Mr. BRIGGS. No, it would not be.

Mrs. GREEN. That was my question.

Mr. BRIGGS. But it isn't an either/or thing. It would be spent on children, but it would not be spent on inner city children, to the same extent.

Mrs. GREEN. That was not what I asked you. I asked would it be equally well spent. I must conclude from what you are saying that Congress or the people in Washington have better judgment and a better idea about establishing priorities for education in Cleveland than the people of Cleveland.

Mr. BRIGGS. No, no. I don't think so.

Mrs. GREEN. That's the way your comment struck me, sir.

Mr. BRIGGS. I know it may sound that way. The point I am trying to make is if the national purpose was to attack poverty, and to attack the inner city problem, by giving us money that we could only use for that, we budgeted it only for that, but the problems of the city of Cleveland are so great that even the best judgment of the city of Cleveland and the board of education and the superintendent of the city of Cleveland would not have allowed us to have made the concentrated effort on the inner city that we have made.

Mrs. GREEN. Well, I will just have to enter a disclaimer. As a member of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, I have a deep and abiding conviction that the people of my city of Portland, Oreg., have a much better understanding of the educational problems of Portland, a much better understanding of how to solve those problems, and a much better grasp of the priorities for the city of Portland than my colleagues here on the committee, or my colleagues in the Congress, White House, or the HEW.

I have a deep and abiding conviction that this is true. If we had a John Gardner in every single spot, at every single level of the Federal programs, I would have a great deal more confidence that they would be carried out wisely.

Mr. BRIGGS. Yes.

Mrs. GREEN. The regional office people come out to Portland for 2 days, and at the end of the 2 days, tell how all of the problems of Portland schools are to be solved. I get a little bit weary of saying that the local school people just cannot solve the problems and Washington has to do it. It would seem that I am about to make a speech on old myths and current realities. I think there are some old myths that need to be exploded. I have heard it on this committee, and I have heard it from the Department, and I have heard it from high levels in my party, that the States have never done, that the local superintendents would not do it, that the schools cannot do it, that the teachers don't know how. I am of the conviction that the reason that you superintendents haven't solved problems, and had so many different kinds of problems, is because you really haven't had the money. I don't think it is a sufficient answer to say, well, before we gave the Federal funds, you never did do it. Before we had Federal funds and we had know-how, and never went into space, either. It seems to me just as ridiculous to say, well, let's have categorical aid, and let's have tight restrictions, because the States obviously haven't taken care of the problem. I think I have heard that a hundred times this year.

Forgive me my little lecture.

Mr. BRIGGS. I don't disagree with you. I think you and I are in total agreement. The point that I was trying to make was the fact that the question was asked, if we had general aid, would it be going for exactly the same thing that it is going for now, and my answer is no, it would not be.

Mrs. GREEN. I don't think that's really the question, though.

Mr. BRIGGS. That was what was asked.

Mrs. GREEN. I don't think that here in Washington, that we can decide what is best in every single State and every single city in the country, because the problems of Cleveland are not the same as Portland's.

Mr. BRIGGS. We won't quarrel with you on that.

Mrs. GREEN. I am just asking you. Would funds be equally well spent in terms of quality education, and equality in education? I think this is all the Congress can ask.

Beyond that, let me ask you, how much title I money was returned? Did you return any, or did you spend it all?

Mr. BRIGGS. We spent practically all of it. I think our records will show that we are just about No. 1 in the Nation as far as the amount that we spent, and any amounts that were unspent, it was just a few dollars here and a few dollars there.

Mrs. GREEN. Let me ask you some other questions.

Mr. BRIGGS. It was in the top 90's, the 90 percent that we spent.

Mrs. GREEN. What about you? Did you return any money?

Mr. DAILARD. We didn't return any.

Mrs. GREEN. New York?

Mr. DONOVAN. Yes, we did return some. It came so late in the year that we could not employ all the personnel we wanted to employ for the operation, and we had to return some the same year.

Mrs. GREEN. Baltimore?

Mr. PAQUIN. Yes, we returned money.

Mr. WHITTIER. Very little, very little.

Mrs. GREEN. Are you gentlemen both from Baltimore?

Mr. WHITTIER. Philadelphia.

Mr. PAQUIN. We returned about 50 percent.

Mrs. GREEN. Was this because of Federal restrictions? Here you are crying for funds, hungry for them, and yet because of restrictions, you can't spend it.

Mr. PAQUIN. I don't think it would be fair to say it would be entirely Federal restrictions. I think there were problems. As Mr. Donovan has said, the matter of getting late notification when the money was available, and I think probably a certain amount of it was inherent conservatism, afraid to make commitments until you knew you had money in the till.

Mrs. GREEN. Let me turn to one other general question. I have figures here for all of the cities in terms of white and nonwhite population.

My figures show Baltimore, in 1954 had 86,611 white and 57,000 nonwhites. You now have 76,000 white and 111,000 nonwhite.

Philadelphia, in 1955 had 140,000 white and 81,000 nonwhite, you now have 116,000 white and 153,000 nonwhite.

Pittsburgh has not changed according to this publication.

I am aware of the fact that the exodus to the suburbs is a major factor.

Are there Federal programs either in the field of education or other Federal programs that have accelerated this exodus from the city to the suburbs? Are there Federal programs in education that have accelerated the exodus from the public schools of the white children to the private schools?

Mr. DONOVAN. I don't think I could put my finger on a Federal program that has done this particularly. I am trying to think if there are any that stand out. I don't believe in our city we blame the flight of the whites on any Federal programs. I think we blame it on just the lack of desire on the part of a number of people to learn to live in a multiracial group.

Secondly, I think we find lack of confidence in the public schools which has been engendered by a number of things that have happened one of which is the use of Office of Economic Opportunity money to help the poor people find themselves, bring themselves up and in their finding they seem to find the public school as a target.

That has hurt us, I think.

Mrs. GREEN. Will you elaborate on that point?

Mr. DONOVAN. I think we have found in practically all our cities that some of the funds used by the Office of Economic Opportunity to instigate improvements for the poor and get the poor to raise their horizons socially and politically have turned themselves into simply complaint organizations against the public schools, that the public school is not doing the job, it is no good and we have to do something else beside the public school.

That has engendered a certain lack of confidence on the part of disadvantaged people as well as advantaged people. I think it is most unfortunate that one agency of the government should center its attack upon another agency of the government.

This is not done by everybody but it is done enough to bother us. I see some hope in the Federal program for recapturing some of our white population. We hope in the city of New York shortly to go into an educational project which is a whole rehabilitation of a section of a city, not just putting the schools together but putting housing in with it, different kinds of housing, community centers, shopping centers, theaters, all in a great section of the city for rehabilitation.

Federal funds will help us, transportation funds, highway funds, we hope some fund for construction eventually of school buildings.

A number of things will help us to build a totality of community within the city where the schools will be an accepted and integrated part.

Mrs. GREEN. What about housing programs, Federal housing programs?

Mr. DONOVAN. The Federal housing program I don't think has—it has not harmed or hurt us except as it is directed by local authorities when they set up that housing.

Mrs. GREEN. Has it accelerated the exodus? Has it placed burdens on the schools in terms of white and nonwhite?

Mr. DONOVAN. It has placed burdens on the schools in terms of school construction but it has not particularly put burdens on us except where large segments of low-cost housing are put together without middle-income housing near this and then you get a segregated situation.

That kind of thing has hurt us.

Mrs. GREEN. Let me quickly ask, do any of you feel there are any Federal programs that have accelerated this pace?

Mr. BRIGGS. Except housing. I think it is a little unfair for one agency of the government to ask us to build schools that will be totally integrated and then the other agency of the government, the Federal Housing Authority, coming in and building totally segregated housing in those areas.

This is happening every day. Now we will bulldoze as we are right now 50 acres of homes, slum houses out and we will fill them with 50 acres of very very low-income housing, housing for very low-income people which means we are perpetuating the concentration of poverty people in the same areas of the city and we are doing it for the next 50 years.

Mrs. GREEN. This is exactly the question I have in mind. We are attempting to overcome segregation in the schools and yet another branch of the government, through housing, is really helping to create the problem: but we only blame education.

Mr. BRIGGS. Yes. One other facet of this is that in our Federal Housing Authority, at least in Cleveland, in lieu of taxes we get about \$20 per child out of the housing projects.

In other words, we have taken private housing out, taken them off the tax assessment rolls. We place public housing on those rolls. The

amount of money we get in lieu of taxation amounts to about \$20 per child.

This means that every time we build a big housing project of this nature we are compounding the tax problem of the private home owner relative to the education of children in public housing projects.

Mrs. GREEN. Let me turn to another subject, the Teacher Corps. If I remember correctly, everyone of you said if you had your "druthers" you would rather have your teacher training programs within your schools.

Mr. BRIGGS. Yes. I didn't react. I would only have one reaction to this. I think the teacher shortage is so great in this Nation that any new approach, any one approach, while it alone will not solve the problem, it brings a certain degree of hope and this is why the first time around I think everybody said yes this morning to it and then when you gave us our druthers we changed positions a little bit.

But, I think that actually most of us feel that this was a form or is a form that may bring some people into the teaching field that might not otherwise get there.

Mrs. GREEN. Off the record.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that at this point I have to leave because I didn't know we were going to have a hearing this afternoon and I made an appointment that I have to keep. I would like, if I may, to say one thing: I don't think we have changed position at all.

What we said this morning was that the Teacher Corps is a good thing. We would like to see the project fully funded. Then we got to an entirely different question and that was: "If you had your own way about it wouldn't you rather do your own teacher training?"

The answer is "Yes, we would." But we don't have our own way about it. To talk practically about what may happen with the bill before you, it will happen to the Teacher Corps one way or other, it will not be a grant of money to us for teacher training apparently.

Therefore, we would like to see the Teacher Corps fully funded. If we ever get to general aid, then we would like to do our own teacher training at that point with the money. I would like to thank you and make sure that we are available to you at any other time.

Chairman PERKINS. Dr. Donovan, could you stay a few more moments?

Mr. FORD. I have one question before you go ahead. One of the common presumptions is that the white people are running away from the city for only one reason and that somehow the population mix of the cities is changing only because of the exodus of people from the city.

Is the city of New York smaller or larger in population now than it was in 1960 when the census was taken?

Mr. DONOVAN. The city of New York today is about the same size it was in 1960.

Mr. FORD. All the people who have left the city have been replaced by someone else?

Mr. DONOVAN. That is correct.

Mr. FORD. Aren't these generally impoverished people, predominantly nonwhites, from some of the less affluent States?

Mr. DONOVAN. Yes.

Mr. FORD. Doesn't this focus attention on the additional problem you have operating under the formula that counted those people in the Southern States in 1960 but now gives you money to educate them in New York in 1967?

Mr. DONOVAN. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Also before you leave, Dr. Donovan, may I ask this question: In what you have just said about teacher training, are you here giving an example of what you feel would be a preferable handling of Federal funds that instead of establishing a Teacher Corps program we place a general guideline that x dollars will be used for teacher training and that then you would use these dollars for teacher training?

Dr. DONOVAN. Yes, sir. If left to my own devices I would prefer that.

Mr. DELLENBACK. If this were to happen, would this improve the quality of teacher training?

Dr. DONOVAN. I think it would change the nature of the training and I trust improve the quality. If it didn't, I wouldn't want to spend the money on it.

Last summer in New York City we trained 8,000 teachers in specially designed courses on the nature of teaching the child from the disadvantage area. We took them in and put them through special courses, 8,000 of them, in one summer.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Were they already teaching?

Dr. DONOVAN. They were already teachers in our system teaching in schools for the disadvantaged. We wanted to broaden and deepen their knowledge of what they were doing.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Would there be a difference in the number of teachers who would be teaching the disadvantaged if we were to vote that kind of guideline instead of a whole specific corps program?

Dr. DONOVAN. I couldn't tell you there would be a difference in the number of teachers. There would be a difference in the quality of teachers.

Mr. DELLENBACK. You feel that measured in totality that there would be an improvement of the teaching in this area which is designed to be served by the Teacher Corps, in total there would be an improvement in this if the funds were to be granted for teacher training rather than through a Teacher Corps program?

Dr. DONOVAN. I believe that; yes, sir.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Would there be a fast yes or no reaction from the other members of the panel?

Mr. PAQUIN. I would agree.

Mr. DAILARD. I would agree.

Mr. MEEDS. I have a question and I would like to start with Dr. Donovan and then perhaps he would like to leave.

Chairman PERKINS. Mrs. Green's time is not up yet.

Mr. MEEDS. If the gentlelady will yield for that purpose.

Mrs. GREEN. I will yield.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Brademas asked the question this morning. Your answer, Dr. Donovan, was taken up by the rest of them. If you don't mind my saying so, I was not quite satisfied that the answer was directed to the question.

Mr. Brademas asked the question with regard to title III. The proposal has been made that the State be interposed and have what is called the veto power over title III projects.

He asked you whether this was acceptable. The answer you gave and I am not quoting you exactly, was that if there was a veto power we would like it to reside in the States.

Is that an accurate statement?

Dr. DONOVAN. I think so; yes.

Mr. MEEDS. I don't think it is that simple—that if there is a veto it must be exercised by the State. The question is that title III now does not have veto power. It has the consultation with the State Department of education and approval finally by the Commissioner of Education or Office of Education of the United States.

We are agreed on that. Now, the question then becomes, do we interpose a further veto power or further power to approve or disapprove this program and let it reside in the State.

Dr. DONOVAN. I think I would have to answer you that—and the same general answer I give to everything else on which I stand—I would rather do my business with the business education department of the State of New York than with the U.S. Office of Education for just one reason, that it is closer to my problem, I believe.

Despite differences of opinion and the fact that they have a veto or Washington has a veto, I still think the closer we get to the local problem the better off we are.

Mr. MEEDS. The way title III operates now you are dealing directly with the U.S. Office of Education.

Dr. DONOVAN. No, sir, we are not. We are dealing through the State on title III. It goes through the State screening committee. If they send an approval to Washington it counts a little bit although Washington has the final say.

Mr. MEEDS. I think we must assume that Washington, D.C. at least in regard to title III is still going to have the final say no matter what happens.

My next question is: Would you then desire that State—in addition to the situation that exists now under title III—would you then desire that the State have the right to veto, let us say, to approve or disapprove the State programs? That is the real question.

Dr. DONOVAN. I think my answer to that would have to be yes. If I believe in the State department I believe in it.

Mr. MEEDS. Now the rest of you gentlemen who responded this morning, do you have an answer to that question?

Dr. WHITTIER. Are you imposing another decisionmaking level?

Mrs. GREEN. Will you yield?

I would like to direct a question to Dr. Donovan before he leaves.

Three quick questions in three specific areas: One in regard to the handicapped. If I recall, originally we defined handicapped to include the gifted.

In the present section the handicapped does not include the gifted. What is the situation in New York?

Dr. DONOVAN. The gifted are not handicapped with us.

Mrs. GREEN. Do you think attention should be given to them as well as to the handicapped? Are their problems just as great?

Dr. DONOVAN. I don't think their problems are as great. I think they have a problem and attention should be given to them but I don't think I would change the handicapped bill.

I think I would leave that to the handicapped, knowing that we and our local authorities still have to handle the gifted.

Mrs. GREEN. In regard to the vocational education, do you have residential vocational schools?

Dr. DONOVAN. No, we do not.

Mrs. GREEN. Do you have vocational schools?

Dr. DONOVAN. Yes, we do.

Mrs. GREEN. What is the per-pupil cost?

Dr. DONOVAN. The cost of a vocational school? Our college preparatory schools today are running us somewhere around \$1,400 or \$1,500 per pupil and our education and vocational education is running about \$2,200.

Now, we spent an average of \$1,000 a year in our city on children. So you have to relate this to the average expenditure. We spend a lot of money on children in the city of New York. Vocational education is very expensive.

The little money we received over the past years from Smith-Hughes and George-Barden was so small in the total picture but so binding in its prescriptions that the new Vocational Act of 1963 was really a blessing to us in its flexibility.

Mrs. GREEN. Have you conducted any study on what it would cost to run a residential vocational school?

Mr. DONOVAN. We have not because up to now we have not decided to run any so we have not calculated that cost, no.

Mrs. GREEN. Would that be hard for you to conduct such a study?

Dr. DONOVAN. No, we could do that.

Mrs. GREEN. The third question is in regard of the OEO. Would you favor the transfer of all of the educational programs from OEO to the Office of Education?

Dr. DONOVAN. Anything that has to do with schooling of children, I would favor the transfer.

Mrs. GREEN. What about the Youth Corps?

Dr. DONOVAN. The Youth Corps is not for children in school. It is for children out of school. There I don't believe is any argument because we do provide some places for them to learn.

There I would not argue the case. But prekindergarten, upward bound, any programs that are a normal part of the educational program should be in education.

Mrs. GREEN. You would not transfer the Youth Corps?

Dr. DONOVAN. I would not transfer it.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you very much, Mr. Donovan.

Mr. QUIE. Do you have to leave right now?

Dr. DONOVAN. I am due over in the Senate at 3:30, sir. I fought for this appointment for a couple of weeks.

Chairman PERKINS. I am going to call on Mr. Meeds. We will excuse Mr. Donovan.

Dr. DONOVAN. Thank you, sir.

Mr. MEEDS. Dr. Donovan, could I ask you just one quick question: Do you contemplate any problems in the continuing at the present

level the number of people both public school children and parochial children that might be reached in the Headstart program if it were transferred either to the Office of Education here or to another agency here through your State office in New York?

In other words, do you have any parochial school problem in handling Headstart and reaching the same people that are presently being reached?

Dr. DONOVAN. I don't see any trouble with it at all.

Mr. MEEDS. No legal problem?

Dr. DONOVAN. No, sir.

Mr. MEEDS. Thank you.

Now I would like to ask questions about title III, if I might.

Dr. WHITTIER. What was that again?

Mr. MEEDS. With regard to title III and the imposition of a veto power.

Dr. WHITTIER. Yes, you were implying, if I understood it, that you would put another layer of decisionmaking. I would not favor this. I don't care where it would be. So if you are going to shift it entirely so that there still would be one layer, that would be one thing.

If you are talking about inserting a second layer I really would not be in favor of it.

Mr. MEEDS. I don't think that you are implying, sir, that you think the Federal Government ought not to have decision power in the ultimate, since it is furnishing the money, as to the type of program, do you?

Dr. WHITTIER. If you are going to keep it at that level then I would not add another one in the process.

Mr. MEEDS. In other words, you would not be in favor of changing the law as it presently exists from straight consultation and coordination with the State department to veto power by the State department.

Dr. WHITTIER. Not if you are going to retain the final decision in the Federal Government.

Mr. MEEDS. Do you think we ought to do anything other than retain the final decision in the Federal Government?

Dr. WHITTIER. We were debating on this business of the State role. I would leave it alone, to answer your question from what I understand.

Mr. FORD. Yesterday we heard from a number of State school officers and the spokesman for their organization, the executive director of the Association of State School Administrators, who made the recommendation to us that the present, if you will, advice and consultation function of the State superintendent of public instruction be changed to an actual approval function.

Now, if you went from your city to the State and they had suggestions for change you might or might not accept those but if we changed it according to their recommendation you would either accept their changes or they would not let you come on to Washington with your application.

That is the suggestion as to the way of handling it.

Dr. PAQUIN. It seems to me that particular question I would prefer leaving it as is rather than giving the veto power to the State without really any right of appeal.

That is about what it amounts to.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Briggs?

Dr. BRIGGS. I would agree.

Mr. MEEDS. The gentleman from California?

Dr. DAILARD. I think if you ask a question of a group like this as to whether we would rather deal through our own State departments than with the U.S. Office of Education, we would be very much inclined to answer the State departments. We are 3,000 miles away. It is easier to get to Sacramento than it is here.

This is a generality. No. 2, so far as the title III in California now, the coordination function, with the final authority lodging in USOE, it is working very well.

We find no particular difficulty with it. If we are putting in another level of veto I would be unfavorable to it.

I have to note that there is a tendency on the part of our State departments and I think others that when they get an amount of money they fall under the same pressure we were talking about a while ago and spread it evenly.

The very essence of title III is that you do not spread it evenly.

You give it to things that are truly creative. So it is a fallacy. There could be a tendency of the State department, with the pressures they have from all parts of the State, to spread it evenly and do some things that are not generally innovative and creative.

Now, as a general tendency, yes, we would rather deal with the agency closer at home. Another layer of veto in this I don't think would serve any good function as it is now working and it is working very well so far as California is concerned.

Mr. MEEDS. In regard to the Headstart program, if you had your druthers would you rather the Headstart program be under the Office of Education or the educational agency of the State?

Dr. WHITTIER. I think we would answer it the same way as we did before. We favor putting educational functions under the Office of Education. As it worked out in Philadelphia, we have not had any problems. We are working it indirectly. We have no particular problems at the moment.

Mr. MEEDS. How are you working it? You say you are working it indirectly?

Dr. WHITTIER. We get the grant from the school system to operate our program. The way it has worked out we have no complaints.

Mr. MEEDS. In other words, your relationship is such that you make your application, you don't have any problem, it works out well?

Dr. WHITTIER. Yes.

Mr. MEEDS. To follow this up there have been a lot of suggestions that Headstart be put under title I, under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Under all titles of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act it would be impossible for the Office of Education, that is the U.S. Office of Education to make grants which would be, for instance, used in a parochial school, even though there were nonparochial students attending.

If it were used in a parochial school, this would be improper, illegal, under our law. Realizing that—I am not saying that maybe we could not change it but realizing it, does this make any difference in the

way you approach this if we have some legal problems attempting to put Headstart programs under the Office of Education here?

Dr. DAILARD. The same thing applies to title II. In the case of title II the grant is made from the U.S. Office to the State agency and then under regulations in the State it is redistributed and the private schools do receive support under title II.

Mr. MEEDS. Title remaining in the public education agency?

Dr. DAILARD. This has created no particular problems so far as we are concerned. We have an opinion from the legislative counsel in California that they would see nothing wrong with legislation that lets money follow the child.

Mr. MEEDS. Maybe we can be very specific about this. I hope we can. So that if a grant was made to the public education agency in California, through the State superintendent's office, of \$5 million for Headstart programs, you would have no legal problem in funding a Headstart program that is being carried on in a church basement with perhaps parochial teachers in some instances?

Dr. DAILARD. If I read that opinion correctly, I think not.

Mr. MEEDS. Would the answers of all you other gentlemen be the same?

Dr. PAQUIN. I am not so sure. I think we would be running into difficulty in Baltimore.

Dr. BRIGGS. I think this is a legal question that none of us would be competent to answer. However, if we are talking about HEW, OEO, we are talking about the Federal Government.

Mr. MEEDS. That is correct.

Dr. BRIGGS. If the Federal Government has the power to do this, that or the other thing through one agency, I am sure the same Constitutional limitations of separation of church and State or cooperation between church and State would exist.

I think if it can be done legally through one arm of the Federal Government it can be done through another arm.

Mr. MEEDS. I hope you are right.

Dr. BRIGGS. I think that what we are trying to say is that Headstart really deals with child growth and development, it deals with the education of the children, and the public schools have been pretty much specialists in this area.

As long as they are this might be more appropriate to them than to some other agency. However, in Ohio, our relationship with the Catholic organizations is a very good one. We might feel a little more comfortable if it were completely in our shop.

Mr. MEEDS. By the same token none of you gentlemen would like to see any of the children who are presently in the group of people being served by this program be cut off. Is that correct?

Dr. PAQUIN. That is correct.

Mr. MEEDS. Those are all the questions I have.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Dr. Briggs, I think my colleague from Oregon asked a question that I would like to push for an answer on because I don't feel that this was really answered. As I read it, the Federal goal that was involved in this, and I was not in the Congress when title I was established, the Federal goal was not to attack inner city problems.

The Federal goal was to attack educational disadvantage. That has one aspect of improving the quality and equality of education. The question that was put to you I would like to put to you again.

If we went to a general grant system in the place of the program as we have had it, do you feel that the funds could be equally well spent so far as quality and equality of education are concerned?

I am not asking whether it would be different. Would it be as well spent so far as these two criteria are concerned?

Dr. BRIGGS. In whose mind? Your mind or mine?

Mr. DELLENBACK. You are the one that said it would be changed.

Dr. BRIGGS. Yes, in my mind, yes. Remember, the question that I was reacting to was one that preceded the one of Mrs. Green.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I am not concerned about what the other question was.

Dr. BRIGGS. No, but it made it appear that I was inconsistent with my answer. But the question I had been reacting to was whether it would be spent in the same way for the same purpose.

The answer to that was "No." As far as I am concerned given the same amount of money I could not help but say the way I would spend it would be better.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I am not worried about whether you were consistent or inconsistent. I am willing to accept you were completely consistent. As far as you as a professional educator are concerned, knowing the problems of Cleveland, if these funds were to be made available to you on a general grant basis instead of this categorical basis, measured by the quality and equality of education within the district that you know best, would the funds be as well or better spent?

I remember your answer as being "Yes."

Dr. BRIGGS. In my mind it would not be. It would not be spent the same way.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I am not worried about whether it would be spent the same way.

Dr. BRIGGS. That is right. Now, there is a second phase of that. That was relative to the fact that if it went the route of the State Department of public instruction, if it went through that route, the reservation I was making was that unless happened in Ohio that has not yet happened, it would not come to Cleveland.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I am not asking the position of the State office. That is not part of my question. If time were available I would like to push that further.

The question I just put to Dr. Briggs I would like to put also to the other gentlemen who are here.

Mr. Whittier, how do you feel about that?

Dr. WHITTIER. There would be no question in my mind, we would spend our money equally well or better.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Do you feel it would really be better spent so far as quality and equality are concerned?

Dr. WHITTIER. I hate to imply that what we are doing now is not effective use of the funds. I would say it would be equally well spent.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Dr. Paquin?

Dr. PAQUIN. I think the money would be equally well spent. In fact, I am inclined to think even better.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Do you feel it would be better spent were this to be done?

Dr. PAQUIN. Yes, I think this would be my position. It seems to me, for example, whenever we do draw up a general budget in the city for the school system we do have to make some value judgments regarding specific programs and defend those decisions which are made or recommendations which are made to the board.

It seems to me this is what we would have to do with general aid.

Mr. DELLENBACK. If I read you correctly you are delighted to get Federal funds to help with critical problems but so far as priorities are concerned you feel that, knowing the problems of Baltimore better than any of us and perhaps better than anyone else in Baltimore, were these funds to be made available to you on a general grant basis instead of pinned down categorically, you could do a better job for education, measured by quality and equality, than is being done at the present time?

Dr. PAQUIN. Yes, sir; I think we could.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Dr. Dailard, what would you say about San Diego?

Dr. DAILARD. I will say several things. We have had the experience in San Diego, first we had the experience of dealing with a situation in which we were literally given Federal aid to the extent of unrestricted Federal aid under Public Law 874.

In the early years of that law the combined support from 874 and 815 amounted to as much as 37 percent of our annual expenditure in 1 year. These were great years for us in that we could do innovation and were doing it, our handicapped program dates back to that time, some of the other programs, some of the compensatory programs.

Then we were inundated with a wave of population that made this much less significant and strained our resources. When we come to the specific question, if the same money that is now coming through title I were distributed to the cities, I do not think it would be spent as well by any of us on the criteria that you set up because there would be the pressures from other parts of the city to put some of the money into lesser priorities that I don't think the boards of education could resist.

If you are talking about enough additional general aid, yes, now I think it would be spent well. I think it would be spent for good purposes. But, in terms of the priorities that now exists, there is little question that the most critical problem is that of dealing with some 20 percent of the population that is an economic drag on the whole Nation.

This is more than just education. Our whole national economy is tied up with raising the level of productivity of this 20 percent.

If that is the No. 1 priority, if the same money we are now getting were given to us unrestricted, I think it would be pulled away from that purpose of general aid.

If it does come for other reasons it should be more massive.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Then you take a different stand than some of your colleagues?

Dr. DAILARD. Yes, I am.

Mr. DELLENBACK. You say that assuming we were not talking about great additional massive infusions of Federal funds but we were

talking about roughly the amount we are now funding, if this were to be changed from the present methods of distribution and to be given to you as general aid, to say we lean on you to determine how best you can use this in your district, that you know best, you feel that the net result would be that the money would not be as well spent as if it were handled in the present way?

Dr. DAILARD. In terms of the existing priorities?

Mr. DELLENBACK. So far as quality and equality of education are concerned.

Dr. DAILARD. We do not think the same amount of money would be as well used in terms of quality and equality which are the priorities right now, the priority for this depressed area.

Mr. DELLENBACK. The three of you feel it would be as well or better spent, one of you feels it would not be as well spent.

Dr. DAILARD. It would be spent differently.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I am not talking about differently. I am talking about reaching results.

Dr. BRIGGS. Each of us feels in our own district it would be spent as well or better. But we feel naturally that it would not be spent in the same manner or in the same way and for the same purposes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. In your districts you know best, the district of Baltimore, the district of Philadelphia, in Cleveland, you feel in your specific districts it would be as well or better spent, not so in San Diego?

Is that correct?

Dr. PAQUIN. I think so.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Thank you very much.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Ford?

Mr. BURTON. Will the gentlemen yield at this point for one question.

Mr. FORD. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. For the record, Dr. Spears' office was informed mistakenly by my own office that some members of the subcommittee would be out to San Francisco. So I want the record to be perfectly clear that Dr. Spears intended to come and his failure to come in no way reflects his lack of interest in the subject matter before the committee.

Chairman PERKINS. I am glad the gentleman made that observation.

Dr. DAILARD. Dr. Spears is president of the American Association of School Administrators and is scheduled to appear before your committee in this capacity.

Mr. BURTON. The point is that he thought he would have another opportunity at a more convenient time. I just wanted his absence not to be misconstrued as having a disinterest in the committee's deliberations.

Chairman PERKINS. I think we got a statement today in the record from him.

Mr. Ford.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, if I might have unanimous consent, Mr. Scheuer is under the gun for an appointment. He would like to go at this time for our side.

Mr. SCHEUER. I thank my colleague for his courtesy.

Dr. Briggs and the rest of you. I would like to take up the question I was discussing this morning with Dr. Ohrenberger about whether we

could have a new program here that would give the total thrust, give the totality of the programs that all of us know are needed on some kind of demonstration grant basis similar to what Dr. Ohrenberger is apparently doing in Boston.

If there was such a program it would make available to perhaps 20 or 25 cities the resources to spend perhaps \$1,000 or \$1,500 per child, with the health and nutrition service, with the parent average, with the community involvement, with the supplementary social service, with the reduced class sizes and augmentation of the professional teacher with the aids, with Headstart, do you think this would give us a laboratory so that we could prove in 3 or 4 years to the country and the administration that really what we needed was a program of this dimension and of this quality of totality for all of our disadvantaged kids?

Would such a program in your view be intelligent?

Dr. BRIGGS. Yes. As one who has just been backed into a position of saying he was for general aid, or categorical aid, he finds himself in a position to react to another form of categorical aid.

I would suggest, however, that possibly the avenue for this may already have been provided in some legislation for the demonstration city.

I would hope that as we think in terms about the demonstration cities in this country that possibly the schools would be tied in very closely with all health services and a total approach, housing, urban renewal, cleaning up areas of the city as well as the education of the children, as well as even volunteer efforts within the city, voluntary social agencies.

Mr. SCHEUER. I could not agree with you more. As a matter of fact, I had lunch today with the head of the model cities program and several officials of the Department of Education with just exactly this long-term coordinated view in mind.

As of now the model cities program does not have the funds. This looks like, so far as the current situation is concerned, our very best hope to find out what investment of dollars will give us a threshold effect in returning to us a demonstrable change in the kids.

I would like to hear if we had a program like this for a couple of years in a testing laboratory would give us some interesting results.

Dr. DAILARD. We have written up and for 2 years we had encouragement to set up demonstration under the Economic Opportunity Act. We want to take an area of about 10 schools and give a massive service to that as a testing laboratory for the things that would go to the dissemination areas.

We have not been able to fund it. We believe this is almost essential because while all of us believe the things we are doing are good we haven't had sufficient testing of most of these to really know.

Mr. SCHEUER. You haven't had sufficient resources to do the total job you wanted to do?

Dr. DAILARD. That is right, even now we don't have it. But if we could get 15 schools out of our 150 in San Diego and do this kind of concentrated job, I think we would learn more, not in 2 years but more like 3 to 5 years, we would get answers to the things.

This ties in with the other things that I mentioned in the testimony this morning about the desire of this group of cities to join together

in a cooperative effort in evaluating title I projects and get joint work here.

We would hope that this would become eligible under V-b for some support.

Dr. PAQUIN. I would react favorably to that. I think the expectation of most of us, I know in my own particular city I am directly involved with the development of the plans and the programs for model cities.

I might say also in that connection this group which we represent, the great cities group, is having its conference in the early part of April. One of the times on that program is that we have invited Secretary Taylor to come to that conference because this is an area where we see a possibility of achieving exactly the kind of things we are talking about.

Dr. WHITTIER. Yes, we certainly support it. We are working on some projects right now in this very vein, even to designing the school in cooperation with the other governmental agencies to make this a complete community school.

This involves a parochial school adjacent and other things. Yes, we want to get additional resources at the same time we get other services and make the school a community center.

We have done this in four schools this fall in which we have introduced additional services but the lack of funds precludes our giving the massive attack you are talking about.

Mr. SCHEUER. How do you feel about amendments that would accomplish that perhaps in an alternative way of requiring that no plan would be approved where there was not at least a 50-percent increase in dollars per student that haven't been spent before, and requiring there be coordination of all existing government programs other than educational programs to make sure that the health and nutrition of the child were taken care of—that type of approach?

Dr. WHITTIER. It needs to be looked at just a little bit because the areas where you would provide it are already provided greater per pupil cost.

It should be in citywide action, not that particular location.

Mr. SCHEUER. Let me ask one more question on the general grant versus the categorical grant. It is obvious that as recognized leaders in your profession you have a high degree of knowledge, professionalism, expertise, and also openmindedness and receptivity to change.

Apparently from the report of the National Advisory Council in other school districts there was not that degree of receptivity to change. Let me read a couple of quotes from the November 1966 Report of the National Advisory Council:

If appropriation of money alone could bring about the needed change it would now be safe to sit back with reasonable satisfaction that we are on our way.

But provision of fund is only one step in an enormously complex task. Human beings must be changed, millions of children must be taught faith in their own accomplishments in face of their negative experience in school as well as out.

Hundreds of thousands of teachers must be persuaded to revise fundamental notions of what the act of learning is, what the relationship of pupil to teacher should be.

For the most part, projects are piecemeal, fragmented efforts at mediation or vaguely directed. It is extremely rare to find strategically planned comprehensive programs for change. The Council continues to be stirred up by the

frequent lack of involvement of teachers in the formulation of programs they are expected to carry out.

One of the most disappointing findings was the failure of most schools to identify the more seriously disadvantaged children. The Council advises more involvement. School officials on the one hand and neighborhood poverty groups on the other in a concerted attack to change the total environment of the disadvantaged child.

The act of local efforts do not yet reflect a widely accepted strategy for creating a new effectively creational climate for disadvantaged children. We have not yet learned to group projects in total programs and to spread such programs throughout the school areas where disadvantaged children are concentrated.

Doesn't this give some indication that in the area of the leadership for change in teacher attitudes; to create a better involvement with the community, to create a better involvement of the teacher, that some direction and guidance by the Federal Government for some communities will help remedy some of these rather large-scale and disturbing deficits which the National Advisory Council has found?

Dr. BRIGGS. Yes, I think I would agree. I would want to come back again and say that real change has been made. There is improvement. I am only speaking of my own city, a city that has and will have great troubles but there is an involvement of people in schools now that we never thought could happen.

Thousands of people are involved.

Mr. SCHEUER. Has that not come in part from the Federal Government's emphasis on the direction that some of these efforts should take?

Dr. BRIGGS. That is correct. Without the assistance from the Federal Government—

Mr. SCHEUER. I am not talking about financial assistance but some the qualitative emphasis on direction that the Federal Government has given based on experience across the country—just like this report of the National Advisory Council.

Dr. BRIGGS. Yes. I would also give encouragement to the fact that there is a lot of fragmentation. This sometimes is good because we all get around and look at each other's programs. Every one of us at the table today visits each other's programs, visits each other's cities; we exchange information.

When something began working in San Diego that we didn't try in Cleveland or Philadelphia or someplace else, we got out to San Diego to see what was and what was making it work.

So the early stages of our programs appear to be a lot of useless fragmentation but out of this comes a sifting and evaluation and a unification of that is good.

The teacher aide program, for example, started in one location. Everyone uses it today. There is a certain form that it is taking. Yet in its early stages it was a more deplorable experience.

Mr. SCHEUER. Take the teacher aid program. For some decades has there not been a great reluctance on the part of the school systems to engage in parent outreach and to use teacher aides effectively?

Hasn't the Federal Government played a catalytic growth here?

Dr. BRIGGS. In the first stages, no. The Federal Government was not involved for 6 or 8 years. That program came out of foundation money during the first years. But it has taken them and encouraged them and given money to underwrite these kinds of programs and have involved lay citizens.

Out of this has come great improvements. While there are thousands of school systems in this country, nevertheless there is surprisingly great uniformity where something works someplace if it has promise it is not long until it is pretty general across the United States.

However, the best example of a real forward thrust was Headstart.

Mr. SCHEUER. Would you not say the Federal Government provided the stimulus?

Dr. BRIGGS. Yes.

Mr. SCHEUER. There seems to be a useful and constructive role that the Federal Government plays apart from the dollars that it provides. It seems to me that this does provide the justification for continuing the categorical grant system at least for a few more years until some of these newer approaches have achieved the widespread acceptance that you gentlemen indicate they deserve to achieve and you hope they do achieve.

Dr. DAILARD. The reason behind the answer I gave to the previous question was that if the same amount of money would be spread generally it would be refused. As long as the amount of money is limited it would better be aimed at the No. 1 priority.

That gives us the protection we need. Each community has the same kind of political pressures that you work in among the States.

Mr. SCHEUER. That it is a justification for the categorical approach.

Dr. DAILARD. If the amount of money is limited it is inadequate to do the job for which it is aimed; then we should keep it within the structure, rather than permitting it to be released. All of us would have pride in our own judgment to believe that we could make better use of some of it, particularly more money.

Mr. SCHEUER. In other words, the categorical approach helps you to do what you would like to do but which you might not be free to do were you abandoned more or less to the local political pressure?

Dr. DAILARD. When it comes to the level of financing, large amount of Federal funds coming into our district amounting to 37 percent of our expenditures for a year, we were moving on a number of fronts.

When our financing tightened up it began to dry up our ability to innovate.

Dr. PAQUIN. Congressman, I think I have a little different point of view. I find it difficult to draw the distinction between money which I get from the Federal Government, which is categorical aid and to be spent for specific purposes, and the money I get from the city in terms of general funds for which I have to make some judgment along with the board and members of the staff as to how that money is to be spent.

We do this with the bulk of the money we spend. We do exercise this kind of judgment. It is general aid. Personally, I don't see why this same formula can't work in terms of a total general-aid program even with Federal money.

Mr. SCHEUER. Thank you very much.

I want to thank my colleague for his courtesy in yielding to me.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Ford?

Mr. FORD. We got off the legislation here a bit today but we have touched on something rather important. It appears that sometime during this Congress we are going to be confronted with a proposal

from quarters that have been in the past against any kind of Federal aid.

We are now going to be advocating general Federal aid, whatever that means. I thought before I came to this committee I knew what it meant but I find it is one of those things with a tremendous number of very fine niceties in it. You have to be extremely careful that we are talking about the same definitions when we extract opinions from one another.

I hope you will keep in mind as you discuss this a little further what the total impact of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act represents in terms of a percentage of total cost of education in various parts of this country. Going to the very bottom of the scale, for example, if we were to fully fund this legislation as we had authorized in legislation in 1966 for fiscal year 1968, we would only be giving California 6 percent of its educational budget.

As a matter of fact, we are giving California in this legislation something less than 3 percent of its budget. There are States that without the 40-percent limitation in this bill would be receiving a greater percentage than that of their total budget just from this legislation.

When you couple that with some other form of Federal aid we have a number of States that at the present time are receiving more than 50 cents on every dollar spent for education from the Federal Government.

This is not true in any of the States, I believe, represented by the members of this panel here today. Recognizing that we have a very limited amount of money in terms of these percentages to spend in a number of places would you feel that, even if title I funds did not have some guidelines directing them toward specific attendance areas or specifically identifiable educationally deprived children, this limited amount of money would add, if anything, to the already ongoing effort of the overtaxed local funds?

I might add this factor also before you respond: For the purpose of this discussion I hope you would not confine yourselves in evaluating general aid and categorical aid to the categories that we have thus far delineated.

There are many opinions in the Congress that some of the more important categories have not yet been added. For example, Mr. Perkins and Mr. O'Hara and I have legislation which we held hearings on which designated as a category of educationally deprived children those in obsolete, overcrowded, or nonexistent classrooms, the rapidly growing school district, the school district faced with population shifts and the school district with exceptional problems and the lack of local resources.

These are categories that we might hope would be added as we go down the road and get more money. Would we be more likely to reach the pressing needs of the overcrowded classroom, the obsolete school, within the districts that you represent, by continuing the categorical approach or by simply adding more money without any definition assuming we are only going to add in the magnitude of maybe double what we are proposing to give you this year?

Dr. WHITTIER. I think it is a little speculative but I would think that to continue support in a manner that will give us additional

funds until we really get a significant part of our budget would be the most expeditious way of going about it.

I take it the level you are talking about, to continue what you are doing but giving it better support, would be both the more reasonable way and the more realistic possibility. I don't think we are getting at the level yet that we probably can make this kind of effective shift, that is what it amounts to.

Mr. FORD. In other words, although we may reach the point where the partnership between the Federal Government and other tax resources for the schools would justify no strings type money we might not have reached the point where you would be free to continue targeting the money?

This does not mean then, I take it, that your testimony would in any way be construed that you are forever more against general aid or forever committed to categorical aid but merely in the terms of the kind of money we are spending and the problems we are now facing.

Dr. BRIGGS. At this point with the limited amount of money that is appropriated for education in this country, it seems to me that there is wisdom in using the target approach in zeroing in on what you feel would be great national needs.

When the time comes that this partnership between local, State, and Federal Government is such that there will be massive large amounts available, then the target approach may not be too important.

This is what makes the answering of the question so difficult when they say, would you spend the money better if you had no strings attached. Each of us probably would think that we would spend it better but nevertheless the national target that you have in mind would be shifted by each of us.

Chairman PERKINS. Just a moment, Mr. Ford. The school superintendent from Baltimore wishes to be excused. We are delighted that you came here to help us today, we all appreciate it.

Dr. PAQUIN. Thank you, sir.

Mr. FORD. Before leaving this point, I would just like to touch very briefly on this.

We have chewed it over several times today. You pointed to the kind of pressures that would make it extremely difficult to avoid spreading the money so that everybody would feel they were getting their fair share. It is still very difficult in the area that I serve to convince the more affluent members of the committee that they have in fact an interest in the education of the less affluent members.

I am not familiar with San Diego but the other three cities who are represented here as cities which I recognize as having a Negro population that is significantly large so that it is a political factor in that city.

If you have these doubts with that kind of potential political power within your city it does not leave much doubt in my mind as a member of this committee as to the fate that might befall the members of the minority groups in a district like mine where they never represent a thing like a majority or close to a majority in the community in which they live.

It is one thing to be a part of a minority that has no local recognition at all because it is a minority but quite another to be in a city where

the minority has reached such proportions that it has to be reckoned with. Laying aside all Christian reasons and others why we should do it, the plain hard facts of life are that frequently people in public life don't do it until they have to.

I think perhaps if we had some of the people from other cities we might be putting them on the spot with the questions we have asked you. In most of the communities I represent the superintendent would be hard pressed indeed to convince the general public who claim to be supporters of the school that any program ought to be put in one school and not all the schools in that district or focus on that one group and not all of the groups.

We have had some very modest success in doing this with crippled children, some very modest success with retarded children, but even in these programs everybody wants them to be in a school closest to them or else have them in every school so that everybody is treated fairly.

It is almost impossible to identify a group or local or community and get everybody else in town to admit that they are less advantaged than we are.

In discussing title I today there has been some suggestion that as superintendents you have had difficulty with the stringent requirements of title I in devising programs that would satisfy the requirements of the Federal act.

My own experience has been that the only unhappiness expressed to me, and I do speak at a number of institutes in the State of Michigan on this, has been over the problem at the State level because we are a little bit slow on the State level in getting started with our State guidelines and getting paper shufflers even to handle the application.

Have you found it, as a superintendent, difficult to devise programs within the restraints that we have placed on the use of these funds?

Dr. BRIGGS. Not really. Remember, we are dealing with two legislatures. One is the National Congress and the other is those who write the guidelines because they are legislating also.

Many times interpretation of the guidelines has given us concern and trouble but guidelines change, as you know. Sometimes rather often. The guideline interpretations have given us some problems.

I think the law as far as we are concerned has been clear and it has been difficult to live with. Sometimes guidelines have been a little more restrictive than the law.

Dr. DAILARD. We have no difficulty. I think we have projects enough on the shelf now to spend twice as much as we are getting usefully and within the purpose of the law.

Dr. WHITTIER. We have plenty of projects, too.

Mr. FORD. Thank you.

Now, in every hearing so far, we have also touched, although it is not in this particular piece of legislation, on the question of the transfer of Office of Economic Opportunity educational programs to the Office of Education. There is a slight difference of opinion.

It may be just semantics when you get down to it, whether Head-start, for example, is truly an educational program or whether it is something more.

You can argue that it is an educational program even with all the other things, and that should be part of education. But there are

two kinds of recommendations coming to us from witnesses with respect to the transfer.

Almost every witness has said he would like to see—and every school principal or State school officer has said he would like to see—Headstart, as an example, transferred for its administration to the Office of Education.

But there is something that underlies this that we found when we got into this with the State school officers. What appeared to be an agreement on their part was not when you asked them under what circumstances they would transfer.

In the Elementary and Secondary Education Act we were restrained to carefully restrict the funding of all those programs to public educational agencies. It could not be funded to anyone but a public educational agency except for the new legislation that we are discussing now.

We have not operated under similar restraint while Headstart has been under OEO. As a result we have 30 percent of the Headstart programs and 10 percent of the children involved not being operated by the public schools of the country.

Perhaps some of you have this in your own cities. In favoring the transfer of the educational functions of OEO, including Headstart, to the Office of Education, could it be fairly read that you would favor including the same kind of restraints so that after it gets to the Office of Education it would only then be operating through a public education agency, thereby in effect terminating the contracts or the contacts with agencies other than public school agencies now operating Headstart?

DR. WHITTIER. Yes, that would be the interpretation I would place on it. Without criticizing the ones that are done, I would interpret this to be a role of public education. If there was some kind of working out some kind of private support, there are two or three programs in our city that we have nothing to do with, but they do involve a very small number of children.

I think the bulk of them are going to be handled in the public school program. Of course, we do service at the present time children from any religious or racial group that wishes to come into the center.

So that we have had a very fine working relationship as far as parochial schools are concerned. I would say, Yes, that is what I would be talking about.

MR. FORD. Would you have any objection to specifically authorizing the Office of Education to continue funding programs through other than the public schools where that organization seems to be the one most likely to reach the people being served?

DR. WHITTIER. I think you came up to another problem because actually the programs now go through our local CAP committees and therefore are supported at the local level.

MR. FORD. But if we make the transfer they won't go through CAP any longer.

DR. WHITTIER. What you are doing then is specifying what kind of group is going to evaluate the local program. You still have the program now in essence going through the local board in terms of the local antipoverty group. If that group is taken out I don't visualize

what part does not go through the State now, that you are going to have some kind of supervision at least for the quality of the program which is one of the concerns.

Mr. FORD. I don't think I am making my point clear. We have Headstart programs being operated in church buildings. In Harlem they have a year around Headstart. They have no classrooms available in New York. So, they have fixed up some rooms in church buildings, and people who are not employed in the public school system are employed in operating these Headstart programs.

We are told by the Office of Economic Opportunity when they defend themselves in this regard that if it were not done there, there would be no room for them and they would not be able to carry out the program or at least not to that extent. As public school superintendents you would not have any objection to the continued funding of this type of organization even though in the same city you are operating a Headstart program in most of your schools.

Dr. WHITTIER. Our programs are all housed outside the public schools, the ones we are operating now. What you describe is the programs we are operating. We are using church facilities of various denominations throughout the city.

Mr. FORD. Do you administer all Headstart in Philadelphia?

Dr. WHITTIER. Not all of it. There are two separate projects which are very small. We do the bulk of it, a \$3 million program. Our program is housed in non-public-school buildings because we have no space.

Mr. FORD. Would you be able to take over these two programs and make them a part of the public school without taking anybody out of the program?

Dr. WHITTIER. If they met the same criteria. I don't see any problem doing that because we are using a large number of the people—

Mr. FORD. What if they are using nuns in teaching the Headstart programs?

Dr. WHITTIER. I think that might pose a problem there, but I don't think any of them are at the moment, that I recall, but I think that would have to be looked at in the local situation whether they wanted to continue doing it that way or not.

Mr. FORD. In our area they are, as a matter of fact. In Chicago they are. We don't have either of those superintendents at the moment. The question that strikes some of us is the anxiety to take over this program in its entirety, thereby putting a substantial number of teachers really out of business at a time when we have a shortage.

Would you be able to replace those teachers if we say to the Detroit Archdiocese or Chicago Archdiocese, your program will now be merged with the public school, if both of the States have taken the trouble to provide that the nuns would not be allowed to teach in the schools.

Dr. WHITTIER. You would have the same problem we do now. It is a pretty hectic problem to recruit enough qualified people so that you are only magnifying the problem more. That would be an additional problem.

Any time you take on a service requiring more trained teachers you just multiply your problem. There is no question about that.

Dr. BRIGGS. We have 40 centers in Cleveland at the present time. The indication in the testimony this morning we covered over 10,500

children in 1965. The majority of Headstart children are in public schools; some are not. I do think it is an educationally related program and one that the leadership in our town has come from our staff and there is no question about that. Most of the programs are outside the public schools, renting facilities here, there, and elsewhere. But I think we would be much more comfortable with funding through HEW than we are with funding through Economic Opportunity programs, although we have no difficulty with the CAP program at the local level.

Nevertheless we have another set of guidelines, we have another set of offices to go through in Chicago. We have another set of people who have ideas about how things should be done. Despite the fact that the Congress of the United States may enact, the fact that there will be as much money spent next year on Headstart as last year, we find out that this means that while we will spend as much under the new OEO guidelines, only half as many children will be involved because of new guidelines that they have developed someplace. I think it would be simpler, it would be more comfortable for us if they were in educational operation rather than OEO.

Dr. Darrard. I agree completely with that. I feel it is an educational problem. The educational institutions are the ones accustomed to dealing with the teaching of children.

Mr. Ford. Let me interrupt you for a minute. How much tradition did you have prior to the Headstart program in dealing with a parent as an aid the way Headstart does?

Dr. Darrard. Rather a substantial amount.

Mr. Ford. You have a tradition down through the kindergarten level that deals with the child?

Dr. Darrard. In our own city we have had experience with a nursery school operation in which we were definitely involving the parents. We consider parent education to be a part of it. So we had experience prior to this in dealing with the parent not only as a helper.

To answer the other question, I would have no reluctance if any legal barricade that exist can be hurdled, of seeing HEW support Headstart programs not only in other facilities but under other control. It does not bother me. But I think we would be working under a single set of guidelines helped by those people whose orientation is primarily educational.

We have some difficulty in working through the CAP agency. Mr. Ford. One other complaint we have heard in this regard from time to time is the comparison drawn between what you pay a kindergarten teacher and what the Headstart teacher is paid and when the total cost of the program is divided out on a per-head basis and it comes out two or three times the amount of money you are spending on general education.

Has this complaint been heard in your city?

Dr. Witter. Yes, it is one of the complaints. It is a more expensive program. I think there is no argument about that at all. You are providing an entirely different staffing level than you are for the rest of the school. That is where the money is.

There have been some questions raised. Basically everyone is pretty well pleased with this program. It is one of our better programs as

far as full support is concerned. I am really unaware that there has been any real criticism although everyone is aware of this problem.

We have run nursery schools since World War II so we have a considerable amount of experience with the underage child in a program that we have operated.

Actually, our Headstart program has easily fitted into this kind of program, provided for a significant extension of what we were already doing. So that it was not a completely new operation so far as Philadelphia schools were concerned.

Mr. FORD. With respect to title II of this act, you have already been asked to give some thought to how much more money you could use under title I. The national library people feel that \$18 per child is the amount that should be spent. I have heard testimony this morning about Detroit. They are spending less than \$2 per child. Would you give some thought, based on the experience you now have had for 2 years on title II funds, to what we ought to be looking forward to as an ongoing need to bringing the school libraries up to what we were talking about in 1965.

Dr. BRIGGS. I think none of us would have too much difficulty in a program 200 or 300 percent greater than the present one. There is a problem relative to title II, and that is the heavy administrative cost to the local district.

Mr. FORD. I noticed in the formal testimony this morning one of you mentioned there should be funds for local administration. Last year this question came up. I thought we made the language clear that when we talk about 5 percent for State administration we didn't mean at the statehouse or in the State capitol. We meant within the State.

We spelled it out in the report. Are you telling us that the State is keeping the 5 percent?

Dr. BRIGGS. I am only speaking of Ohio. We calculated our cost the other day. The cost of administering the program in Cleveland in the different school districts, public, parochial, private schools, exceeded \$100,000.

In other words, this is operational money that we had to take out of the other programs in Cleveland to operate title II.

Mr. FORD. What would that represent as a percentage of your total title II money?

Dr. BRIGGS. I can't answer that question. It would be pretty high because we do not get much title II money. By the time we got through administering the program for everyone—

Mr. FORD. Is the State taking all the allowable withholding for administration of title II and keeping it at the State level for administration?

Dr. BRIGGS. They are using it all to the extent that at least in Ohio, to the best of my knowledge, there is none available for the administration of the program at the local level.

Mr. FORD. How about California?

Dr. DAILARD. So far as I know, if they are getting it they must be keeping it. It is not coming down to us.

Mr. FORD. We spelled out in the bill a limitation as to the amount of money that could be used for administration. Five percent, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman PERKINS. I believe it is 5 percent.

Mr. FORD. Last year it was called to your attention that the State was not passing any of the 5 percent onto the local agencies.

Chairman PERKINS. The people that were administering the library program, we did our best to see that the money filtered down.

Mr. FORD. We ought to put in the act that when we say the State it means within the State.

Dr. WHITTIER. Of course, it is done differently in different States.

Mr. FORD. In Michigan they brought it down to the intermediate school level which is administering the program for the school district.

Dr. WHITTIER. Ours is at the State level.

Mr. FORD. They did that as a result of the report language. It was the representative of the intermediate schools that came into the committee last year with this complaint.

Thank you very much, gentlemen, for your patience and for your assistance on this legislation.

Dr. DAILARD. May I comment on one thing?

You opened a door a while ago that I wanted to comment on, additional categories, and by implication you indicate acceptance of additional categories might be assistance for group housing, replacement housing and so forth.

I just wanted to add a word of support to that. I think this is another one of the high priorities that is developing very rapidly for replacement of obsolete buildings, providing new housing and many, many districts in our State have already exceeded and are having to borrow from State funding for building.

I think this would be a very high priority in all of the cities here represented. We would see the building category as a very important one.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Perkins had a bill that we will have hearings on in May. We will have to wait for the cessation of hostility in the Far East before we get that kind of money. It deals with the unhoused child, the definition of which would be a child in an overcrowded classroom, the child for whom there is no classroom, a child in the one-room country school, a child beyond x number in the classroom. This kind of formula would determine another category of educational deprivation which had to do with the school facility and ability of the school district to support that facility rather than the individual status in the community of the child himself.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Bell?

Mr. BELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

A question was asked of a previous witness. I understand that one of you gentlemen stated that you would prefer a general aid than categorical. Is that correct?

Dr. BRIGGS. Yes. Let me say this: At this moment in history when the amount of money coming from Congress is so small and you seem to have some targets you want us to hit, maybe the only way you can do it is to give us a rifle and a shot.

If we had what we would like, we would like to have enough money to educate the children in our school districts. We feel that we would have the kind of judgment that would develop the best kind of programs.

It would appear that we just don't quite have our choice these days. Therefore, we as people here today may appear to be against what we are for really at times but we do need more money generally for education.

We would like to have more freedom with that money. However, we have expressed an honest opinion that maybe it would not always be used for purposes that you might want it used for. So this is the argument for the categorical aid. All things being equal, I think we would all say if we could have enough to really educate the children in our school districts we would like to have a general no strings attached.

We know that that is quite impossible.

Mr. BELL. I also noted that you all indicated that it is very important that the amounts and the decisions so far as this committee is concerned and as far as the Congress is concerned be made early so that you can make your plans.

Did you specifically indicate the time limit? What do you think is the time limit that this matter should be decided to place you in the position when you could use it in the most efficient manner.

Dr. WHITTIER. As early as possible. We would like to have it known at the time we are forming our budget so that the whole process could be done at once.

Mr. BELL. What would be the latest time?

Dr. WHITTIER. For example, our budget will be published in the next couple of weeks. If we had our choice, we would have known about it in the last month and a half at the very latest.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Quie tells me that he has a 4:30 appointment. If you would yield, Mr. Bell, he would like to ask a question.

Mr. QUIE. I would like to ask you, now before you leave, your reaction to the change in Public Law 874 and also some of the problems you are having in the Minneapolis School District, and how this could affect you.

I think that would be helpful to us.

Mr. BEVIS. Thank you.

I am not sure how the others are affected by this particular part of the 874 but in Minneapolis we are not able to come in with a total of 3 percent.

Currently we have one student over enough to bring us into 3 percent but we are assuming that by the time the regulators of the regulation get through with us we won't have our 3 percent.

So, looking at the new regulations that allow us to come in with 400 students or more. At this point we will come in with somewhere around 2,000 students.

We have currently lost a 16-mill referendum which left us in dire political straits as you might imagine. In addition to a change in the tax base, not an unusual one.

I think Cleveland had the same sort of thing, with a change in the base for industrial and business establishments and for homes, one being at 40 percent, the other being altered to 33 percent, leaving us again with a serious deficit in the amount available.

But this being a side issue, the issue is that if there is money available, and I understand there is not, for those coming under the 400

part of 874, this would provide a great deal of help at this particular time, with around 2,000 students who are in the category recognized under 874 but not enough to bring us within a 3-percent part.

Mr. QUIE. Last year, in an amendment, I had wanted to see 874 changed so that we would get away from the inequity where if you had less than 3 percent you had to absorb all the 3 percent, if you had more than 3 percent you get paid for the entire 3.1 percent or what you have above it.

I would like to see it so that everybody would eventually absorb 3 percent—1 percent the first year, 2 percent the second year, and 3 percent in the third year. I think it is significant for Minneapolis schools especially now when we do have the problem of a loss referendum.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Bell?

Mr. BELL. Referring to the last exchange in which I believe Dr. Whittier was saying that the money should be available or at least they should have knowledge to make their plans around this time, this particular period, to do the job effectively.

So, we are running out of time right now. Now would you feel the way the operation worked last year, for example, that you should have had full authorization of the full amount of money.

Dr. WHITTIER. Naturally we feel we should have had the full amount; yes.

Mr. BELL. Do you think you could have handled it if you had had the full amount?

Dr. WHITTIER. Yes; we had our programs all set up. We have had to back up, as a matter of fact after we got initial guidelines which we assumed on full percentage and then found we were to get 85 percent.

We had to have a reappraisal of what we were doing.

Mr. BELL. This possibly would not work for your area, however, I notice that the Commissioner of Education, Dr. Howe, stated that—

I presented testimony last year to the effect that full funding of the total authorization would create a situation which would mean in all likelihood unwise expenditure of funds. I still believe that is the case.

In other words, he does not go along with you, that he feels for last year really the funding would not have been handled as expeditiously as they could nationwide.

Dr. WHITTIER. I am talking about our particular school district.

Mr. BELL. I noticed here earlier there was considerable conversation about Headstart program working better if it were to be moved over into the Office of Education under the Commissioner of Education rather than under the Poverty Act.

I must say I fully concur in this. However, the adult basic education was removed from the Poverty Act this last year and moved under the Education Commission.

Have you had any indication to show that it is working better as a result of the change?

Dr. BRIGGS. You will get a very good reaction to this. We had one of the big projects and a very successful one. But when it was moved over one little thing happened. It wasn't funded. I must confess it worked much better when it was funded even under OEO.

But we, like our programs, seem to work so much smoother when they are funded. This one was not funded. It was moved over but

since it was not funded we have had to go out and we have raised our subscription from business and industry, interim amounts of money for an interim period to keep it operating.

We have a full daytime high school for adults with nearly 1,600 adults with the age bracket running up to 77 years of age.

Mr. BELL. I was the author of the amendment that moved it out of the Poverty Act to under the Education Commission.

However, I did provide in my amendment for the funding. What happened was that the Appropriations Subcommittee did not choose to move the money over. That is basically what happened.

I thought they should have funded it but they didn't. One of the problems, as you know, is that a child who has his Headstart training for a few months and then goes in the kindergarten or first grade under the same circumstances that he was raised, that the school system is not adequate to follow up the Headstart program.

There is no point having a Headstart program if it does not go on with an effective kindergarten at the primary school.

Would you like to comment on that?

Dr. BRIGGS. I agree with you because the kind of leadership we are getting on our Headstart program certainly is having its effect on the vitality of the entire school program of kindergarten on through. It also gives continuity of planning, it gives continuity of staffing, proper use of equipment, materials, even such mundane things as the preparation of hot meals and all of these other things that are basically a part of the educational enterprise that allows this kind of utilization that when fragmented out and put under other jurisdictions these services, supportive services, are not there.

The psychological service, even the services of the staff psychiatrist, the service of our health officers, the service of trained visiting teachers, visiting therapists, all of these services are available to a school system.

They are regularly available. When you segment this out and put it under another agency, another organization, you don't have this kind of teamwork that can be had. We will be the last to say that we have all been as wide awake as we should have but we feel more wide awake today than we used to.

I think that the vitality of Headstart is moving on through. I think there is no question about it.

Mr. BELL. For the record, gentlemen, I would like to take you on a slightly different track. You know, during the debate on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act when it came out in 1964 you had the constant referral of certain groups opposing the bill to the dangers of Federal aid bringing Federal control.

We still hear this in my own State. Do you see any real inherent danger of that?

Dr. DAILARD. In my testimony this morning I made the statement that all programs so far as content, emphasis, teachers used, materials used and selected, have been locally planned and directed.

The report, referring to the report I made, demonstrates that: One, progress has been made toward satisfying the national need as defined in the statutes.

Two, progress has been made fulfilling the educational needs of the district.

Three, local control and direction of the program has not been weakened or compromised.

Mr. BELL. You are saying you don't believe there has been any control so far as you are concerned?

Dr. DAILARD. There has been control to the extent we have discussed here this afternoon, that these funds were of limited applicability. It was not general aid. It was specific aid. But we designed our own program and no one changed it.

Mr. BELL. Dr. Dailard, you, of course, are from my home State, California. I welcome you here. What you have said is true, in the Los Angeles area as well.

However, I have heard some complaints about the State making its guidelines beyond what the Federal guidelines were. Have you had any particular problems in this area?

Dr. DAILARD. Not with reference to title I. There were some of the State guidelines under the National Defense Education Act which seemed to us to go beyond both the national guidelines and intent of the Act in restricting the use of the funds.

This is particularly true in title V. So far as the SEA Act, we have no such complaint. I have not heard it in the State. So far as our district, the districts in our area, we feel no added restraints.

Mr. BELL. Dr. Briggs, would you like to comment on both those points?

Dr. BRIGGS. Yes, I would essentially agree. However, I would not want to mislead you to think that there were no movements of discussion at our conferences about interpretations. But as far as willful takeover of local programs and the kind of fears that all of us have had from time to time, I think that we would feel more comfortable today in our relationship with the Federal Government than we have ever had before.

I could not in good conscience complain to this committee.

Mr. BELL. Have you felt that you have had adequate elbow room to move?

Dr. BRIGGS. Yes.

Mr. BELL. Dr. Whittier?

Dr. WHITTIER. I think I can agree in general. I think the biggest problem we have is the amount of staff time that goes in getting Federal funds. We think sometimes this is a hard way to get the money.

There is a lot of staff time and effort that goes into meetings, discussions and preparation of forms and other things which are not always too productive of the time and energy spent.

Under our State, of course, the Federal part of it also entails considerable discussions at that level. So we have actually gone through the formality of State discussions, Federal discussions, Federal discussions with State people together on the same project.

By the time you get through you have spent a lot of staff time in discussing even though in the end it finally came out.

Dr. DAILARD. I registered the same complaint this morning that there is an excessive amount of detail. We are dealing with 21 sections of 11-X in our school district. It seemed to us that there could be a great deal of simplification, standardization, and coordination of both the statute and guidelines.

It would simplify our task. We are spending a great deal of administrative time and costs to process the application. We processed 160 applications last year over and above our 874 survey and application.

Each of those was approved, not all were approved but those approved result in separate accountability, separate reporting and very often in delayed funding.

I mentioned this morning that we have an NDEA program at cost of \$1 million. We have received \$96,000 so far. We have a substantial investment of our local funds. We know we will get it eventually but the shoe pinches every now and then.

Dr. WHITTIER. Actually, the guidelines change every once in a while in this process which entails our redoing, our reevaluating. I realize it may not be anyone's fault, but it will certainly be part of the problem of time involvement.

Again, we have had to do this quite a number of times.

Mr. BELL. As you know, last year there was an additional amendment made to the act which provided that the AFDC, latest available information on AFDC children could be used. It is my understanding that the Department provided that 1965 data would be most generally acceptable data.

It was my understanding that California, for example, was ready, willing, and able to have provided 1966 data, and this in fact lost California approximately \$10 million.

I am wondering about your State of Pennsylvania and your State of Ohio, could they have provided the 1966 data if they had been allowed to?

Dr. WHITTIER. I really can't answer that.

Mr. BELL. You don't know?

Dr. WHITTIER. No.

Dr. BRIGGS. I can't answer that either. However, I am embarrassed that our State made a very big error on its 1965 data. It has held up for California and all the other States for several days, maybe several weeks in the actual distribution of moneys.

But this was a clerical error. I don't know that we could have given 1966 or not.

Mr. BELL. We are going to try very hard to push the department here and bring this up to date for the next time if we can.

Dr. DAILARD. I would also comment that we would like to see the 1960 census base updated. We have had a 20 percent increase in population and enrollment which is not reflected at all in our entitlement.

Mr. BELL. We hear frequently the classroom size is 30 per teacher. That, of course, is ideal. That is the very maximum, is that right?

Dr. BRIGGS. Ours is about 35 in Cleveland.

Mr. BELL. 35?

Dr. BRIGGS. Yes.

Mr. BELL. That is getting into the dangerous area.

Dr. BRIGGS. Yes.

Dr. DAILARD. Our average elementary schools of the city are 33. In the target area schools, which shows the impact of title I, it is 26.

Mr. BELL. That should be getting down pretty good, 25, 26.

Dr. DAILARD. Yes.

Mr. BELL. One more question which is a sort of general one: I am wondering if you feel that the Teacher Corps program per se as provided by the amendments to this bill is the right approach to that problem?

Do you feel that it is?

Let me get more specific. Do you think the Teacher Corps program as set out in the amendment is the best approach to handling this problem or could the problem be handled better by financing the program through the States without the national Teachers Corps?

Some problem would be worked out on the part of recruiting but basically do you think it could work better in that fashion or do you think it is better as it is?

Dr. WHITTIER. I think it might be better the other way of organizing it actually. I think that there is a certain esprit de corps that can come from a national effort of this kind than there is from that impetus which you can't deny but we have had a certain number of problems with the way both have been funded as you know.

In the present year we happen to have one of the cooperative programs and it has been a real headache because of the lack of funding and lack of availability of funds initially which caused considerable consternation.

I suppose one of the biggest concerns I would have is, if we are going to have it, to know that we are going to have it and have it funded rather than let us be in the position this year of not knowing where we were going, with having all the students and knowing we could not gracefully back out because we had the commitments and not the funds.

Whatever system is devised, if we can be fairly assured of what we are going to have when we make a commitment, then I think we would be much more comfortable about it.

Dr. DAILARD. I agree with that. If the amount of money is limited the Teachers Corps program does zero in on a problem of providing needed staffing for the areas of deprived children. It is narrow.

I think we would all answer and did answer earlier in the day that we would prefer to see the program come to us providing that, using the term you used, there was adequate funding.

If there is a limited amount of money, this is probably the way to do it. There is an amendment on which I commented this morning. I would feel that the amendment to make sure that the people assigned are from the local district is important.

In a State with tenure as we have, we are responsible for it, we want to be sure that the people have a reasonable chance of succeeding in the community before we accept them.

The present program of limited scope is hitting at the problem that we all have, of finding an adequate number of teachers to stay in the deprived area. We would like to build our intern programs into some of the other programs.

Dr. BRIGGS. I agree.

Mr. BELL. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me thank all of you distinguished educators for coming before the committee and helping us write this bill.

You have been so generous of your time not only on this occasion but in the past, I know the full committee appreciates your coming here to-day.

You have made great contributions. We know that we are operating today with more or less a limited budget but under the conditions it is the best we can do.

However, I personally feel we should greatly expand the program. We have to face the reality and do the best job we can possibly do in the circumstances.

Now we have to spend as best we can the amount of funds we have on the basis of need throughout the country to reach the most disadvantaged groups. Your testimony has been most helpful to us.

I look forward to your next appearance before this committee on some future date.

Thank you all.

Dr. DALLARD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We were honored to be permitted to testify.

The CHAIRMAN. It is my plan after we write this bill to look further into the great need of the Federal aid to education on school construction and other areas of Federal aid to education later on in the year.

I expect to hold hearings.

We will recess until 9:30 in the morning.

(Whereupon, at 5 p.m., the hearing was recessed to reconvene at 9:30 a.m., Thursday, March 9, 1967.)

