

You are right in a sense, but when you look at the exciting projects that have come in, the 1,000 projects, of those 100 or 200 are startling in their creativity, scope and organization, so it seems to me we have enough good out of this whole kettle to say that the pot is somewhat beginning to simmer. It is not boiling yet and I think it would be too early to ask it to boil after just one year.

Mr. QUIE. What do you envision in the future? You talk about fiscal year 1972 as \$2.2 billion. That is a substantial increase over present funds. I imagine you envision something much greater, even more varied than we have right now.

Should we expand further than is being contemplated?

Mr. MILLER. The two basic projects, supplementary centers and the projects, both have to be expanded, I think, considerably. Actually, the funding has been a problem in terms of just the number of projects to be approved. I think they should be expanded dramatically. It is succeeding, in our opinion, in terms of the people who have studied it, and certainly it is adding something, an element in most schools that has not been there.

I think if you go out into many of the States and talk to the title III people, you will see what we found. These are interesting projects.

The important thing is the people involved. I think when you really get down to it, we capture some people by the excitement of the idea.

Therefore, if III goes into the area of needs without being innovative, we are really moving in a troublesome direction, in my opinion. We need to keep creativity and innovation, and the process of change pretty foremost in these projects.

But they are far from perfect. In no way would we want to say that there haven't been some bad projects, there haven't been some political aspects there. But when you take the whole kettle, I think it is pretty good.

If you focus on one aspect in terms of the bad projects, you are going to get one picture. We tried to look at the total as best we could.

Mr. QUIE. You put a great deal of emphasis on creativity of the individual on the local school district, and if we are actually to do a job we have to harness them. I share your feelings in that.

But I also get the impression, and perhaps you could tell me if I get the right impression, that you don't feel the same way about the State departments of education, or the possibilities. A number of colleagues seem to share that view, that there isn't much possibility of creativity in the State departments of education to accomplish this so you need the Federal relationship directly with the local school district and there the creativity of the individual with the whole system can be seen.

Mr. MILLER. The suggestion that 4 percent be allocated to State departments is in recognition of the importance of strengthening State departments. There is quite a lengthy section in this State-Federal relationship. I think the important thing is that the partnership be strengthened considerably.

So, in a sense, 4 percent would allow them to do some things in terms of personnel, some of their own research, studies, conferences, things