

university, one may wonder about the professional competence in the area of school counseling, of the rating panel. The use of "related disciplines" in evaluating proposals is to be encouraged, but not to the point where the basic discipline has a minority representation.

C. U.S. Office of Education communications frequently stress the fact that the Commissioner of Education has the "right" to determine which institutions will be offered contracts for various programs. The manual says that the submission of proposals by institutions "does not restrict any initiative the Commissioner may take in arranging for institutes * * *." This is, of course, legally correct, just as a university president, as the chief executive officer, has the "right" to hire a professor in any department in the university. In both cases, however, these individuals would show a high degree of professional irresponsibility if they took it upon themselves to determine which programs, and which individuals, were effective in areas about which they knew little or nothing. Counselors and counselor educators would not be of too much assistance in helping NASA to develop a new guidance system for space research, nor would NASA officials be very effective in determining which institutions were offering superior programs in counselor education.

The determination of which institutions receive Federal funds for the education of school counselors should be in the hands of those who have shown themselves to be most competent in the area of counseling and personnel services, and in the professional education of those who work in this area. It would be illuminating to know the number of times recently Mr. Howe and other U.S. Office officials have "taken the initiative," as well as the names of the institutions who have been recipients of their "initiative."

Briefly, then, a few suggestions:

1. Federal moneys should go to those institutions which can best perform the function for which the money was legislated, and the top professional people in the field are the ones who should determine just which institutions satisfy this criterion.

2. There should be a high level of openness and honesty in the U.S. Office of Education, since the funds being used are public, and the American taxpayer has the right to know how his moneys are being expended. There is an unfortunate tendency among some officials to refer to "my" \$32.7 million, and some, by their actions, apparently feel it is "their" \$32.7 million. I modestly suggest such delusions should be discouraged.

3. U.S. Office of Education officials should not abuse their power and authority. The broader their powers, the greater their area of ignorance over the areas which they direct, but hopefully do not control. We could assume that Mr. Gardner would have a broader area of ignorance than Mr. Howe. This is reasonable enough, but these officials should understand their limitations of knowledge, and should not confuse power with understanding.

4. The U.S. Office of Education, with its vastly increased budget, is rapidly becoming the major determiner of the direction of education in the United States. Thus it would appear that when various proposals and programs are being evaluated by the U.S. Office, it is actual-