

Under the status quo, school districts do not yet know the allocation for the present school year and probably won't know for at least another week or two.

In the meantime, the districts have been operating programs on estimates and faith. For the most part the estimates have been conservative, which means that when school districts are notified of their allocations they will have 5 months in which to plan, recruit, carry out, and evaluate proposals. This is not conducive to wise use of the money.

On the other hand a few districts have badly over estimated the amount of Federal funds they are to receive. These districts will have to drastically curtail their programs during the remainder of the year.

3. Distribute all funds under title III, ESEA through the State educational agency.

Shift a greater degree of control of titles I, II, and III, ESEA to the States permitting them to establish their own administrative procedures to a maximum degree.

4. Permit judicial review of the aid provisions to private and denominational schools.

The church-state issue has served as a major block to general Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools for a century. The accommodations under ESEA do not satisfy either the denominational schools or the proponents of strict separation. This controversy will continue to jeopardize general aid proposals until the judiciary makes its position clear.

Under existing circumstances it is virtually impossible to achieve standing in the court to challenge the constitutionality of the accommodations without a specific provision by Congress.

Mr. Chairman, this completes my prepared statement. I would be happy to entertain any questions the committee might pose.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Thank you, Mr. Swanson. Let me ask you a few questions about your statement if I may. We appreciate very much your observations. I must say, however, that I am somewhat astonished by the positions you assert in your statement for a very simple reason and maybe you can help me.

I was brought up as a political scientist and trained to think that you ought always to offer some evidence for your propositions and you have a lot of propositions but I am afraid not very much evidence.

I find it significant that on page 2 of your statement you say that:

Ninety percent of the innovations reported by school districts of the region were federally aided.

On page 3 you say you are appalled to learn that one of our colleagues had received not a single letter in support of the accomplishments of ESEA legislation and you say:

This is probably because of the great frustration on the part of the administrators and the public alike with the administration of the bill.

If I was your teacher in political science, I would probably flunk you for that statement. Might it not be said this is because most of them are satisfied? I don't know that this would be accurate either but I would like to see more evidence for your conclusion that a mere assumption.