

in education today than we could have even dreamed ten years ago. To be sure, part of this increased support has come from the states and local communities, but our rapid forward momentum has been in large part due to the effort of the federal government.

On the whole, I am in agreement with the proposed amendments to the various educational acts which are under consideration by this committee. The extension of the several titles, in some cases for a longer period of time than has been the practice in the past, is encouraging. The change in the nature of Title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is noteworthy. The new Sections 504, 505 and 506 are particularly to be commended, since they provide a small beginning in a much needed direction: the shifting of funds from program to program, and the coordination of effort among three agencies dealing with educational funding. The new Section 541 adds a needed provision for the training of teachers and administrators for our institutions of higher education.

I do disagree with two or three parts of the amendments, as proposed.

First, the legislation dealing with the Teacher Corps continues the practice of having the Office of Education select participants, in a sense placing in the hands of the central government the responsibility for selecting teachers for our local school systems. It is true that the local system may reject these teachers and theoretically is free to participate in the program on a voluntary basis. In practice, this is hardly the case in these days of teacher shortages. I submit that the institution of higher education which trains these teachers and the local school system which uses them are in the best position to select participants with the greatest potential for success in a given situation. This is especially true of the conditions which prevail in our large urban centers.

Secondly, the extension of training programs for teachers under Title V is to be commended, but this section does continue the old practice of stipulating fixed amounts for the stipends going to participants. \$2,000, \$2,300, and \$2,400 for the young man with a large family are not realistic in many cases. The man with four small children would be hard-pressed to live within this financial constraint. If flexible stipend payments were possible, a considerably larger number of highly qualified persons in the 25-40 age bracket would be made available to the program.

Under the amendments to Title VI as proposed, the historical practice of providing for programs of matching grants for equipment and materials is continuing. This in theory is not a bad idea. In practice, however, it does work to the detriment of those institutions which are academically strong but are lacking in financial resources. It would seem more equitable to establish a sliding schedule, geared to the financial resources of the institution. Unless some such practice is adopted, the "haves" will continue to prosper while the "have-nots" will fall farther and farther behind.

Thirdly, the support for teacher education at the graduate level, which is proposed under the amendments, should accrue to the benefit of the teaching profession. The lack of support for teacher education at the undergraduate level, however, continues to hold back many worthwhile efforts. For an institution such as I represent, which focuses its attention on the educational problems plaguing our urban centers, this need is especially great. A massive effort at the undergraduate as well as the graduate level is necessary if we are to solve the problems of education besetting our cities.

May I turn my discussion to several areas which are not covered in the presently proposed amendments but which, it seems to me, need careful attention by the Congress. In general, the system of overlapping authorities and overlapping programs of the many agencies involved in education continues to plague the universities. Some real coordination of effort among these myriad agencies must be brought about if we are not to expend an exorbitant amount of our resources in the process of discovering the sources of money and in preparing proposals for all the agencies involved. For example, at my institution we just now submitted proposals on a proposed science building to the Office of Education, the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health. Under the present system, these proposals are involved, bulky, and extremely time consuming in their preparation. A separate proposal must go to each agency because each has different deadlines and different guidelines. The preparation of one proposal does not help you too much in the preparation of the others, even though they are basically for the same purpose. In addition, we will have three site visits, probably of two days each, by these agencies. Six months of efforts on the part of