

that there was a possibility that title I would not be funded for fiscal year 1967 in which case a legislative appropriation by the State legislature would find no funds with which to match.

This was, I am sure, a part of the reason why our efforts to secure State matching funds at that time was not successful.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Almost thou persuadest me, but not really. I am very dubious, in all candor, about that kind of an explanation. I think what we are really saying here is that the State politicians don't want to vote the money but want the Federal politicians to vote the money.

Mr. SMITH. I think that clearly does enter into it. I think that State legislators as well perhaps as Federal ones are not quite sure just what can be accomplished in terms of what are the purposes of title I and are in part waiting to have this proved to them. I think that is one reason for hoping that the situation may change in State legislatures.

Mr. BRADEMAs. That ought to be your job, though, ought it not?

Mr. SMITH. Indeed. I am not saying that that is your job. I am just explaining that I do think that we have more chance of persuading our own legislatures each year than we had the year before that this sort of thing should be done.

Dr. THOMPSON. And the legislature, at least in Minnesota, has not been totally reluctant to appropriate funds this way. Historically over a long period of time they have done this in terms of cooperative extension. They have in the past legislature appropriated matching funds for use in support of the Technical Services Act, and they have provided funds to establish an office to make possible some of the things under title VIII of the Housing Act.

So it is not without precedent. I think it is in large part the uncertainty that has been attendant upon title I efforts.

Mr. BANOVERTZ. I think an added part of this picture, Mr. Chairman, at least in my own State of Illinois has been the nature of the priorities which the State has currently established for the development of higher education.

As Congressman Erlenborn well knows, the State is now engaged in a massive attempt to develop what we call community colleges or the 2-year junior college institution and a major part of the functions perceived for the junior college are community service and continuing education activities. The funds are going into this channel at the moment and the title I advisory committee in the State is making a great deal of effort to help junior colleges with title I funds develop these specific kinds of programs.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Let me just make one observation before I yield to Mr. Erlenborn.

I am not trying to be combative. I am on your side, as you can judge. I have certainly nothing to boast about because I think my State of Indiana is one of the few in the country—and I see Mr. Robert Pitchell with you who is from my State—I think we are one of the few States that do not participate in title I or the Technical Services Act, so that we have a distance to go.

The only point I was trying to get across is that in both these fields, it seems to me that there has not been nearly enough effective leadership on the part of the university community, but perhaps still more the political leaders in those States. There is a great deal of cry about