

Mr. BRADEMAs. I just have three more points that I would like your comments on and then I will yield to Mr. Quie for his questions.

First, let me make an observation about two programs with which all of you are familiar. You are aware of the effort that the administration made to put more emphasis on the private banks in the NDEA undergraduate loan program. I don't know what you have heard, but the same suggestion could be forthcoming. I don't say this year but in a couple of years, in respect of college housing loans.

In other words, we should move in financing undergraduate aid and construction, both of housing and possibly academic facilities, more toward the private banking institutions in the country and less from direct Federal funding. Do you have any reaction?

Mr. HARRELL. Mr. Chairman, this is not going to work in the sense that the burdens of financing on the majority of the people in college would be so heavy they simply can't perform that service both in interest rates and the terms that banks would have to lay down. It is not going to be substantive unless the Federal Government picks up part of the interest rate.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Would there be any substantial disagreement among the rest of you with that observation?

Dr. UMBECK. I think Mr. Raffkind's suggestion was a very able one. Mr. Raffkind proposes that the Federal housing loan program be diverted in large measure to the private institutions with the Government subsidizing the interest, as you were suggesting.

Mr. HARRELL. To keep the record straight, I was speaking of the student loan program. I do not disagree with those comments.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Actually with both and if you have a different comment on either aspect.

All I am saying is that an effort may again be made to do this in the field of student undergraduate assistance. I am suggesting that there is a possibility someday that the same proposal may be made with respect to construction of facilities. Do I take it that you are in agreement that in either respect such a move would impose onerous burdens?

Mr. MAUKSCH. Yes.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I have another question. It is a two-part one. We have not talked at all, really, about the title I community service extension, the adult education title, or about the title III, the developing institutions title. Have you gentlemen any comments to make, primarily focusing on your procedural problems but on any substantive comment as well on how you see the operation of those two programs?

Mr. HARRELL. I would be glad to comment on the second one, the National Science Foundation programs. There is a slight variation with the same concept. I have had the privilege of acting in an advisory capacity on the Panel and followed that one very closely, and I think it is one of the most promising programs that I know of in terms of upgrading the institutions.

Mr. MAUKSCH. Yes.

Dr. MOUSOLITE. Mr. Chairman, may I just say when Dr. Umbeck was talking about this managerial program, I had the privilege of being invited to participate, talking about the Federal programs, and I was there some time. Tremendous. Dr. Willa Player, who heads up