

at the State level and the elimination of title III-B supervisory and related programs for NDEA. These important programs are under consideration for transfer to title V of ESEA. If this legislation is enacted, the State departments of education may need to reduce drastically their advisory personnel which could result in internal confusion and possible elimination of expanding worthy, and successful programs. It is apparent that these legislative proposals were not discussed with State department of education administrative personnel. Accordingly, we urge that this problem be brought to the attention of the Members of Congress and urge them to support the existing program and its full appropriation for the 1968 fiscal year and consider these suggested amendments in 1969 with a phasing-out period.

A. G. BREIDENSTINE,

*Deputy Superintendent, Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction.*

Mr. QUIE. Are you familiar with this objection?

Mr. HOWE. Yes.

Mr. QUIE. What would the answer be?

Mr. HOWE. Let me say a word and let Mr. Estes comment further on it. First of all, we have reduced—and I was not aware it was 41 percent but that is approximately correct, I am sure—the request in 1968 budget for equipment funds under title III. It goes along with the general policy in 1968 budget of investing more heavily in personal services, additional teachers, and additional, or direct opportunities for schools outside of the equipment and building routes. They are being cut in both of those items in the 1968 budget.

We would continue to support the budget arrangement we have set up as really of more direct and immediate assistance to the schools and the expansion of our budget; the total budget in 1968 reflects this philosophy.

In regard to the transfer of the supervisory positions to title V, it seemed to us that was very directly an effort to do exactly what title V is about—to build the strength of State departments of education in a particular regard; and although in doing so we do drop the matching feature and the required matching feature, it seems to us that these departments which have been in the habit of matching these funds will continue to match them as they have them under title V if they are interested in having the service.

So it seems to us a useful consolidation. Perhaps Mr. Estes would like to comment on it further.

Mr. ESTES. I have two points. As you know, about 21 percent of our title I funds this last year went for equipment and facilities. This year it appears as though about 16 percent will go into equipment and facilities. Therefore, the total impact of this is not as great as it would appear in the telegram.

Local school districts will have available to them through the various programs we administer funds for equipment and facilities.

Secondly, we have talked with the State department of education people and we have talked to them in Harrisburg and in title V of the Elementary and Secondary Act we are spending throughout the States about 20 percent of our money to assist them in strengthening their leadership ability in these various areas. This same kind of service is available under title III of NDEA.

We think it makes more sense to give the States a control of these funds and let them assess their needs and assign priorities accordingly so they can coordinate the use of these funds rather than segment and fragment in one.