

there be advantage to changing the legislation to give the States in certain instances, at least, or in some areas, at least, greater discretion as to how to expend these funds?

Do I not understand that title I is to be fragmentized so that there would not be complete control within any State department anyway? They could, within the guidelines set by the Federal legislation, say you could use so much money in this particular field and distribute it, if you handle the problem correctly of having started with the local and coming to the State for approval; you can reject all applications other than from this geographical area; or reject applications from all other areas other than area X. Still there is fragmentation, is there not?

Mr. HOWE. There is fragmentation in the sense that there is an effort here to meet what local school districts think they need in their districts. I assume in Oregon there are probably local school districts that may have certain problems. They may have Indian populations. They may have some migrant workers. They may have concentrations of unemployed people with various kinds of problems that represent concentrations of poverty.

I would assume you would want those districts to fit their use of these funds to the particular needs they have. In one case it might be learning English. In another case it might be something to do with vocational counseling at the high school level.

I would seriously doubt whether there is any single very narrow level of expenditure that will serve all the deprived students within a State as effectively as a diversified enterprise would. But that would be up the State, and it is the State's business.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Do you mean if the fragmentation, under the law, is not particularly great, there is a high degree of flexibility within the State as to how it will move back and forth between areas of concentration?

I must confess I will have to go back into the breakdown of title I funds to find out where the lines are in truth drawn on this.

Mr. HOWE. The State has very considerable discretion in approving local projects, very considerable.

Mr. ESTES. These are projects that are submitted to the State by the local or county school district. I would add here that title II of the Elementary and Secondary Act, the State does have this discretion. They are charged with the responsibility of establishing criteria based on relative need in the distribution of title II funds.

Mr. DELLENBACK. What about amendment of title I to permit the same type of discretion by a State department?

Mr. ESTES. Let me add that we find as a general rule across the Nation that there is geographical distribution of title I funds. The States are using these. There are very few districts within a State that do not receive funds based on the fact that our need is so great for instructional materials, teaching materials, library books, supplies, that all have a real need for this kind of service.

I think the same might be true for title I. There are very few districts that do not have the need in some area for improving the quality of instruction for disadvantaged children.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Let me ask one more question and I will quit, Mr. Chairman.