

this hearing and it probably was snowed under by much of the mail that you receive.

When Dr. Niemeyer and Dr. Klopff reported to us on March 15 that you did not have this material, we sent you the five new profiles and indicated that if you wished to have the first 10 which had already been sent to the members of the committee, we would be happy to send a repeat order.

This went out on Thursday air mail special delivery to all of you. Chairman PERKINS. We will withhold any questions until all of you ladies have had a chance to make a general statement.

STATEMENT OF MRS. NATHAN W. LEVIN, CHAIRMAN OF THE EDUCATIONAL SERVICES SECTION OF THE CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR CHILDREN

STATEMENT OF MRS. NATHAN W. LEVIN, CHAIRMAN OF THE EDUCATIONAL SERVICES SECTION, CITIZENS' COMMITTEE FOR CHILDREN OF NEW YORK, INC.

Your Committee plays a decisive role in establishing the educational pattern for present and future generations. Citizens' Committee for Children, a community agency which has for twenty years worked for the improvement of New York City's educational system, is honored to appear before you. We hope that you will exercise to the fullest the power that the Congress has invested in you to assure that the resources of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 are used to provide the greatest benefit to those whom it was enacted to help. We believe that amendments are needed if this goal is to be reached.

You have been examining how present appropriations have been used—whether for "add on" programs or whether the emphasis has been put on programs to create change in education. We share with you the opinion that the legislative intent of the Congress was not that ESEA serve as general aid to pay for "more of the same" by simply relieving states, counties, cities, towns and local school boards of their financing problems. We realize, of course, that these local governmental units are hard-pressed financially with a narrowing tax base, but we also know that federal aid to education was not designed to solve this problem. We fear that this message has failed to reach lay boards of education throughout the land. Our close observations of Title I programs in New York City leave little doubt in our minds that almost all the money has been used for general support of the school system.

In the two years of Title I operation in New York City, approximately twenty percent of the total has been allocated for the reorganization of grade levels to a 4-4-4 system. This "reorganization" has been mandated as a way to effect racial balance in the schools by the New York State Department of Education in 1964, before ESEA existed. But when ESEA money was made available, \$28 million went for this purpose—the largest segment (\$17.6 million) for the creation of Comprehensive High Schools, whose actual inception is not yet scheduled. The funneling of this money for routine school expenses seems to us inappropriate and a deliberate misreading of the educational intent of Title I that you wrote into the law.

That infusions of federal aid are needed may not be disputed, but it is a cruel hoax upon the children of the poor that these funds are used to maintain and strengthen the system that has failed to educate them. It is not the children who need remediation, but the system. Our present course suggests that if the prescription fails, we throw the patient out.

It is obvious that the only redress is legislative. Accordingly, we appear before you to express our hope that you will be bold enough to mandate needed changes in the Act to communicate unmistakably that the legislative intent is to break with old patterns wherever they no longer are useful.

We are aware that the local educational agencies raise the spectre of federal domination and that this properly gives pause to some legislators. But urban America, particularly the largest cities, cannot wait for consensus among educators as they veer from crisis to crisis, half-paralyzed by the fear that their autonomy will be destroyed.

As we have observed ESEA in New York City, and particularly Title I, the following legislative mandates seem necessary to us: