

1056 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS

tional Association an opportunity to make their general statement now.

STATEMENTS OF JOHN M. LUMLEY, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF FEDERAL RELATIONS, NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION; MRS. MARY C. GEREAU AND STANLEY J. McFARLAND, MEMBERS OF THE STAFF

Mr. LUMLEY. I have filed my statement. In the interest of time, Mr. Chairman, you may want to just file it.

Chairman PERKINS. Your prepared statement will be inserted in the record at this point.

I hear no objection.

You can proceed in any manner you choose, Dr. Lumley.

(The statement referred to follows:)

TESTIMONY OF JOHN M. LUMLEY, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF FEDERAL RELATIONS, NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I am John M. Lumley, Director of the Division of Federal Relations of the National Education Association. Mrs. Mary C. Gereau and Stanley J. McFarland, members of our staff, are with me this morning.

I appreciate this opportunity to appear before your committee to discuss the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967.

Passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 has been one of the most important educational events of this generation. After only two years, there have already been major impacts on the scope and quality of American education. We believe that federal money alone will not solve the problems facing our schools but we also believe, that, under existing school financing arrangements, they cannot be solved without federal money. The ESEA, by providing comparatively substantial funds as an incentive to state and local education agencies for specific purposes and under specific conditions as determined by the Congress, has already achieved three important contributions to the ideal of meaningful education for all American children:

1. By focusing attention on the economically disadvantaged, the Congress has recognized the importance of education in overcoming the problem of the poverty cycle if each individual is to have an opportunity to achieve economic and social well-being. This recognition has activated public interest in an appreciation of the vital role of education. Although improved educational opportunities alone cannot solve all the problems faced by those who live in poverty, it is encouraging to note a national recognition of the fact that without improved educational programs none of the problems will be solved.

Unfortunately, the handicap of limited state and local financial resources has resulted in many school districts being unable to meet the special needs of the economically disadvantaged.

Title I of ESEA has given the school authorities who recognized these needs an opportunity to develop programs which they knew were needed. Title I has also served to awaken those who may have been unaware of these problems. And, finally, Title I has served as a federal incentive—to the school systems who ignored the needs of this special group. The degree of success of Title I programs is probably measurable in direct proportion to the attitude of the local school officials. Thus, since the programs have been overwhelmingly successful to date, we can conclude that local school boards are interested in providing good educational programs when possible.

2. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act has encouraged innovation—by providing the funds to state and local school systems to discover and utilize the creativity which has been financially undernourished in local districts. Under Title III, for example, we see the fundamental innovative philosophy of ESEA.

Increased cooperation between the teacher education and research programs of higher education institutions and the local and state school systems is proving