

As you know, we require the States to look at them, but do not provide a veto. Have there been substantial complaints that there is no State veto over title III projects?

Mr. HOWE. There are two or three points here.

One, there are some State officials who feel that there should be such.

Two, there is a very high correlation between State approvals and our approvals in the realm of 95 percent, so that we are acting in common with the States.

Three, we are developing with a growing number of States a plan for operation of title III on an informal, voluntary basis which, in effect, puts our planning and their planning on the same track and brings the coincidence of agreement about what title III projects shall be funded.

I think we are developing through operations rather than through legislation, some of the things that States would like to see legislated.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman—

Chairman PERKINS. Let Mr. Reid ask a question and then Mr. Carey has a couple of questions. Then I will call on you, Mr. Scheuer.

Mr. REID. I have one additional question of the Commissioner, if I may.

It is my understanding that the fiscal year 1968 formula will involve half the national average or half of the State average, whichever is highest.

My query is this: What steps are you planning to take to prorate these funds? In the case of Mississippi versus New York, for example, half of New York State's average would be something on the order of \$394 million and Mississippi, we will say, is now \$121 million and might go to \$263 million.

Does this not mean that proportionately New York would receive less, and does not this mean that proportionately the cities would receive less, unless you substantially increase the fund?

Mr. HOWE. Let me ask Mr. Estes to comment.

Mr. ESTES. That is a very technical question, as you well know. We met with about 200 representatives from State departments of education in the Southeast in Atlanta yesterday. These were the kinds of questions they were asking.

If I might, I would like to ask Jack Hughes, who is the Director of this program, who has a handle on these kinds of figures, if he might react to that.

Mr. HUGHES. I can give you the comparable amounts, Mr. Reid, between the New York State allowances for fiscal 1967, our estimate for fiscal 1968, and the comparable figures for Mississippi. These will be total dollars.

The amount for New York in fiscal year 1967 is \$114,811,000. The estimate for fiscal 1968, based on the appropriation request, is \$115,150,000.

The amount for Mississippi this year is \$23,656,000, and for next year the amount would be \$40,591,000.

Mr. HOWE. I would say, Mr. Reid, the answer to your question is "Yes."

Mr. REID. My only followup, Mr. Commissioner, is if New York is not proportionately to receive less and if we have to do something more