

I have been interested in the testimony and I wonder if I could adjust a little bit about how we see title I for example, from our regional office. I believe I am speaking for all of us when I say that our position or mission in this region is to serve the States and the local school districts and to represent them in Washington. It is to assist making their views known, so that they can be considered in the development of policy. Furthermore, we bring back the policies and so forth from Washington and explain their purpose and help the States and through them, the local schools.

This would be the broad statement.

Specifically on title I, I have made a number of talks in this region and the adjacent one working out of Kansas City, in which I have taken certain liberties with the congressional intent as given in the policy of Congress for title I. I have done this to help to explain to our consumers what we believe is the intent of Congress. In the intent of Congress they mention that the moneys in title I are to be used to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children in areas of economic deprivation.

I have taken the liberty in this way: I have stated it as "to meet the greatest educational needs of the most educationally deprived children in the areas of highest economic deprivation." In other words, I believe this is the intent of Congress; I believe this was very helpful to States and locales in focusing on the children that are really under consideration. The States and locales have had various reservations, as have been mentioned here.

I would like to follow up just a little bit on one of them, wherein it was said that they felt the schools were not equipped and should not be equipped to determine economic deprivation. Education, yes; economic, no.

Very recently in attempting to represent these consumers, constituents of ours, to the U.S. Office I wrote a memo in which I pointed out that the Welfare Administration nationally is furnishing data so that we can administer the initial allocation to counties throughout the country.

It would be helpful if Welfare, in securing these data would do just one thing more—and we have found that generally in States they can do this—if they would, in making their surveys, find out the school district and they tell us that these data then fed through the U.S. Office, through the States back so that they can be used for subcounty allocations would furnish two things which would be very helpful.

One, it would provide a basis with ADC figures for the determination of subcounty allocations. This is money to the specific school districts. It would furnish this, provided the State in its wisdom felt that this followed the intent of Congress and the legislation is there already.

Furthermore, it would provide the local school district with a guide to just which were the areas of highest economic deprivation within that school district. It would provide this by school attendance areas.

Mr. QUIE. Only to the extent of ADC children.

Mr. BROWN. In this relation, it seems to be the intent of Congress to lean more heavily on that because it is so much more recent.