

nesota because the income tax has not been able to fulfill all of our needs in the State and realizing the property taxes would not do it.

Dr. MATTHEIS. Minnesota consistently ranks higher than our others. We do dedicate a considerable amount to education. You can appreciate the position of a commissioner of education who on the one hand works with the State legislature that you are referring to here as the State body governing these things day in and day out and pleading the case and working hard to get it and it is not an easy task. I think improvements are being made and we appreciate the assistance coming from the Federal level.

Mr. BRADEMAS. In title III you call for a far greater role of the States also and it would seem to me that it would be of interest then if you would compare what you said with the reports of the survey conducted by Dr. Richard Miller which were given to us the other day because they are not really on all fours. At least judging from Dr. Miller's survey, the only one I know on how the title III program is operating today, there is a strong case—a strong indication that States have not generally speaking, only a handful have, paid much serious attention to or invested much of their resources and top people in helping shape title III programs.

Do you have any comment on that?

Dr. MATTHEIS. Yes, sir; I would. This is indicative of the degree of authority that the law in the U.S. Office of Education has given to the States. They have not given us any authority.

Mr. BRADEMAS. That is not accurate.

Dr. MATTHEIS. I think the record would speak to the contrary.

Mr. BRADEMAS. You do not have a statutory veto power but, as I recall Dr. Miller's statement, a number of States—California and New York among others—there has been an effort to give real leadership which has had a very constructive impact on the shaping and operation of title III programs under the authority given to the State departments of education to review and make recommendations.

I am not yet impressed that the State departments have made enough of an effort to give the leadership that they could give if they were really serious about these programs.

Dr. MATTHEIS. I would only respond by saying I speak from the personal experience of one State, Minnesota, and I would say from the first proposal that we submitted, and I think we saw a clear indication that we were not going to have this kind of authority and judgment being accepted by the U.S. Office of Education.

Mr. BRADEMAS. In my last second I would be glad, too, if you would give us maybe not now but maybe some time when there is more time some evidence for your observations.

Dr. MATTHEIS. I would be happy to.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Erlenborn.

Mr. ERLNBORN. Dr. Mattheis, as I note you are strongly in favor of title V, to strengthen State departments of education, but in your prepared statement which I have had a chance to read—I was not here when you delivered it—I notice that you are not in favor of the amendments to title V; is that right?

Dr. MATTHEIS. That is right.

Mr. ERLNBORN. In particular, is it correct that you do not care for the 25-percent holdback from the funds and the ability of the