

that would have otherwise come much more slowly, if at all, without Federal assistance.

This has certainly been true in New York where successful programs have included midcareer development training for State and municipal employees—incidentally with the cooperation of Dean Bailey—a model training program for lay community planning boards, a program for training community service staff people for schools with small or nonexistent extension divisions, and where the possibility of seeking title I grants encouraged many schools to initiate programs for which they did not receive grants.

To avoid embarrassing anyone else, I will cite only an example from my school, where we launched a career information and planning service for women partly because it was a good idea and partly because we had anticipated obtaining a title I grant for it and had put much staff time into its development.

To be sure, the program has a more limited scope and rate of development than if it had been funded under title I, but it has started, and others will start if title I is adequately funded over a period of years. Otherwise community service programs will grow only at the slow pace that characterized them prior to the creation of the title I program.

The program is taking on a new urgency with the enactment and funding of model cities legislation and title VIII of the Housing Act. Efforts are already being made to coordinate what the universities are doing and can do under these three acts. The pitiful inadequacy of the model cities legislation in particular makes it especially important to increase, not decrease, the work that can be accomplished with funds from title I of the Higher Education Act.

Many of us in the universities are anxious to see an expansion of the community service programs that have been given so much stimulus by the relatively small amount of funding under title I. When additional funds become available for domestic problems, we shall certainly urge upon you specialized legislation for educational and training needs of many kinds.

For the present, we urge you most strongly to do as much as you can to make as much available under title I as possible under favorable conditions. These funds are the most versatile, the most flexible support any government has ever provided for education that gets out into the community and directs itself practically to a variety of important social needs.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Dean Smith, for your very useful statement.

All three of you gentlemen represent States with strong leadership in the field of education, which have major urban areas, cities, metropolitan areas in each and where the sensitivity and support for the kind of program represented by title I could be expected to be considerable.

I would ask all of you or any of you to comment on this pair of questions. Where has the matching money in your States come from for title I, and to what extent has that matching money come from the State governments and from the local governments that might be expected to benefit from title I type programs?