

Mr. HOWE. No, \$15 million.

Mr. GOODELL. \$15 million.

Mr. HOWE. Right.

Mr. GOODELL. In addition to the \$22 million? Then the \$22 million is moving to \$29 million and you are asking \$15 million for the planning and programming budget?

Mr. HOWE. Yes; the \$29 million includes the operation of title V and a number of other small items that go over into the State education departments. The \$15 million is the amount for the planning activity that we are suggesting.

Mr. GOODELL. I think most of us look with sympathy on the idea of getting more information and data analysis in terms of the implementation of our goals but as I understand your comment; Secretary Gardner and others in the field of education have indicated considerable reservation about the applicability of PPBS to education.

I wonder if we are wise to move the first year into a program involving \$15 million and in effect trying to induce our States all to move in the direction when we are not sure exactly what the value will be and the applicability will be.

Mr. HOWE. All we are suggesting here is the development within each State of a capacity to look ahead on an organized basis through a system which that State will decide upon for itself. Our only requirement, if you will, being that the look-ahead be comprehensive and address itself to all the educational problems and issues that exist in that State. There is no imposition or necessarily a use of the so-called PPBS system, and I think describing that system in this way probably makes it seem as more of a system than it really is.

The PPBS, in turn, is simply a discipline way the Federal Government is using to look at the forward planning affairs of the administration.

Mr. GOODELL. The course you state is unarguable. Our problem is that you are asking us to adopt general language that throughout provides that "as the Commissioner shall approve," and "as the Commissioner shall prescribe," and so forth. It would appear to be ample authority for the Commissioner to prescribe a rather detailed specific approach by the States, including a PPBS approach as dreamed up by someone in your Department asking the States to set up programs looking down the road and analyze how far you are going to go in accomplishing your goal.

It certainly is a very worthy objective. The language you have suggested in section 524 of the bill leaves many of us with some concern just how far we are going to go in pressing the States in an area where virtually every expert says there is considerable doubt as to the applicability.

Now, if it is as broad as you have indicated and you are simply telling the State if you want some money to look at the long-term problems and set up a system for analyzing how you are moving to accomplish your objective, that is one thing. The description that I have read in other areas and which we had described in some detail by the witnesses here yesterday is quite another thing.

Have you had an opportunity to review or be briefed on the objections of the State school superintendents yesterday to this proposal in title V?