

Mr. DAILARD. The Federal programs in these areas have given us the opportunities to accelerate somewhat in keeping with the growth of the problem. If we did not have the funds, we could not move nearly as fast.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Hathaway.

Mr. HATHAWAY. I would like to elaborate a little on Mrs. Green's questions as to the panel.

Dr. Donovan, on page 4 of your statement you express the sentiments shared probably by a majority of the school superintendents in other States of let's stop this categorical aid in the next year or the year after and just give you the money because you know what to do with it.

It seems to me that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has more than just given money to the various States. It has stimulated innovations in education. I would think that we need continued stimulation and innovation in education, and we won't have to drop categorical aid next year or the year after or ever.

I would like to have you and other members of the panel explain why we should drop categorical aid in the near future and go to general aid programs.

Mr. DONOVAN. I think in the rest of the statement you might find the sentence that I think general aid is the basic aid that should be given. But I recognize the desirability of Congress stimulating the school districts now, and then, in certain directions, and therefore, the basic general aid is needed and certain categorical aid might be put on top of that.

For example, title III. That is strictly innovative. Then it is not for anything else. There is not anything there very innovative about title I. We are pouring title I into programs that may have something innovative in them, but they are essentially getting at the hard core that we knew existed and did not have the funds to deal with.

Now we have the funds. So there is nothing wrong with general aid for the general conduct of a program, supplemented by occasional specific categorical aid. I think I made that statement before. You do stimulate some innovative approaches. But I must also say that innovation was not yet created by a congressional act.

There must be some credit given for the fact that innovation has always proceeded even on a local level. Only now, with additional money, you are able to carry out some things you could not carry out before.

I don't think title I is strictly an innovative provision.

Title III is strictly innovative. Title I is an approach to disadvantaged children, and it was the hope that new approaches would be made.

Mr. HATHAWAY. As a result of title I money, many new ideas have come into play. Maybe that is not true in urban areas as much as in rural areas.

Mr. OHRENBERGER. In our title I proposal, we did not feel that we could absorb all the funds for the disadvantaged. For example, in Boston, our enrichment program, I would say, which takes the bulk of the title I money is now in 16 districts. We feel they should be released to additional districts that should have it.

But we did have to weigh effectively what our enrichment program should be 2, 3, 4, or 5 years from now. That is why we established