

We have had difficulty in our State as well, but our real test is between the local school districts and the State board of education, or the State education office, rather, on title I. That is where the friction has been.

Chairman PERKINS. The gentlelady from Oregon.

Mr. DAILARD. May I comment?

Mrs. GREEN. Let me just make it clear, I think the gentleman from Michigan did not understand me. I said that the law prescribes that you cannot do things under title I funds that you have been doing before. The programs must be above and beyond present programs. The district to which I referred a moment ago had been carrying on a particular program, very inadequately, due to limited finances. They were precluded from using Federal funds, because we had written that provision in the law, while the adjoining district could do it. This particular example was not about a State plan being turned down. It was a Federal restriction.

Mr. FORD. I am sorry. I misunderstood. I understood you to state before that they made application, and their application was rejected because—

Mrs. GREEN. I did not say that.

Mr. FORD. I am sorry.

Chairman PERKINS. The gentleman from San Diego.

Mr. DAILARD. May I comment on several points that have been under discussion here, and express an opinion?

We did have in California what might be regarded as a pilot program for compensatory education. In fact, if you look to the hearings held before the passage of 89-10, you will find a presentation, that happens to use the same picture that I used on the face of this today, of the three children, reporting on what could be done.

We were not precluded from the program. We could not replace those funds that we had had in the title program, but we were not precluded from extending that to all the rest of the area, and adding this above.

Since the enactment of this, there was an additional program aimed at the target areas. We referred to it as the Watts bill, for fairly obvious reasons, but it has made money, in which you have State funds available which we can use for prekindergarten programs, or housing, for class size reductions, within the target area. That is point No. 1.

The second point, I don't believe I could give you the firm assurance of being permitted from public pressure to continue the use of the funds if this were suddenly shifted to general aid. I would become aware within just a couple of weeks of requests from some of the most favored areas of our community to add certain kinds of services there, using the argument that this is what you are doing in the southeast areas, which happens to be our area, and I am sure those pressures would mount to spread this to get the reduced class size.

We have a class size in our target area now of seven pupils per teacher below the city average. The other areas would ask for that, so it is my feeling, so far as we are concerned, if there were any sudden turnover from this, we would not be permitted within the city to use them in the same way.