

To avoid repetition, I would prefer not to read my testimony as many of the things covered in it have been covered by the people who preceded me and perhaps I could refer to about five points.

No. 1 is where I relate to the various shortages of qualified teachers of mathematics and science. As it is necessary in the national interest to provide a Teacher Corps to work in areas of the underprivileged, it is also necessary to insure the adequate instruction of the future leaders of industry and science.

The competition from industry for trained teachers must be met if schools are to continue to meet this challenge.

I believe that funds that would allow school districts to pay for a full year's employment of teachers in critical subject areas such as mathematics, physics, and chemistry would provide an incentive for college students to enter the teaching profession.

Item No. 2, I believe it should be clearly stated that ESEA programs do not replace impacted area needs and certainly we have heard this mentioned before. In fact, if funds are decreased to schools which are so dependent on 874 the funds as the district I represent it would mean a decrease in the expenditure per pupil and thereby eliminate us from the eligibility of title I, title II of ESEA and as I read the interpretation of the act.

A heavy impacted district such as the Security Schools then would become completely ineligible because we would not have the sources to raise the money and continue the per pupil costs thereby again we would be ineligible for ESEA programs.

The build up of Federal activities to meet the national emergency has created an ever increasing burden on other schools near military bases. Because of this I have suggested that a plan for payment of the Federal Government obligation to aid in the education of children in these areas be based on a formula that will more nearly reflect the true cost of education and will allow for an adequate and acceptable educational program.

I would propose as a just method of determining support a base such as one similar to the one that all impacted districts now have and work under and this is determined by arbitration with the U.S. Office of Education and that this base be either increased or decreased yearly according to the average cost of education within a given State.

Thereby, we who operate so entirely on impacted funds could keep our programs during recent periods of time the costs have increased yearly, the Federal payments have not kept up with the costs, so we must find some manner to cap up our expenditures if we are going to keep even.

I believe that the decrease in the quality of education being offered in heavy impacted districts is not being fair to the students of the military people particularly when their fathers are fighting to preserve equality and freedom in other places.

Item No. 3 I should refer to is part B of title V of the amended act. This does not, to my point of view, aid in the strengthening of State departments of education. Instead it would create another agency to do those duties which are the function of good State departments of education.