

Mr. BRADEMAs. Will you yield? I apologize first of all for having been late, but I just got off of an airplane from Indiana. My colleague from Minnesota, Mr. Quie, and I worked together very hard in 1963 to try to diminish some of the very rigid categories in the Vocational Education Act, which, in effect, made it difficult to respond to the needs of the changing, more urbanized economy.

Is it fair to suggest that what you are observing right now is analogous to that problem? You are not asking us to decrease or do away with the support you give to English or mathematics or other categories, just as in 1963 we were not trying to do in farm occupations or farm-related occupations, but rather to open the door to important new subjects? That is a rhetorical question, but I asked it in order to try to understand what you are proposing.

Mr. HOWE. I think this is a fair statement of our purposes. I think the same line of thought runs through a number of suggestions we are making here. In the equipment and remodeling titles of both NDEA and Higher Education Act we are suggesting that categories be removed.

Mr. BRADEMAs. If my colleague will yield for a further question which is not related to the particular matter under discussion but to a general concept that runs through both NDEA categories and vocational education. It also touches upon your proposed Educational Professions Development Act.

As I understand it, you want to do away with patchwork, to use your word, of existing authority in the field of teacher training, just as you want to do away with the patchwork in the NDEA categories. But I am not quite so persuaded in the field of teacher training as I am by your argument on vocational education. I am open minded, but I will make a rhetorical attack and ask you to respond. Would it be unfair to argue that what you are really doing is sending up a kind of smokescreen here for the fact that you have not put up much money for existing teacher education programs? I think you now have \$15 million for the experienced and prospective teacher fellowship programs. I am not sure of what you are recommending for the coming year, but if we are concerned about teacher education programs and bringing more people into teaching, shouldn't more funds be the first order of priority? Then we can talk about resolving the patchwork problem.

Mr. HOWE. Let me say a couple of things about amounts of money. First of all, for all training authority in the Office of Education, and there is quite a mix or patchwork of authorities, we had in fiscal 1967, in appropriations, a total of \$323 million.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I am addressing myself to authority that is aimed at providing training for people planning to pursue careers in elementary and secondary education.

Mr. HOWE. Well, I can't pick that out from these figures as they are.

Mrs. GREEN. If the gentleman will yield. On those authorized funds, \$275 million for 1968, if my figures are correct you are asking for only 12 percent, or \$35 million, and the additional \$240 million available in authorized funds you are not requesting.

Mr. HOWE. Yes, we have slowly built this program up: We started at a lower level than the authorization by a good deal, as you suggest,