

Mr. LUMLEY. Obviously the answer is that you could not do anything that can't be identified. The law required the Office of Economic Opportunity or the Headstart program to be coordinating with the Office of Education so that these programs would be coordinated and information would be available.

If it is not, then it has fallen down somewhere along the line.

Mr. ERLBORN. I don't know if it is a matter of weakness in the law or the execution.

Mr. LUMLEY. I don't know either.

Mr. ERLBORN. I am given to understand that this information is not made available to the local school districts or the State superintendent as to which children participated in Headstart and which did not.

In another area I notice that you are not happy with the idea of decentralization of the Office of Education.

As I read this in your statement you would rather not have this carried on to its full implementation. If the local regional office of the Office of Education were given the power to make final decisions rather than be just another administrative layer between the school districts and the State departments and the Office of Education, would you still feel the same way?

Mr. LUMLEY. Yes, because title I projects are now approved by the State departments. You see, philosophically what we are saying is that we want to strengthen State departments of education and we believe that if the Office of Education is dealing directly they are only dealing with 50 State departments.

To set up nine regional offices, even though you give the regional office the power of decisionmaking, it is our contention that you develop an inflexible system because of the fact that the first year region A may do something and region B do something just slightly different under the same rules and regulations.

Therefore, the rules and regulations have to be tightened so that everybody makes the same decision. The result is that moving the decision from the Office of Education out here to regional offices will not continue innovations.

In other words, because the thing works in California does not mean it is going to work in Illinois. This is our contention. But we do say that the State department of education in Illinois has knowledge of Illinois and they will make decisions on this basis.

It is not going to help Illinois because the regional office is—I assume will be—in Chicago. Maybe Illinois is not a good illustration because you will be too close to it.

Take Michigan, it is not going to help Michigan any to have a regional office in Chicago. They might as well come to Washington is the point I am trying to make. It is our belief that the 50 States are responsible for the educational programs. The Federal Government is a partner. But the Federal Government should be the partner through the 50 States, not by setting up another layer here or not by going directly from Washington to the school district.

Mr. ERLBORN. To paraphrase what you say, the difficulties that the Office of Education now has in administering these categorical aid programs is that they are not structured to go through the State departments of education.