

terms of metropolitan versus urban communities, if it would not work to the disadvantage of innovative progress for the types of boys and girls that are supposed to be helped by the approach.

Mr. ROSE. I would like to make another statement about title III. The only experience that I have was that the State department approve the title III program for the school which I administer and the U.S. Office disapprove it and the State department didn't give us any leadership or guidance in what was wrong with our project when we submitted it but gave us tacit approval and this is a matter of record with no criticism, we will say of how we should have better opposed it.

We have reopposed it this year and we have not had an answer on whether our project would be acceptable or whether it would not be.

Mr. MEEDS. Would the gentleman from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. STEIGER. I certainly will.

Mr. MEEDS. If we went ahead under this title V in section 5(b) and somehow changed this so that State educational agencies such as we would define them in the bill rather than the Governor or someone were to enter into a comprehensive plan for education in the State, they would necessarily then have to work with local school districts and large urban centers in drawing this plan up.

Would this not put them in a more knowledgeable position and couldn't we then look perhaps toward a little more control or a little more say from the State departments of education than we might be justified in looking to them for now in some instances, not all, in fact, but very few.

Mr. SIMMONS. My reaction to that, Mr. Meeds, is this. I would hope that you always have some title in this very fine Elementary and Secondary Act that we are certainly enjoying in metropolitan areas in Michigan, that you always have a chance for innovation that does not necessarily fit a State plan because, indeed, my experience during the last 25 years is it is sometimes the compromises that are worked out in terms of developing a state-wide plan which do not always permit the kind of innovation that you people try to do in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The only thing I am suggesting is that first of all I don't think this should be in the hands of the Governor or anyone else. I think secondly there ought to be some kind of an opportunity even where you have a well-organized State department that this is not just a nice comfortable State plan and some school districts become innovated they will have some redress to the act that you have written.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me say we have eight distinguished members of this panel and we have Mr. Lillywhite, and I would like to know if the panel has any comments in connection with Commissioner Howe's testimony when he referred to some prospective amendments to section 14 of Public Law 815 and I certainly would like to have Mr. Lillywhite document for the record just what those amendments involve and how they change the present law.

Go ahead, Mr. Lillywhite on the amendments that are before the committee.

Mr. LILLYWHITE. Do you want a description only of the amendments to section 14 or do you want anything said about the other amendments referred to in the Commissioner's testimony.