

tion on the Appropriations Committee to make the money available and the tax-sharing proposal that I have mentioned would not go to the Appropriations Committee.

You would know, based on a figure well in advance, the money going to your State. The State would, in turn, allocate between education and municipal functions, and you would know again the allocation for your own State.

Another aspect that troubles me: It has come to my attention from a number of areas of the country—I will give you a specific instance.

Under a title III application, a county was given a \$300,000 grant for a 3-year period which involved remedial work in the early elementary grades, \$300,000 for 3 years. Of that amount, \$60,000 a year was for salaries of personnel that were added to administer the grant.

They had to buy a truck. They had a truckdriver. They had to rent quarters. It was a small county. When they got all through, more than 70 percent of the money, 70 percent of the \$300,000 had been eaten up in salaries and overhead expenses.

I had a great many of the school people in that particular area, when I was talking with them, tell me if they could have had the \$100,000 a year distributed to them, they had a large number of high-priority items they could have spent it on in terms of helping the youngster at the early elementary level who needed special care and special help. They resented very much the fact that 70 percent of the money was gone before they saw any of the new materials or other things that they wanted to help these youngsters.

As I say, I have heard this from a variety of sources, every area of the country, each example somewhat different. It seems to me a rather general commentary. I would like to hear your comments.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Sir, I would like to comment on this. I think this points up basically one of the things that we are all concerned about the same as you are. The allocation of funds under title III is not extremely large. If we want to give these supplementary services, then we ought to go to a long-range basis. Service to most of the school districts outside the larger cities really depends upon setting up an area concept to provide services for local school districts.

To do this on the basis that you have expressed is one thing, but to take these funds and start to develop a long-range approach that will serve many school districts on an area concept basis, you do not have to repeat some of the same things that you have indicated time and time again that you can make better utilization of the funds. I think this goes right back to one of the things that we were discussing on the statewide planning approach to this thing. The coordination of these funds between the various titles, in a particular area, is a little over \$1,700,000 this year which can be utilized in many ways or wasted in many ways.

But much of this, if it is used in conjunction with the other programs you can really build a service area for services back to local school districts on a permanent basis. Or you can set it up on an individual application where you can waste a lot of this money over a period of time also. This is one of the things that we are all concerned with, that as these funds become available we do not do it on a basis of 1, 2, or 3 years. We can take a look at a broad concept