

III than for the U.S. Office of Education to force the same trial and error on all of the states each time direction is changed.

I am not overly concerned about individual States making errors—to guarantee against making errors is the easiest way to stifle progress that I know. I simply ask that you give us a chance, under a state plan, to administer title III.

Title IV with its regional educational laboratories is relatively well organized in implementation at this point and fundamentally the only need here is for a clear indication, by appropriation, as to their future, and I don't know that I can react with sufficient knowledge about the proposed amendment to title VI at this time or not but it is at least conceivable to me that the functions of these new regional centers to appraise the special education needs of referred handicapped children and to provide services to assist in meeting such needs in so far as they pertain to any multistate responsibility might be carried out by the presently organized regional laboratories of title IV. I would hope that we might be able to eliminate the possibility of another organizational unit.

Title V—Strengthening State Departments of Education, has been by far the most acceptable, as you can readily imagine, and easily administered titles of ESEA 1965. The past has been excellent. Minnesota has used some of its funds to employ staff but the prime use of money has been for a long range statewide educational planning.

The proposed amendment of V-B looks like it came out of our program of the past 2 years. Which in and of itself causes me to wonder about the necessity of V-B when this is already a possibility under the present title.

It is true that there are a few things—a few new things in the amendment and they give rise to some serious concerns on my part.

First and foremost might be the question of, "If title V is to strengthen State departments of education, why can't funds under the new amendment be allocated directly to State departments of education similar to the original Title?"

Is it because of the inclusion of provision for the higher education option? Why not assign any funds for such study automatically to that State agency that is now required to administer the Higher Education Facilities Act and the Higher Education Act of 1965?

Why the designation by the Governor, when, quite clearly, in each State there is a specific, established state agency responsible for public elementary and secondary education?

I do not question the necessity of planning. I have indicated the importance that we gave to this area in the first and second years of the present act. Nationwide attention to statewide planning under title V can easily be implemented by encouragement of U.S. Office of Education personnel under the present act.

I am concerned about the 25 percent of title V-B which would be at the discretion of the U.S. Commissioner for project or contract to anyone and everyone. As the Commissioner has stated, a number of excellent projects have been initiated by State departments of education, working cooperatively and jointly, with funds under the 15-percent provision of the present title.

I would strongly recommend that if statewide planning is to be emphasized, and I think this would be excellent, that it be done within