

to classrooms in other parts of the city and the receiving schools receiving these children, received these children in good style and they are making a success along these lines.

I think the NDEA Act which has been in for some year is a better one to enable you to see what has been accomplished, rather than the present one which is a young act and our efforts are relatively new. I want to emphasize again what it means trying to get a group of teachers, 200 or 300 of them in this program, and hold them on the sidelines each year and tell them: "You are not quite a part of our organization." They are working side by side with other teachers, but we are not quite sure that we can rehire them. And if there is one point I would like to make, I think more important than any of the aspects of these changes in this bill, I think the most important thing that Congress can do is to appropriate money on a longer basis and let us work with what we have and not tie ourselves up too much with the revisions of it, and get off on that track and move along.

I would sacrifice changes in order to get the funding and the appropriations coming along, if we could do that.

We are concerned about the revision to a certain extent, and other things have been put in this act. All that we trust is that you will also realize this means more money unless we take something out that you already have, and you can't stop the program for these children. They are on their way, and you can't take it away from the children or the community; and we can't, because the local boards work with these citizens. If we try to take it away and can't, we have to try to find more local taxes somewhere to carry it on. We can't treat a child or a community that way.

When the Federal Government starts on funding of public education, you can't back up. You can't back up just as we can't back up on a local basis when we start something that is good for the people and they want it. We would like to get off of this two-budget system that we have in San Francisco, and you are the people who can get us off of it.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I have noticed there is a lack, in the testimony coming to the committee thus far, of either subjective or objective opinions with regard to the equities or inequities of the program carried out under the act. The act as originally conceived had several features in it that we considered would cultivate or encourage greater support in some areas from State and local sources that the schools are now getting.

The so-called incentive grant provision that was in the act in 1965 and came out promptly in 1966 was entirely for that purpose. There are other features of the act that were intended to do this. We have stayed away completely from any kind of State or local matching in the programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

In going into matching, one of the things that we accomplish is that we stretch the Federal dollars farther and we get this partnership going where we have both partners or all three partners putting something in the pot. From the beginning of this hearing we have heard testimony indicating that the State departments of public instruction want to exercise more authority over ESEA funds than they now exercise, particularly title III; that the local officials