

Our relationships happen to be good. I think that is important in the educational system, that the State and city relationships be good. I cannot speak for other States.

Chairman PERKINS. I would like to hear all of you address yourselves to this particular point. It is very much in controversy within the committee.

Mr. WHITTIER. I would like to comment on that point, if I might.

I think one of the concerns that we all have, as we move to a broader base, and I think this must be studied and plans must be moved in this direction, is that we also have to involve the other school districts and areas in our States.

I can't help but feel it would strengthen this relationship ultimately for the State to play a key part in it. I think that the issue is not at which point it is going to be done in terms of funding but, rather, that we do it in a way that will bring about maximum cooperation of the various segments in the area.

I think that this can be done more effectively, probably, through the State relationship than otherwise. I think one of the problems that some of the great cities, at least in our case, have suffered at the State level is the feeling that it is not part of the total State. We would like to feel that we are a part of the total commonwealth of the State.

I think to tie this into a meaningful total relationship in the long run would be more healthy than it would be to pull it out.

Mr. VINCENT. I think my viewpoint would be very much the same. In our particular State we would be in favor of an increasing role on the part of the State department of public instruction.

Mr. OHRENBARGER. The relationship in Boston with the State board of education has presented no difficulty in the preparing of these particular titles, and I don't foresee any difficulty in the future. I would go along with greater State participation.

Mr. DAILARD. Our relationship in California has been good. We would favor the appropriation planning going through the State education department. We have had problems under title III where there has been a direct district relationship, a relationship between each district and the Office of Education of the United States.

I can illustrate the adequacy of our relationship in California. The State board of education farmed out to our particular school district a part of the title VI funds to do research for the improvement of the State department of education. I think this is indicative of the sound and wholesome relationship.

Mr. FORD. Would the chairman yield for a question?

Chairman PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. FORD. Yesterday we had testimony from the Commissioner of Education and from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to the effect that their interpretation of title VB would be that the Governors of the respective States would designate the board or commission that we are talking about, and it might not necessarily be the State educational agency or superintendent of public instruction, or State school board, whatever it is called, that he designates.

They said they presumed he generally would. How would you, as city superintendents, feel if the pattern became the appointment of an independent agency outside of the normal State agency?