

Mr. CICCO. Congressman, I would like to add to that. I reiterate your concern from my experience from in and around Pittsburgh and throughout the State of Pennsylvania on title III.

I would like to hasten to add that I feel very optimistic about title I. But I too had the idea that title III would provide consortiums and educational research—

Mr. PUCINSKI. Isn't one reason you have not had better luck with title III that the committee which approved these projects placed a greater emphasis on innovative demonstration projects rather than hard-proven formulas of education that communities need.

I think this committee as far as this member of Congress is concerned has to some degree distorted the intend of Congress. I don't recall in the debate on title III ever saying that we are going to give top priority to innovative and demonstration projects. I recall that we were going to set up the very things we are talking about. In my congressional district being the outer city I have youngsters who need compensatory education, remedial reading, remedial math, various other forms of assistance and they are not getting it simply because the Office of Education has been diverting this money to so-called demonstration projects instead of ongoing, proven projects that we can establish in Chicago or Cincinnati or in any other city.

Mr. CICCO. As a result we have a number of fragmented programs that are being eaten up as far as I am concerned to a great extent by administration.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Thank you very much.

Mr. ERLNBORN. Let me say first to Dr. Swanson, I appreciated your statement very much. I think it was very much to the point. It may have touched some sore spots with those who disagree with your conclusion about categorical aid and general aid but I think the essence of your testimony was attested to by the immediate and strong response we got from the other side of the aisle here today but I did appreciate your statement and many of your conclusions.

With that I will yield my time to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIN. I have just one question that is bothering me. On page 4 of your statement you said:

There is a large trained, able, and willing body of educators which has not been tapped. I am speaking of more than 177,000 private elementary and secondary school teachers who could be available at least on a part-time basis, and in many cases on a full-time basis, to staff ESEA programs.

I would expect they are pretty busy now. How could they be available more than public school teachers are available?

Monsignor DONOHUE. What I meant first of all, was to indicate that there is a corps of teachers under private auspices who certainly would not be available all the time and some who would not be available at all but there is that large corps of teachers and many of them would be available and willing to do work on projects that would be of service to the total educational community.

Mr. CICCO. I would like to add to that. In my experience with the Office there was a general concept throughout the country among many public school administrators that they could not use religious teachers during off time, off time after school, summertime, Saturdays, and what have you.