The whole plan here relates directly to the States, not to the local school districts. The concerns that have been expressed about this regional move have been concerns which I would agree with, if we were going to do the things that worry those concerned.

The concerns have been that we might move now into regional offices and then bypass the States, and deal directly with local school districts. We have set up a system of organization which prevents that, which brings the State into the picture at every point where we have a dealing over matters involving a local school district, and passes us through the States for these purposes.

I think that part of this picture that does not get talked about enough is the fact that we have many relationships to individual institutions, is higher education particularly. In all of our student support programs—loans, grants, scholarships—we have direct institutional relationships.

When conducted from Washington, on a back-and-forth basis, we don't get the kind of personal element into these that we can get by having a staff in the regional office which calls directly on the institution in the region more frequently than it can if that staff is located here centrally, so I believe that there are real possibilities for better administration and better services through this regional enterprise. I have been somewhat concerned that it has come up as much of an issue as it has, and it is for that reason that I am holding a meeting this week with the organizations and representatives of the organization which have been expressing criticism of the regional plan of the office, in an effort to get across to them in greater detail what we plan to do in dealing with the States and how we plan to avoid the problems that would come up if we dealt directly with local school districts.

I did not mean to deliver a real lecture on this subject, but now that I have, I am glad I did. [Laughter.]

Mrs. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I don't want to take any more time. I will close this conversation, except, ask the Secretary and the Commissioner, what other comments they might make.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Quie?

Mr. QUIE. Thank you. I would like to follow up, Mr. Secretary—and Commissioner Howe, you might want to answer this, too—on the method of financing title I under the new formula. As you well know, we increased the benchmark for poor families from $2,000 to $3,000, and even more significant to the poor States, we increased—changed the formula—so that they can utilize the national average, rather than their own State average of expenditures on education. So using last year's figures, this would mean in Mississippi, the poor State would be moved from $121, if I recall correctly, to about $263. It would mean for the chairman's State of Kentucky, something like $155 to $263.

Now if you utilized that new formula, I would expect, with an appropriation of only $1,200 million, compared to an authorization of $2,441 million, you would have something like 49-percent funding of the program.

But you indicated this morning, Mr. Secretary, that you would utilize the same language that the Appropriations Committee put into