

cerned, but all I am saying is that I hope it can receive the congressional, executive, and educational consideration that it deserves.

There are amendments dealing with evaluation and long range planning for education; the timing of Federal funding would be an excellent place to start both of these studies.

Now I would like to direct my comments to each of the specific titles of the act. Title I—Education of Children of Low-Income Families, has worked out relatively well. I can support the amendments being recommended for this title, including the change in amount of funds available for State agency administration and inclusion of the teacher corps as a new section.

I am pleased to see the amendment to the Teacher Corps section providing for authority of State departments of education but cannot support the retention by the U.S. Commissioner of Education of authority "to provide members of the Teacher Corps with such training as the Commissioner may deem appropriate."

It seems to me this is a serious breach of relationships regarding teacher preparation programs and ought to be corrected immediately. "Appropriate training" for teachers is a State function and responsibility and should remain so.

My support of the amendments regarding the Teacher Corps should be qualified by a statement that I am opposed to the way the entire proposal has been developed out of the U.S. Office of Education. Such a program could be implemented by appropriation to the State educational agency under a State plan arrangement with considerably greater authority and flexibility vested in the State.

I am disappointed to note that the executive branch of the Federal Government has not recommended the development of a "State plan" philosophy for title I of ESEA. This procedure has been used with much success in other Federal educational aid programs, notably vocational education and NDEA and could in my opinion do a great deal to help each State meet specific and unique needs of the respective State under the broad guidelines of the law.

It would also provide the opportunity to eliminate considerable red tape for school districts, State education departments and the U.S. Office of Education. State departments now have authority for approval of title I project application by local school districts; it would only be a short, but important step to provide for a State plan method of operation for the title.

The most disturbing matter relating to the title I, I have saved for the last. It relates to the method of funding used for this fiscal year. At the outset I might say that I am well aware of the fact that the inclusion of more eligible children without the corresponding increase in appropriation added to the distribution problem for this title. However, the fundamental situation is still there with all of its resultant problems and issues.

For fiscal year 1966, Minnesota was allocated approximately \$24.5 million for title I. Late funding, late receipt of Federal guidelines and a large number of school districts in our State contributed to our inability to develop sound programs to expend all of the funds allocated.

More important than these reasons, however, was the fact that our State department of education in particular, and the school districts