Mr. HOWE. Educators generally have given a great deal of thought to this. It is quite clear that those States that have moved on consolidation have improved education by doing so.

But it is also quite clear that this is a State matter and not a Federal matter. Internal organization within a State for education certainly ought to be the State's business. We would influence it only indirectly.

By indirectly, I mean that the appropriations we might make under title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act would help a State bring to the State leadership additional people who would move into the realms of administration. That would encourage the development of State policy leading toward consolidation.

Additional understandings within a State about the advantages of consolidation, may also be gained.

If you have been through this in Wisconsin, you know that some pretty excited attitudes do get developed, mostly because somebody loses his basketball team.

But just the same, these things matter. I think it would probably not be wise to think of a Federal program which attempted to require this by direct pressure. In fact, I don't think it would have a great deal of success in the Congress.

Mr. STEIGER. I think that is a very wise answer. Let me ask, if I may, Mr. Chairman, a couple more questions.

There was a presentation made to Mrs. Green's subcommittee of this committee by Mr. Archie Buchmiller of the State department of public instruction in December of last year.

He made a number of suggestions insofar as the reaction of our State Department toward the operations of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

You indicated you had not made a proposal in terms of trying to bring Headstart, for example, under the Office of Education.

Have you had any discussions with the Office of Economic Opportunity in terms of trying to find a way to consolidate the agencies involved in education rather than proliferating?

Mr. HOWE. I think it is easy to take an oversimplified approach in this area and say that anything with the word "education" in their name should be in the Office of Education. I don't think that is the approach we ought to take.

Education has become the instrument for helping a great many different kinds of programs to move ahead, some programs in the State Department, some programs in the Department of Defense, others in a variety of Government-sponsored areas or agencies.

I think there is a more cogent argument for bringing under the Office of Education those endeavors which particularly relate to the operation of the schools and colleges.

Of course, so far we have tended to do this with OEO by processes of coordination. Whereas we had some problems, discussed earlier in this testimony today, about those processes of coordination, they are working much better now.

I have taken the position publicly that I think Headstart ought to be a part of the Office of Education at some time. Right now we are running a larger early childhood education operation than Headstart is.