

Mr. TREZZA. On the reorganization in the spring of 1965. That is when they reorganized the Office of Education.

Mr. BRADEMAs. You may not be the person to whom to put this question. Do you have any idea when they expect to be moving at full throttle?

My point, of course is, while understanding your very relevant criticisms, it may be that the Center is just not completely in business yet.

Mr. TREZZA. That is part of it except that the problem they have of course is the priority demands from programs were much larger grants always pushed the library one down. The total library program, if you take all the action together and lump it together, comes out to \$300 million, something like that. Well, compared to some of the other educational programs this is peanuts, yet this \$300 million impact on libraries is probably what all the library programs are matching. All the library programs are always said to be seed money. The Library Service Construction Act, which is 10 years old now, has done this job beautifully because it has had this effect of growing. So the amount of money itself is really not the fact of importance but in administering any office you tend to give priority to where the most money is. This is natural and we don't frown on it, it is the facts of life, but if we had all the library activity in one place—

Mr. BRADEMAs. I am trying to be the Devil's advocate here for the moment to see the other side of the coin and it might be that in the Office of Education they have said: "Well, our chief purpose is education; our chief mission is education, not libraries. Libraries are an integral part of the enterprise of education in the United States and we want to be sure that the tail is not wagging the dog, rather than the other way around." I say this because we are familiar on our committee with each particular interest group feeling that its interest ought to be at the top of the heap in terms of priority. I should have thought that there is at least one good reason for this change in the technique of collecting information that you suggest. Namely, instead of having separate library forms, you would have one educational form on which libraries and other things are included. This form would enable the Office of Education, for perhaps the first time, to see the entire picture and not to see only fragments of it as in the past.

Now as I say, I don't know that that is the explanation but that is one conceivable one.

Mr. TREZZA. That of course is a basis of explanation but the difficulty is that library statistics are such that you cannot use them. If you are going to use them, for two purposes, one is legislation but the other which is equally as important in the long run, is really why you have the legislation and that is the development of libraries—the development of the best library.

Research was another example. They didn't spread that, they put that up as a separate bureau of research. Now why didn't they spread that out? Why did they have a bureau of research with the pieces in it? Because this was the reasoning behind this where libraries are common to all. Elementary school is common to elementary and I can see elementary and secondary and higher education. However, libraries run across the entire gamut and then we keep talking about the absolute necessity of having real cooperation of kinds of libraries—