

Mr. HOWE. I think we could give you information, Mr. O'Hara, State by State. I don't think we could do this in a breakdown by local school districts. We could give you State-by-State information. I would point out to you a point that Mr. Estes just passed on to me, that the so-called floor provision in the appropriations in fiscal year 1968 assures States of the amount allocated for fiscal year 1967, so that the floor provision would operate in a way to prevent any State's decrease from 1967 to 1968.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Esch.

Mr. ESCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, speaking on behalf of my new colleagues, I echo the sentiment of the challenge of being here and the honor of having you here. Let us stay with title V for a short time.

First of all, you are asking for approximately \$30 million in funds, or that \$29,700,000: is that right? You have authorized \$50 million for title V, but you are asking for \$29,700,000?

Mr. HOWE. We are asking for \$29.7 million for the previously in-being positions in title V and other elements of State administration, and then an additional 15 for this planning exercise.

Mr. ESCH. The planning exercise and you use the phrase "exercise," the planning exercise would reflect and go to State educational planning agencies, at least, a portion of it. However, what portion would go to the State agencies, what portion would go to metropolitan areas or other agencies?

The emphasis in title V seems to be to strengthen State agencies. Is that the concept of title V?

Secretary GARDNER. I believe 75 percent of it would go directly to the States and there would be a 25 percent set aside for projects that could go directly to cities or to other instrumentalities concerned with planning.

Mr. ESCH. In effect, Mr. Secretary, what you are saying, if I understand it correctly, is that three-fourths of your effort will be toward improving and developing and encouraging State agencies, one-fourth of your effort will be toward discouraging State agencies through direct grants locally and through regional planning?

Secretary GARDNER. Well, I don't believe that any more than I think you believe it, really. The quarter that will not go directly to the States will still be directed at problems with which the States will be deeply concerned. Our tradition in this country has always been one of having a lot of people in the act, and there are a lot of people in the States who want to be in the act, and we who have a long tradition of being in the act. It would be wrong to assume that 25 percent set aside is in any way to discourage the States. It can be spent in ways which will vastly simplify their task in educational planning.

Mr. ESCH. Might we assume that this proportion reflects the uncertainty of your group toward which direction we should take, whether it should be strengthening State agencies as opposed to direct Federal local relationship or regional planning? Does this separation reflect, as you indicated earlier, you "don't know where we are going to come out"? That we are in a period of transition and you would not like to give any direction at this particular time. Am I assuming that this is correct?

Secretary GARDNER. The situation is that we see objectives which are not mutually exclusive, need not be considered so. We can go both