

of money to be used for what appeared to us to be an extremely high priority task if we wished to strengthen these State educational agencies.

Mrs. MINK. Does not the existing title V already set out the general outlines of what was intended on requiring the State departments, or the State educational agencies to go into the matter of educational planning? Is there not already sufficient guidelines under title V for such plans to be promulgated but depending upon the initiative of the State agencies?

Secretary GARDNER. It is possible under present title V. I would say that relatively few States, with the limited funds at their disposal, have gone into planning on a scale that we think would benefit them very much, and that many of them think, too.

Mrs. MINK. Borrowing from your comment regarding limited funds available under title V, would you not say that one of the major reasons the States have not gone into the program planning and development idea was the lack of funds and would not the full implementation of title V as envisioned by this committee in the \$50 million program enable the State educational agencies to assume this responsibility without setting aside another agency for the specific purposes of planning?

Mr. HOWE. Mrs. Mink, I think your observation is, in part, true. At the same time I think funds for planning when they are placed in competition with funds for administration, no matter what the level of funding, are very likely to lose out in the tough decision States have to make a decision as to whether they are going to do something that demands a service right now, the administrative function of the State versus the longer range payoff that comes with planning. Therefore, it seemed wise to us to try to sequester a portion of these funds for that very important purpose which is likely to get shortchanged.

Mrs. MINK. Could you not accomplish the same purpose—and I quite agree with you that planning is an essential component for strengthening the departments—could you not accomplish the same goal by simply apportioning the \$50 million fund that we authorized under the existing provisions of title V and require that a certain percentage of these funds heretofore authorized must be used for planning purposes, and still leave the responsibility in the State educational agency and not call for the development of another agency that has no administrative responsibility in the State?

Mr. HOWE. I think here we are not really calling for the delineation of an additional agency. As I said in earlier testimony, it is our hope that existing planning agencies and, in fact, the existing responsible board in elementary and secondary education will pick up these functions and use these funds to get critical staff for the special purpose of planning.

But I do believe that there is less likelihood of getting that accomplished unless we make it a specialized and identified function as we are suggesting here.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Steiger.

Mr. STEIGER. Mr. Secretary, if I may touch briefly on the Teacher Corps, would you agree that one of the difficulties that we have in teacher education is that most teacher education students who have