

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS 1403

record during this session. Hopefully, the many educational gains made nationwide through the several programs will rally greater congressional support with each annual reappraisal and tend to make the arguments of the past milestones that had to be passed in meeting the socio-economic needs of our constantly changing society.

The points I would make here are (1) federal educational legislation, to include these two laws, has been expanded and funded each year, the arguments notwithstanding, (2) the new programs enacted have not replaced the need for the continued extension and expansion of P.L. 815 and P.L. 874, and (3) had revenues been possible from local sources or from state grants, it must be assumed that the several federally supported programs would not have reached their present dimensions.

H.R. 5471 and H.R. 6118 propose a simple extension of P.L. 815. I concur with this extension because of the great need for school construction in the impacted school districts. The simple fact that application requirements for this year alone will total in excess of \$100,000,000 supports this position. It would seem appropriate that this legislation be continued and financed as long as the eligibility requirements can be met by the participating school districts. Indeed, I would suggest that this basic legislation could be a vehicle for an expanded school construction program that would provide classrooms wherever they are needed. The use of P.L. 874 as such a vehicle for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act provides adequate precedent.

H.R. 6558 would add a new category of eligible pupils to P.L. 874, pupils living in low cost housing. Such an amendment would provide general fund monies to both the large cities, the nearby suburbs, and, possibly, to those impacted districts whose housing has been sold or assigned to a municipality.

Prior to the introduction of this proposal, I had circulated a questionnaire to each of the Great Cities and to the suburban school districts in Wayne, Macomb, and Oakland Counties in Michigan to determine the number of pupils living in housing units built with federal funds. The rationale behind the survey was (1) pupils living in federal housing projects were eligible pupils during the period of federal ownership, (2) the pupils now in school were there as a direct result of the federal project, (3) the transfer of title to another unit of government did not lessen the cost to the local school district of educating the pupils living therein, (4) the payment-in-lieu-of-taxes does not meet the per pupil costs of the school district, (5) where private ownership occurred, the taxable value of the units was so low that costs were not met, (6) many of these units become centers for the educationally and economically deprived pupil.

A summary of the questionnaire for twelve of the Great Cities is attached. The magnitude of the problem is reflected in the number of pupils reported as living in such units, 284,760. These pupils are, for the most part, living in areas designated as eligible for project allotments under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The very small per pupil allocation from payments in lieu of taxes in almost every city is so small that the allocations under Title I are, in effect, diluted, since the local contribution rate for the entire district is drastically reduced by including these pupils from units with such limited tax potential. Every dollar received by a district that could qualify pupils in such units for payments under P.L. 874 would be providing a higher local base which still provides the greatest financial share of all programs.

An additional summary of the effect of such legislation on certain metropolitan communities will be sent to the Committee as soon as the tabulation is completed. The possibility of such aid to the suburban school districts would help substantially in providing educational programs that might very well forestall a repetition of the problems now being experienced in the center city.

I would be remiss if I did not speak of the need for a supplemental appropriation to meet the needs of the new educational legislation enacted by the Congress since July 1, 1966. Briefly summarized, in addition to those amounts necessary to meet the appropriations requirements of the acts mentioned above, the new authorizations would require for (1) the new provisions of Public Law 874, approximately \$31 million; (2) the Adult Education Program (Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act), approximately \$40 million, (3) Education of the Handicapped (new Title VI, ESEA), approximately \$50 million; and (4) Public Law 815, approximately \$100 million.