

million for fiscal 1968 and which we wrote into the bill. Now if I understand correctly you are asking at this particular time for \$44.75 million; is that right?

Secretary GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. MEEDS. Yet you are asking that a portion of this, exactly \$15 million, be apportioned to the planning function or the comprehensive planning. Am I correct in this?

Secretary GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. MEEDS. Would it not make as much sense to in effect incorporate the purposes of section B into title V that now exists and earmark a portion of that money for the planning function?

We get away from the problem that has been expressed all along this row and that row with regard to who is going to do this planning function in the State. Also, we get away from the problem of writing in a new agency situation.

Would your office have any great objection if this were done by the committee? Is this something you feel very strongly about?

Secretary GARDNER. I would like to ask the Commissioner to comment on that.

Mr. HOWE. I can't comment in detail. I would want to examine the actual language that addresses itself to planning and refresh my memory on it before giving you a positive or negative answer about it.

We did examine it carefully of course when we came up with this suggestion. The important objective to achieve here is one of getting a definite amount of money into the planning function on a truly comprehensive and long-range basis in such fashion that this planning activity continues year in and year out, has a specialized staff, is protected from invasion by administrative activities so that the State can guarantee itself the benefit of such a function over the years.

As the Secretary said earlier, there is no quick and easy way to get at this problem of forward planning. It will be a kind of kindergarten operation in the beginning and is going to have to build by building a base of information which will then be used in subsequent years.

But we would be happy to take your suggestion and take another look at this possibility.

Mr. MEEDS. As much as I hate to do so I am afraid I will have to disagree with the earlier statement of the Commissioner that there would be more continuity in this planning function if it were delegated to the Governor of the State. It is my feeling it would be the opposite.

There would be more continuity if this planning function were delegated to the State agency, the superintendent of schools or the chief State school officer.

Mr. HOWE. I would like to call your attention to two points: One, there is a variety of arrangements in the several States for which allowance must be made and beginning with the backing resources of Federal planning; second, higher education involves a complex element in the planning of the State—chiefly the State school officers and the board of education of the State have not had, been responsible for higher education although that is not universally true. In New York State you have a board of regents that is across the whole picture of education. So, you have a mixed picture for which allowance must be made.