

I believe that I got a good hearing.

Mr. REID. Could I ask one final question? If the funds were available in the budget is there any reason why the educational systems or educational agencies could not take advantage wisely and soundly of a full authorization?

Secretary GARDNER. As you have indicated, this does vary some with the States. I believe that our conception of how much States could absorb and the rapidity with which they could absorb it has become more cautious in the last year as we have watched this process of absorption.

But I think it would be foolish for me to argue that they could not absorb more than they are getting. Many States could.

Mr. REID. And a significant increase?

Secretary GARDNER. That I think is possible.

Mr. REID. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Chairman PERKINS. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Dent.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Secretary, I want to get back to the situation that was discussed when the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Quie, was interrogating you—the Teachers Corps relationship between local, State, and Federal. We all know that the Teachers Corps program is one of our toughest hurdles to clear during this session in this legislation. Are we in a sense offering some kind of compromise to get away from the basic principles behind the whole thing?

Are we deciding that in order to pass it we compromise with the State, we will take over from on in, we provide the money, you do all the rest of it?

We will go on with the expense of recruitment; we will go on with the expense of setting it up. The State will then say all right, we will tell you where to put them, we will control the teachers, we will handle the mobility, and we will now establish the salary base which in some instances could be lower in some States than in others—the starting wage is higher in some States and lower in others?

I always thought the starting salary was pretty much of a fair guideline since we have no two local units that have the same starting salaries in many instances. They are different from one school board to another. Are we in a sense saying here we want to pass this bill even though we compromise on any Federal control?

If the States demand the right to veto it, they can veto any project we may establish in a local district. Wasn't that basically the reason we went to the local district?

Was it the idea that States would not set them up in certain areas, that they needed Teachers Corps trainees, that they needed Teachers Corps personnel more than the others? Are we saying to the States, "We don't want you to set up a project in Tuscaloosa in some places, we will set it up here."

The idea behind all of this was that we had neglected areas where we had children who were not getting proper attention from the States. The States have always had the right to set up special training but here we are saying we are going to compromise that right out of the bill because of the fact we have to pass the bill.

Why pass it if it does not meet what we started to do, unless I am completely wrong with what I am talking about, and I would like to be corrected if I am wrong.