

I think the reaction to this is going to, as Dr. Lumley stated, bring home the point that with less than half or about half of the money needed for next year being proposed in the budget will bring this point home even more.

Mr. FORD. My understanding is the final allocation works out to about 73 percent of the authorization last year and what we are now talking about is fully funded which nobody really thinks will happen, is 49 percent of the request from the Office of Education. They are, of course, responding to the pressures of the Budget Bureau in doing this.

One further question on title III. We have had testimony from a number of State school offices and local superintendents from large cities and smaller communities, the tenor of which is they would prefer to have the State office, as you have suggested, have greater say in the movement of title III but generally they would go to the point of letting a State office veto a program they did not feel should be funded.

At the same time, however, they have all, and I say "all," insisted that the local school districts and the State offices are presently co-operating beautifully, that they have heard there are problems but in their State it works fine.

That is not a very persuasive way to convince us that we ought to change the program when everybody tells us they want a change but it is working fine.

One of the things that was raised, however, by a couple of superintendents was the problem of the State office having absolute approval power, whether it is 75 percent or 25 percent or 50 percent you suggest in your testimony here that 75 percent be handled this way. At least one superintendent, I believe from San Diego, Calif., indicated that he felt even though they had marvelous cooperation in their State that once the authority resided in the State office of education, the pressure would then come from all over the State to consider applications on some sort of a formula to equalize the distribution of funds in northern California, southern California, big cities, small cities. We would thus start spreading the money out instead of considering whether individual title III programs were of sufficient size to really demonstrate the validity or lack of validity of any innovative approach to education.

The second point that was raised was the possibility that by giving approval the authority to States would lead to more duplication than when you have a central office that might recognize that there are several programs trying a particular thing in one State and therefore than another State ought to be concentrating on a different sort of approach.

Would you comment on these two points of view with respect actually to the disagreement with your suggestion?

Mr. LUMLEY. A copy of the project goes to the State department where it is reviewed and a recommendation is made but it then goes to the Office of Education where it is reviewed by the staff readers or consultants. A recommendation is made and then a decision made in Washington.

It is our feeling that innovation in California is not necessarily innovation in Alabama. This may be taken care of over here, but