

may be that you are dealing with a regional problem, such as the study that I was conducting on title III, which is really a national problem. That is, in that respect.

Therefore, this wouldn't be of equal concern to all the States.

I would say that is the real question, on the resources.

When you come up to resources in education, we are pretty feeble in terms of providing the types of assistances that are needed for certain types of studies. For example, I know the situation in Vermont where Commissioner Gibony wanted this, so he looked for educational help and he went to ADL, Arthur Little, as California did. They didn't do it by just turning to ADL, but they did it on the basis of looking around for resources to do the job.

It is partly a weakness that we have in education. We have not developed this. We are developing by leaps and bounds but we are still behind. It doesn't really concern me much as long as it is taken on the basis of who can do the job that needs to be done.

Incidentally, on the planning, I think the Commissioner does need funds to do planning and to do research. This has been a real problem in terms of title I, for example, and title III. There are many other types of research that need to be done on title III. The one that we did really just scratched the surface. Yet there are flow funds available.

For this type of research, whether done by a university or an industrial firm, in my opinion is not the real point. The real point is who can best do the job that needs to be done. This is my view on it.

Mrs. GREEN. Did I understand you to say that staffing was the No. 1 problem, as you see it?

Mr. MILLER. It is the No. 1 problem in terms of the 723 project directors who responded to an anonymous questionnaire on their total operation. I asked them to list the three most difficult problems they faced in title III. No. 1 was personnel, by all means.

Mrs. GREEN. Do you think that that can be said of all educational programs and problems that we have today, getting adequate staff?

Mr. MILLER. I am afraid so. It is just all across, in research developments, educational technology.

Mrs. GREEN. Then may I go back to the trend of entering into contracts with private agencies on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis.

Such groups are not limited by the voters in a district, in tax levies or bond issues. The profitmaking institution can pay any salary necessary to do the job and make a profit on what they do. It seems reasonable to assume that they would siphon off people in the public school systems or in universities because they can offer a much higher salary.

I am not arguing about what the salary should be. I think all salaries should be higher than what we are paying in education. But I am wondering what we are doing to the total educational program if we do this. I can cite R. & D. labs as one. Here we have in every State but California, I believe, the R. & D. lab and it is not subject to any tax limits of a State. It is not subject to any vote or any approval by the State legislature, or the approval of Congress or anybody else. It is a law unto itself, completely autonomous.

They offer in every area that I know of higher salaries than State superintendents receive, higher salaries than the Commissioner of