

titled to have their cake and eat it, too. I think this is a good bill, the purpose of it is proper but as school districts, such as some of my own have done, very purposely taken funds which they should not have taken. I don't think they have any right to kick when they are cut off.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one other statement. It has been my observation over the years in trying to make what seems to rather drastic local changes, if we schedule them out over a period of years, say 3 or 4 years, the impact is less objectionable.

Frankly what I would say, rather than say extending it, the thing we are talking about here is the State ought to pay for those children the same amount that they pay for the other children.

So, if the first year they would be charged back with a part of the Federal funds and next year a part of the Federal funds, the next year a part of the Federal funds, then we would impress on the State officials over which parole, Burkehead and Hardin and a few other counties have no control whatever and something has to be done.

Either they finance the schools which they destroy, where they destroy the budgets or they finance all children. They are given that choice and that is the way I would approach this program. I don't think as Mr. Meeds said that they ought to have their cake and eat it, too.

On the other hand, I cannot help but be sympathetic with individual school districts. Let's take four or five districts in Kentucky. They cannot tell the legislature what to do and as long as there is no penalty assessed, then there is no progress made.

I think that this committee can work out a program which would encourage Kentucky and the other States Mr. Lillywhite mentioned fall in line with the theory of this particular legislation. I think the same thing is true, frankly, with the States that charge back a part of their impact against the State agency.

As has been said here, the installations that we say cause district impact are not a problem to the States where they exist. They are an economic boon to the States where they exist.

I rather regret coming here to emphasize the need for impact area legislation when I know that a great deal of it is going to reduce the part of educational cost that the States are assuming.

I don't know how you handle that problem but I think again it is the two principles that I mentioned, and that is that the local district should have an equal amount of funds to provide an educational program with and they should also maintain a level of ethics equal to other schools and the impact area program could never be sold to this Congress on the basis of State's economy. It just could not be done.

Mr. FORD. You just touched on another aspect of the impact legislation that we considered last year for which we could not come up with an answer.

We went to the west coast and again I was distressed to discover that a school district in Mr. Meeds district—I believe it was out in Olympia—received some money and then the State of Washington took it back away from them by deducting it, in effect, from their State aid.