

Office of Education

Budget request-----	\$4,054,670,000
Recommended reduction-----	527,000,000

There is increasing evidence that the tremendous up-surge in Federal spending on education resulting from programs enacted by the 89th Congress is causing administrative and management problems at all levels of government that have yet to be solved. Likewise, the on-rush of new education and training programs is creating a considerable drain on the Nation's supply of skilled educators and administrators. This is leading to wasteful expenditures and ineffective programs. The time has come to make a thorough evaluation of existing programs to ascertain their effectiveness and the ability of the Nation to man them with the kind of qualified personnel needed. We therefore recommend reductions of \$260,000,000 in the budget requests for elementary and secondary educational activities.

The Chamber recommends that none of the \$35,000,000 requested for the National Teachers Corps be approved. The program is not needed, and even if it were, qualified staff is simply not available.

The "temporary" program of Federal assistance for operating as well as constructing schools in areas overburdened by the children of Federal employees has drifted along for 16 years, with periodic proposals to the Congress to make the program more equitable and justifiable. Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson have repeatedly recommended a reexamination of this program to limit it to truly "overburdened" school districts, but without avail. The 89th Congress authorized such research, and the Office of Education duly expended appropriated funds therefor in contract with the Stanford Research Institute, to provide objective bases for returning this program to its original purposes. These recommendations were duly forwarded to the Congress by the Administration, along with appropriately reduced budget requests for FY 1967. The 89th Congress ignored both the research findings and the budget recommendations, thus conceding that this program is more pork barrel than educational in its justification. We strongly recommend a further review of this program by the 90th Congress, with a view to amend P.L. 815 and 874 in accordance with the research evidence already purchased by tax funds. Such action could reduce this program by \$232,000,000.

Urban grant-in-aid and loan programs

Budget request-----	\$1,897,850,000
Recommended reduction-----	700,000,000

The HUD budget for 1968 proposes the expansion of a number of grant-in-aid and loan programs. These programs include Grants for Neighborhood Facilities, Urban Renewal, Urban Planning Grants, Metropolitan Development Incentive Grants, Open Space Land Programs, Grants for Basic Water and Sewer Facilities, Grants to Aid Advance Acquisition of Land, Public Works Planning Fund, Comprehensive City Demonstration Programs, Urban Research and Technology, Low Income Housing Demonstration Programs, and Rent Supplements. The record of these programs makes their expansion at this time seriously questionable. The programs are not new. They have had many years in which to prove their effectiveness. The record to date indicates they have not been successful in achieving their primary objectives.

Evidence in support of this has been and is being compiled by the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization, headed by Senator Abraham Ribicoff. This evidence has led Senator Ribicoff to say: "The fact is that the job is not being done. And you can go on and list these programs from now until tomorrow and still the job is not being done." Senator Ribicoff, after pointing out that we had spent \$96 billion on our cities in the last ten years, went on to say that some of these Federal programs were causing the nation to slip further and further behind. Similar evidence relating to the confusion and duplication of Federal programs for cities is being accumulated by investigations conducted by Senator Muskie and his Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations.

The increasing recognition of the ineffectiveness of programs such as those listed above is becoming a major issue. To a large extent, this issue is behind current efforts to design new approaches to solving urban problems—approaches such as revenue sharing, block grants, and quasi public-private approaches. Senate Majority Leader Mansfield has also called for a really thorough evaluation of where the Nation stands with some of these programs. On the basis of this widespread concern, it is highly justified to refrain from expanding these