

to which the public is ready to accept change. It could well be that the public, in response to education, is as far ahead of educators as it is ahead of its legislative leaders in the field of government.

All PACE projects are required to list community participation in their proposal, so recommendation No. XXV should be redundant. But that is not the case. The fact that community involvement is required during formative stages of project development has meant that the more fundamental community involvement in education over a period of time and use of title III as a symbol of broader change needed on the local scene has not come about as yet.

Representative Charles Goodell has stated:

Unless we see an educational ferment at the local level . . . all the Federal efforts will be for naught.

And in his 1967 state of the Union address, President Lyndon B. Johnson spoke about relationships in these terms:

Federal energy is essential. But it is not enough. Only a total working partnership among federal, state and local governments can succeed. The test of that partnership will be the concern of each public organization, each private institution and each responsible citizen.

Those are some of the points. In conclusion, I might mention that title III is really an institution of great expectations, based upon what has already been accomplished. Its ability to do good for the future of education is limited only by the vision, courage, and persistence of those in policymaking roles, such as yourselves.

Local schools are ready to go further and faster, and whether they do so will depend upon congressional supports and upon OES leadership. I emphasize the point. All systems are go at the local level. They are ready to go. How fast you go is really, in a sense, up to you.

Thank you very much.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Brademas.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thanks very much to all of the people who have testified. I have several questions. Let me begin, Dr. Miller, by asking you a couple of questions. I have in my hand the document to which you have been referring, "Catalyst for Change."

I raise an issue which has been discussed on title III programs by a number of our colleagues. That is the issue of whether or not the State departments of education should, in addition to the present statutory requirement to engage in review and recommendations of title III projects, have a mandatory statutory veto power over local school district applications under title III.

I notice on page A-150 of this document, in which you discuss the issue of Federal versus State department of education control, you note:

. . . Prophets of doom who predicted dire consequences would flow from what they alleged would be the Commissioner's control of local school systems revealed their fundamental misunderstanding of patterns of power in public education. Their forebodings have not been realized at all, based upon the findings of this study.

Then on page A-156 you say, speaking of the position of a State Title III coordinator: