

bility in the signoff sense where the Commissioner now has a signoff to the State signoff, that is the State final decision on the giving of the grant.

It seems to me also there is a very good argument for maintaining some of the title III type activity in the Office of Education. And that if and when we come to a move on this I would certainly speak in favor of having a percentage set aside of title III kept in the hands of the Commissioner for project grants of an innovative type encouraged from the Office of Education while at the same time transferring a major percentage to final State authority.

Of course, the transfer of a major percentage to final State authority will also involve the Commissioner at that time developing certain guidelines, if you will, for the States to use in exercising that authority.

We would want those guidelines to reflect primarily the idea that title III type grants should not be divided up among the State's school districts but should be focused in such a way that they represent good bets on significant supplementary activities within a State, hopefully of an innovative kind.

Mr. FORD. This matter has been raised most forcibly as a result of the testimony of Mr. Fuller and other members of the panel yesterday speaking as State school administrators and Mr. Fuller as executive director of their organization. In 1965 he raised exactly the same suggestion on behalf of his organization.

The superintendent of public instruction from the State of Michigan, then Dr. Lynn Bartlett, appeared before the committee following Mr. Fuller's testimony and disassociated himself from that position of the association. He felt that in his own experience of some several years standing in our own State of Michigan his office was neither equipped nor likely to be equipped in the near future to stand as intermediary between our State colleges and universities and others who are showing interest in this program, and the people down here, the Commissioner, who would be examining the applications and approving the grants.

I have some feeling that if there was any strong suggestion that we might be changing the thrust that the committee took or followed at that time, we might say that the committee was aware of this expression of concern on the part of the State school officers when we went ahead and wrote the bill as we did.

I feel if there was a genuine concern that we might now be contemplating a change in the title III and title IV applications of handling so that they had to be approved or were subject to a State veto we could fill this committee room in a couple of days with people around the country who would be far more upset than Mr. Fuller was yesterday.

Mr. HOWE. From our point of view we are discussing it but we are proposing no action. I will tell you we seriously considered such a proposal and decided not to make it. It would be against the recommendation of our advisory committee in title III. We can reveal that this was not the time to make such a move.

Mr. FORD. I will take that one chance to agree with you. This is the first time I have been up here. I would like to be very clear in the form of the question so that I understand what you contemplate as the method of distributing funds.