

programs for the training of recreation personnel. As the NDEA categories have expanded over the years, the physical education program has been discriminated against, since equipment for other school subjects could be financed up to 50% from federal funds, while physical education equipment was not so favored. Unless the language excluding "athletic and recreational equipment" is clarified, this unfortunate situation is likely to continue, even though the litany of categories is eliminated from the Act, presumably so that all interests can be treated fairly. We believe that the bill should clarify such matters as this and not leave the decision to the guideline writers in USOE.

Page 70, lines 19 through 21, repeal the provision in Title III of NDEA which authorizes \$10 million for state supervisory services in the categories enumerated in Title III NDEA. We oppose the repeal of the authority for the states to use NDEA funds for this purpose. Indeed, there is reason to believe that this part of NDEA Title III has been perhaps of more benefit than the equipment provision, especially in what the Office of Education calls the weaker states. Until Title V of ESEA is amended to provide for autonomy within the states over uses of funds provided to strengthen state departments of education as each state determines, we strongly urge that Congress continue to provide state education agencies the opportunity to appoint subject matter specialists to their staffs to assist local school systems in strengthening their curricular offerings. This is further reason for our resistance to removing the categories in NDEA Title III.

Page 72 provides for extension of the private school loan program for equipment. We note with approval that the bill proposes to extend this opportunity to schools operated by United States citizens primarily for American children overseas. This is a minor, but important, step in the direction of extending to pupils in these schools some of the assistance they are entitled to as American citizens.

While the language on page 73, Sec. 701, extends Part A of NDEA Title VII (Guidance, Counseling and Testing) for five more years, it is silent on Part B. We assume that Part B (Institutes) is to be absorbed, after this year, into the Education Professions Development Act.

We note also that Sec. 801, page 74, extends Title VIII: Language Development of NDEA for one year only. We trust the programs developed under this title will continue to receive comparable attention from the USOE under other acts in subsequent years.

Note: We have not been able to determine how much the USOE is requesting to implement the Educational Professions Development Act. We believe the amount should be substantially higher than the total of the authorizations for the various programs—such as teacher fellowships under the Higher Education Act and the NDEA institutes—presently in the laws. For example, if anything approaching an adequate expansion of the NDEA type of subject matter institutes is to be carried on, and considering the extension, potentially, to all subject matter areas at the elementary, secondary and college level, at least three times the amount requested in the 1968 budget for NDEA institutes alone would be required. Specifically, at least \$100 million is necessary for this activity alone. If in addition any meaningful effort to implement programs described in the imposing list of activities outlined on pages 60 to 63 for every type of educational personnel from teacher aides to school administrators, school board members and college presidents is to be carried out, at least \$150 million or more in additional funds should be provided for the first year, with proportionate increases in subsequent years. Further, if the Commissioner is to be authorized to employ experts and consultants—as we think he should—for \$100 or more a day as provided on page 53, Sec. 507, the need for adequate funding for this purpose also must be met. A conservative estimate of the funds required for the first year of operation of the Professions Development Act would be about \$255 million, in addition to full funding of the teacher fellowship program.

We testified at length on March 14 in support of the Teacher Corps as amended by legislation before the full House Education and Labor Committee. We re-emphasize that supportive position again here today, for the record.

We note the extension of NDEA programs to children in the federally-operated Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools. We have consistently maintained that these youngsters belong in the public school systems in the states in which they reside.

Madam Chairman, we appreciate the opportunity to present the views of the National Education Association to this Committee. We are confident that this Committee will produce a bill which will continue to improve the quality and quantity of educational opportunity in this country and at the same time preserve the traditional structure and control of education by the states.