

but I would say again that while you said Hardin County couldn't assume their responsibility, then neither can they assume the responsibility of what the attorney general is going to do or what the State legislature is going to do.

May I say this: One of the serious things in Oklahoma that I have had to combat is the fact that the general people in the State legislature think that the Midwest City school district is a plush, well-financed school system when in reality it is not.

Therefore, I can see where the State of Kentucky might think like the State of Oklahoma. We do not need to be concerned about Midwest City because they have all of this Federal money but they don't have as much money to educate a child as the State of Kentucky does or in the State of Oklahoma in the case of a Midwest City.

Mr. LILLYWHITE. Let me finish up by saying two things.

Chairman PERKINS. But you see no difficulty in postponing the effective date?

Mr. ROSE. No, sir; I do not.

Mr. LILLYWHITE. If you decide to postpone it a year I don't think it is going to be any great problems if you do, but I would hope you would state in the report in connection with the deferral, if you do it, that you intend to go through with this.

This gives States and school districts time to make the arrangements so it does not cut the ground out from under us in trying to get the Federal Government out of the business of running schools. We don't want to run schools.

Michigan had three of them and they have already transferred the full responsibility to local school districts and they did that before this amendment was ever set up.

Mr. FORD. I certainly do not want to put Mr. Rose and his people on the spot with the chairman of the committee, but I don't think you gentlemen can come here and make a presentation about the tremendous burden we put on your local school district by a Federal installation that adds kids to the Federal school system and say that is the reason we ought to give you Federal funds over 874 and 815 to offset that burden and then sit there and agree that it is all right for a State to receive the money from the Federal Government, have a Federal installation there but not accept those children or make any provision for those children in the public school.

I was not aware until last year when we got into this that it was possible to have a State provide not \$1 of local or State money for the education of federally connected children and yet claim them as a Federal impact.

I suspect if that was very widely publicized across the country, the next time you fellows come back before the Congress for 815 or 874 money you might have a little trouble. I promise you will, if the provision added by this committee was cut off by the Appropriation Committee by a little amendment that said no new impact area would be taken into consideration.

I am talking about cities like New York, Chicago, Detroit, and a lot of others that have many thousands of federally impacted children.

It pains me to take issue with anybody in Kentucky because I know how sincerely the people wanted to help the chairman of this commit-