

really nothing different in that from what there is in our ordinary purchase of equipment. We bought audiovisual equipment, and we bought other things, before NDEA came along. This gave us additional money for it. We were grateful. So that we would necessarily have to buy our equipment, and we got aid. That money would be aid for equipment, personnel, or anything else it goes for.

The second one on library and textbooks, the purchase of library and textbooks is nothing new to us. We have been buying library books and textbooks right along.

What this did was direct a large flow of money particularly into the library book field, for which we were grateful.

Now, of course, because of the element of the law that directed it to both public and nonpublic, I am not getting into that. I am just discussing the public schools at the moment.

So those, two, to me, there would be no shift at all in our approach. That would be part of our approach to equipment and library and audiovisual materials.

On the first one, on title I, where you have directed your aid to the disadvantaged, again, as I indicated this morning, we had already directed our aid to the disadvantaged. You did give us more money, gave more thrust to it, and in certain cases, despite the fact that I don't think it is a very innovative title, it proved innovative, in some cases, as was talked about this morning here.

I think there would be a matter of the judgment and the conscience of the school board, in the expenditure of its money, and I would not be able to stand here and say that everybody would continue to do the same thing, if the money were general aid.

We are pouring so much these days into the disadvantaged, and we must, that there are other segments of our school population that are saying, "What are you going to do for us, now, because we, too, need some things."

So that if we had general aid, we would have to make the judgments again as to the way to spend the money, but I am certain that with the inner cities being what they are, in this Nation today, all of the money coming to us in general aid would be spent for the very things we are spending it now, in categorical aid, essentially. We can't give up pouring money into our disadvantaged areas. We must pour in services, and whether it comes in general aid or categorical aid, that's where it will go, only we will have a little more flexibility.

This is the more important point to us.

Chairman PERKINS. Would the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. QUINCY. Yes, I would like to have Mr. Briggs' reaction, too. Would you like to have me yield to you first?

Chairman PERKINS. Yes, I would like to probe just a little deeper here.

If we move to general aid, now, Dr. Donovan, as a complete substitute, without giving any Federal guidance, turning the money over to the States to spend as they see fit, do you still feel that the States could reach the disadvantaged groups? This is a complete substitute, I am talking about.

Mr. DONOVAN. I think today that the problem of the disadvantaged is so very, very clearly and well recognized by both local and State