Today I am appearing in support of H.R. 6232, the Higher Education Amendments of 1967. Briefly, these amendments have two purposes: to extend and amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the Higher Education Act of 1965, and the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act; and to strengthen and expand the teacher training authority delegated to the Office of Education in what we have called the Education Professions Development Act—Title V of the Amendments under consideration today.

EXTENSION OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

The National Defense Education Act was pased to strengthen teaching and learning in science, mathematics, and foreign languages. When the Act was passed, President Johnson, then one of its authors in the Senate, commented that "History may well record that we saved liberty and saved freedom when we undertook a crash program in the field of education." The experience of the past 9 years goes far to bear out this glowing prophecy; the NDEA has had increasing effect on the quality and availability of American education. It has been amended from time to time—most recently by the Higher Education Amendments of 1966—to extend its coverage to virtually all areas of education. Its original purpose—to augment the supply of highly trained manpower in fields relating to national security—has been broadened until students from kindergarten through graduate school now benefit from its provisions.

Enacted originally for a 4-year period, the NDEA was extended in 1962 and again in 1964. Although the current authorization does not expire under the end of Fiscal Year 1968, we are recommending that several titles of the Act be extended at this time. As I am sure this Committee is aware from the testimony of the many institutional witnesses who have appeared before it in the past, our Nation's schools and colleges have often been handicapped in their program planning by the Federal Government's timetable for both authorization and appropriation measures. Extension of NDEA one year before it "runs out" would provide a Federal commitment to the continuation of its programs, and would allow schools and colleges more ample leadtime for educational, fiscal, and manpower planning.

Title II—the National Defense Student Loan Program—is probably the Act's best known and most successful portion. As originally enacted, the title provided for loans to be made to full-time students in institutions of higher education, with preference to be given those majoring in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages. Forgiveness of a percentage of the loan amount and interest was afforded to students who subsequently taught in public elementary and secondary schools. All these restrictions have been substantially broadened in the past 9 years. Part-time students are now eligible to borrow; forgiveness has been extended to teachers in nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools and in institutions of higher education and to teachers of handicapped children; preference is now given to students with superior records in any field. Student borrowers totaled 1,053,211 at the end of Fiscal Year 1966, as compared with 833,476 at the close of Fiscal Year 1965 and 639,732 at the close of Fiscal Year 1964. Advances made to students since enactment of Title II totaled $823,937,851 at the end of Fiscal Year 1966, an 85 percent increase over the amount loaned through Fiscal Year 1964. The average loan amount has also increased; it was $470 in Fiscal Year 1964, $520 in Fiscal Year 1965, and reached an estimated $624 in Fiscal Year 1966.

We are asking that the National Defense Student Loan Program be extended 5 years, through Fiscal Year 1973. In keeping with the philosophy that loan forgiveness may attract students into career areas of greatest benefit to our Nation and its goals, loan cancellation benefits would be extended to teachers in programs of special education or training designed to combat disadvantage, poverty, or unemployment, even though they may not be working in the regular schools.

Finally, in order to encourage non-Federal capital for National Defense Student Loans, a revolving fund would be established from which institutions might obtain loans to capitalize fully additional student loans. A flow chart illustrating the operation of this fund is attached. Members of this Subcommittee will recognize this proposal as similar to the one advanced a year ago. The current funding pattern of National Defense Student Loans—whereby the institution receives contributions of Federal capital and must match with its own funds one-ninth of