

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS 1717

Adult basic education combined with MDTA funds or other job placement assistance means a break in the poverty cycle for countless people. It is, in my opinion, sound economics.

I endorse the President's proposal for rapid expansion of the Teacher Corps. I am particularly interested in that portion of the proposal which suggests a relationship between the Teacher Corps and special programs such as Migrant Education. It seems to me that this is an area in which the Congress can innovate. For migrant children one of the most difficult educational tasks is to secure continuity in learning. Compacts between states and between districts within states are useful to that end; but a mobile Teacher Corps which could move with migrants from state to state could be the most useful method to obtain that continuity.

Michigan is proposing in its migrant education program to finance a university program which will train up to fifty teachers who will then be employed by school districts in migrant education. This could become a Teacher Corps effort.

The Teacher Corps offers to altruistic and talented young people an appeal to action. It is this kind of appeal which, in my opinion, encourages able young people to choose a particular career over others. And teaching has not mounted enough of those kind of appeals.

We need the Teacher Corps and many similar kinds of programs to increase the attractiveness of teaching to those who want a career of service in an area of excitement.

I wish to give emphatic support to the President's recommendation for an appropriation to the states for comprehensive planning. The advent of Federal aid for education has confronted the administrators of our schools with a responsibility for assessing the needs of all their students and establishing a set of priorities from which the most urgent tasks can be chosen.

I believe this to be comprehensive planning. And I think it is important that the state, as well as its school districts, undertake such a process. However, a state agency does not have the funds to do this; and Federal aid would be most appropriate and useful to this end.

One of the President's recommendations troubles me considerably. That is the proposal to distribute funds for strengthening state departments of education on a 40% flat grant—60% enrollment ratio. As I understand it, there is a further proposal to merge Title X, NDEA and NDEA Title III Administration funds into this appropriation and, thus, to distribute that money, too, on the same 40-60 basis.

The effect of the President's proposal is to reduce administrative funds available to states with high enrollments. It is a departure, it seems to me, from the customary manner of allotting Federal funds, because it denies the significant relationship which exists between total number of children, volume of programs for these children, and state administrative burden.

The one percent administrative sum for Aid to the Economically Deprived, and the five percent administrative sum for Library Materials Aid are not sufficient for state management of those programs. "Title V" money must be available as a supplement. It should be available, also, for a state's costs to assist in ESEA Supplementary Services programs. It certainly should be available to enable a state to build its own programs to dimensions appropriate to the sheer numbers of pupils in the state.

If it is necessary to recognize the problems of smaller or sparsely-settled states, this could, in my opinion, be done by a separate appropriation which would not come out of the present Title V grant.

I hope that the Committee has had an opportunity to examine the present operation of Title I, ESEA. The inadequacy of appropriations recommended by the President—\$1.2 billion—hardly needs mention to your Committee, which has authorized a program requiring at least \$2.2 billion for 1967-68.

I would like to discuss briefly the allocation formula which is being used to distribute funds to school districts.

1960 Census data and 1965 AFDC data are neither current nor precise enough to describe relative concentrations of poverty as between school districts. Significant inequities creep into the allocations of funds within counties and cause the public to question the distribution of money.

Yet in the information collected by government agencies such as the Internal Revenue Service, there is information on income distribution which can be combined with welfare recipient data and school district pupil count to produce an adequate picture, updated yearly, of the burden which respective school districts bear.