

the present title with the simple addition of more funds and that special planning projects in this area continue to even be arranged for in the same manner as is presently used in title V.

There is also the possibility that any funds and/or regional planning contemplated under the Commissioner's 25 percent of V-B could go directly and more properly, in my judgment, to the established Regional Educational Laboratories under title IV of this act.

Title V is the best title. I am disappointed that someone has seen fit to meddle it up with what looks like a mixture of politics, bureaucracy and increased control and direction from the U.S. Office of Education. It is a good title now; necessary changes and expansion could best be taken care of by making additional funds available.

The U.S. Office of Education staff working in this area are the most experienced and understanding. They are the first to agree that the problems and needs of the various states are different and should be recognized. Many of them have had experience in State departments of education. They know the situation first hand.

I am disappointed with the fact that the one title of ESEA 1965 that has received almost complete and unanimous support from every segment did not warrant a recommendation for an increase in its basic appropriation.

I will only make a brief comment or two regarding the proposed amendment to the Vocational Education Act of 1963. This sounds like title III of ESEA 1965 all over again, and I won't repeat my feelings about the title but suffice it to say that I strongly oppose this amendment. The stated objective of the amendment can be accomplished within the present act very simply by the U.S. Office of Education requiring that each state plan provide for the development of "exemplary and innovative programs or projects in vocational education."

And if the answer is that it can and should have been taken care of under the present act then I would say people at the State and Federal level have not been doing their job.

But just as one cylinder of an engine not functioning properly is no reason to throw out the engine so a minor problem with an excellent piece of legislation is no reason to alter it so severely as this amendment would cause to happen. The engine like the act might just need a little tuning, not a complete overhaul or discard.

Minnesota has a State board for vocational education that is responsible for Federal vocational program administration at all levels. I am proud to say that I think we have one of the finest vocational education programs in the Nation—and we are constantly seeking ways to improve it.

In my judgment the amendment to the Vocational Education Act of 1963 could have a negative if not ruinous effect on our State program. I would strongly encourage the philosophy of the amendment to be provided for in the State plan provision of the act in its present form.

I would also like to comment on something noticeably absent from the list of amendments proposed for ESEA 1965. I would like to add my strong recommendation to the many you have undoubtedly heard for the transfer of the Headstart program and the Headstart followthrough to the U.S. Office of Education and their inclusion as an integral part of title I, ESEA.