

Second, if the intent of the amendment is to bring the computer type of research training and resources into the educational picture, this can better be accomplished by contracts between the USOE and the non-profit institutions. These institutions can in turn, as the occasion warrants, purchase services from the commercial research firms. Such a system will keep non-profit educational institutions in control of the programs. Profit-making agencies, with the well-financed public relations and promotional services available to them, can, and we have reason to fear, will "merchandise" their programs, sound or not, in a way potentially dangerous to a balanced educational system.

Third, since these firms are in business to make a profit, we feel that the training program they may offer, must necessarily be more expensive to the taxpayer than that offered by the public and private non-profit institutions.

Fourth, we question the propriety of the U.S. Office of Education becoming directly involved in the training of research personnel. The USOE is an administrative agency, not an educational institution, nor should it be. It is reasonable to assume that many of the problems which have arisen with P.L. 89-10 are related to the lack of understanding on the part of some USOE personnel of the structure of the elementary and secondary school systems in the various states. Researchers can greatly influence the subject with which they are concerned. We do not believe that such influence should emanate from the Office of Education through personnel trained by non-education oriented, commercial profit-making agencies.

Finally, the profit-making agencies can and do lure away the most competent faculty members from the non-profit institutions—to the detriment of the whole educational process—by offering higher salaries. We have seen this happen in science and mathematics. We do not want it to happen to professional education.

The language in the present cooperative research act, provides for limiting the grants and contracts for training personnel to public and private non-profit institutions, agencies, organizations. For these reasons we urge the Committee to reject this amendment.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN M. LUMLEY, *Director, Division of Federal Relations.*

Chairman PERKINS. If the members have had the time to read it they may just want to ask questions.

Give us your evaluation of the present elementary and secondary education.

Mr. LUMLEY. Mr. Pucinski asked the question earlier, if there was any evaluation. We have to give the evaluation which is subjective—

Chairman PERKINS. Give us the results of your study.

Mr. LUMLEY. We say there the program has had a great impact on education, title 1, particularly.

Chairman PERKINS. Does your statement today spell that out?

Mr. LUMLEY. Yes. You see, this was necessary because of the fact that many districts with limited financial resources could enter into the things they knew they should do for the disadvantaged. This made it possible for them to move into programs that people had to meet with compensatory education. We had other groups that were stimulated to do things which possibly had not given enough thought to this. You will find in your statement we give you three categories.

Chairman PERKINS. From your organization studies have you been able to come up with any positive results that are obtained as a result of title 1?

Mr. LUMLEY. I would have to say to you, Mr. Chairman, at the moment that our research division is in the process of surveying districts and we will make this available to you as soon as it is complete.

Chairman PERKINS. I would like to have that information when it is available.