

On behalf of the committee may I express our appreciation for your willingness to come here and give us your views. Your statement will be made a part of the record and you may proceed in any way you wish.

(The statement follows:)

TESTIMONY PRESENTED BY JOHN M. LUMLEY IN BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL
EDUCATION ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES

Madam Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am John M. Lumley, Director of the Division of Federal Relations of the National Education Association. The NEA, as you know, is an independent association of professional educators. Our membership includes educators in the public and private schools and colleges ranging from pre-school teachers to university presidents. Of our 1,025,000 members, 95% are classroom teachers.

Our testimony on HR 6232 and HR 6265 is based on the policies of the parent Association as defined by the platform and resolutions adopted by the 7000 delegates to the annual convention of the Association.

There are 33 constituent special interest departments in the NEA complex. They do not always agree in every detail with the position of the parent organization. With me today are representatives of two of these departments, Dr. Ronald Uhl, representing the Department of Audio-Visual Instruction, and Dr. Howard S. Decker, Executive Secretary of the American Industrial Arts Association, and they will be presenting statements. Two members of the staff of the Division of Federal Relations, Mrs. Mary Gereau and Mr. Richard Carrigan, are also with me today.

In general, the National Education Association supports HR 6232 as we have in the past supported the National Defense Education Act, the Higher Education Facilities Act, the Higher Education Act, and the National Vocational Student Loan Facilities Act. All of these laws have made significant contributions to improving the quality of American education. Their main thrust, to provide greater opportunity for individuals to improve their professional competence is, of course, not only important to the individuals but also to the nation's economic and social development. We regret only that the programs are too meagerly financed and thus too limited, especially in the number of student aids of all types which they provide.

We have read the testimony presented by the American Council of Education and as a constituent member of that organization we concur with the formal testimony presented by Dr. Gross yesterday. It is not necessary to repeat the points he made, especially as they pertain to details of the higher education amendments.

For the convenience of the Committee, I believe it preferable to present our comments on the bill item by item as they appear in the draft legislation. However, I would like to comment first on what we believe to be a serious departure from acceptable practice which appears several times in this bill and is a development which is a recurring feature in various Administration proposals relative to education before the 90th Congress.

The Commissioner is authorized at several points in this bill to contract with profitmaking agencies for carrying out projects ranging from improving the qualifications of persons who are serving or preparing to serve in education programs in the public elementary and secondary schools to hiring public relations firms to recruit persons into the field of education.

Madam Chairman, this constant effort on the part of the Office of Education to secure authority for the Commissioner to bypass the public and private non-profit education agencies and deal with profit-makers is, in our opinion, the most dangerous proposal ever to come before the Congress.

Potentially it would authorize the Commissioner to use tax-payers' money to provide profit for private agencies in carrying out activities which are clearly and solely the prerogative of the public schools and public and private non-profit institutions and agencies. Of even more danger, however, is the potentiality for federal control and direction of the entire education effort of this country, in direct violation of the American tradition of state control of public education. Profit-making agencies are in business primarily to make a profit. If the permission to contract with profit-making agencies is granted, nothing prohibits the