

Mr. ESCH. One other question in the area of planning. You suggest on page 19 of your testimony the problem of statewide planning, suggesting they cannot afford to plan and yet they cannot afford not to.

There has been, I believe, a growing feeling that States and, to some degree, local districts lack long-range planning. Has this problem in recent years been the result of lack of statewide planning or lack of Federal planning?

Mr. HOWE. Possibly both in a way, although certainly the Federal Government should not plan for the States. Certainly the responsibility for the planning and the operation of education is a State function.

I happen to think that State educational agencies have typically been starved by the States, with the levels of salary in them, the levels of support personnel of all kinds, specialists and so on.

They have not been what they should be. I realize this is a generalization that will not apply absolutely everywhere, and that there are few States that have done a good job. But across the board, it is a pretty good generalization.

Therefore, it seems to me useful for the Federal Government to come in and say, "If you want to do it," and that is what this amendment says, "We will pick up a part of the cost of your planning activities," thereby getting for that State, if it wishes to have it, the benefits of a long-range planning capacity.

Mr. ESCH. We recognize the factor of need for predictability in planning. To what degree is the inconsistency in the Federal programs in terms of funding brought into this picture?

Mr. HOWE. By inconsistency, do you mean the calendar inconsistency?

Mr. ESCH. Both calendar inconsistency and internally, in the Federal-State-local relationships.

Mr. HOWE. Certainly the calendar inefficiency in the Federal program, which is really related to the appropriations committees of the Congress, makes a real problem in what I would call short-range planning for States.

It doesn't address itself to the long-range planning issue at all.

I think we have a job to do in the Federal Government in bringing Federal-State-local relationships into alinement by planning at the Federal level more effectively than we have some of our educational activities.

Mr. ESCH. But you suggested, Mr. Commissioner, you thought planning should be done at the State level earlier.

Mr. HOWE. Yes, but I am speaking of the programs for which we are responsible at the Federal level. It seems to me that the operations related to education that exist now in several agencies of the Government need to be looked at together by the Federal Government.

Let's take, for example, student support programs of all kinds, grants, loans, fellowships, of a bewildering variety of kinds.

They are supported in the Federal Government by different agencies. I think some common policies, if they ran through here, might be of help to the world of higher education.

This kind of coordination isn't any effort to control education, but it is an effort to confront education with some consistent expectations.