

The third point that I question whether this is an either/or proposition. I think the present programs have been very productive. We are developing a new framework of Federal-local cooperation and effort that is useful. I think it would be catastrophic if this were suddenly upset and we moved to an altogether different base. I think we will move to the time that the Congress will find it appropriate to build the Federal aid, but in watching our building a general Federal aid program, in watching California State programs, we have had a strong foundation program, but we still have built into that a number of categorical aids to give emphasis for the teaching of the handicapped; to give emphasis even in this area, we had it. I cannot convince myself that there will not always be occasion and necessity for earmarking certain funds to accomplish certain purposes, even when we move in with Federal aid.

Mr. OUIE. This is true. We have tried to accomplish certain national purposes. We have gone along on the categorical aid program. The question is, Do we need that Federal direction forever? Is there such a lack of competence on the State and local level to pick up the ball and realize the necessity of it later on? I don't think you would ever find it if one year we had a full-blown title I program, and the next year changed to a general aid program. It is more a question of whether we could phase into it. Some of the men say that this sensitivity of the need is recognized.

Now we are talking about title I, about a program that is directed toward a certain group of children. What of the other two I asked about, the textbooks and equipment? Do you think we need Federal direction in both of those, in order for the schools to continue to spend the money that is needed?

I would be interested in Mr. Briggs answering that, since he kind of took the other approach on title I.

Mr. BRIGGS. I wish that title II would be similar to the NDEA on a per pupil basis. Cleveland would come out better. We do not get the State average per pupil that you distribute in the State of Ohio.

Mr. OUIE. How about title III? Do you think we still need the equipment title separate? Otherwise, you wouldn't be able to convince your board to buy the equipment.

Mr. BRIGGS. No; we have no trouble convincing the board. You misunderstand this. We have no argument with title III. However, it was attempting to do certain things, it was attempting, as I understood it, to better equip laboratories in this country, and you may be sure that the laboratories in this country are better equipped because of title III. There is no question about it.

Mr. OUIE. And you need this special program for all time in the future?

Mr. BRIGGS. No; I don't think so, and I am not——

Mr. OUIE. Would you be willing to give this one up to general aid, and, therefore, through general aid, be able to buy all the equipment that you could need, and also be able to set some priorities for use of the money?

Mr. BRIGGS. I have one reservation. I am not sure that the Congress of the United States is as enthusiastic about just giving general fund moneys to public schools across the country as it is in seeing that certain things are accomplished.