

cases, the programs will undoubtedly be carried on in the school normally attended by those educationally deprived children, but not necessarily so.

One of the prime examples was the Greater Cleveland school system which was building a center which we used as a model not only for broadening the original proposal in title I, but also title III that was written into the 1965 act. A number of programs are contemplated where children will be bused from all over Greater Cleveland to a central science laboratory.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. Chairman, this might clarify it a bit as to confusion so far as the State is concerned. Might I read from a draft copy of an audit report of the Chicago funds under title I? We had our conference last Friday with them and challenged this as you have challenged it. They have challenged the wisdom and the right of Chicago to use these funds and I read from their report:

The schools were neither ranked as to the degree of concentration of poverty, nor identified to the projects comprising the two programs.

Therefore, they said Chicago did not have the right to locate these projects as they did unless they located them in the highest priority of high concentration on down the line.

Mr. FORD. I have to respectfully disagree with you. We are more than passively acquainted with the Chicago situation on this committee.

Mr. PAGE. So am I.

Mr. FORD. Because when it came up last year we had a very serious complaint. I think most of the committee agreed that Chicago may have, on the basis of testimony we had last year, gone a little too far in the direction of turning this into general aid to the Chicago school system. There was some difficulty on the part of some groups to trace the effect of this Federal money into programs that were targeted for identifiably educationally deprived children.

You picked perhaps the only city in the country, as a matter of fact the only one in the country I can remember, where this charge has been made. On examination we find that in administering the program for the second year they were more careful in using these funds for a specific program and met the criteria that were set up.

Here we have a situation where the city perhaps stretched in one direction further than we wanted them to go. I want to caution you that Mr. Goodell is probably more opposed to Federal control and Federal aid to education than anybody on this committee. If you agree too quickly with him—

Mr. GOODELL. That is a high compliment of a kind that comes to me very seldom from the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. If you agree too quickly with him you are liable to find legislative history on this bill that will do more to put Federal strings on this money.

Mr. GOODELL. The way the law is written and the way the regulations are written and the guidelines they specifically require it to be in areas of concentration of poor families. I will listen as long as you want as to what you say the law should say, and maybe what we said in the off-the-record discussion it would mean, but the regulations are pretty specific on this point.