

he can contract with any person or group of his choice (—and he can undoubtedly find a profit-making agency which can be hired, for a price, to do almost anything he may ask—) to develop programs which *he* wants the nation to follow. This is federal control of the most objectionable sort; and we urge the Committee to reject this proposal every time it is made, for the sake of placing authority for American education where it belongs—with the state and local governments and nonprofit institutions.

If my language seems strong, I assure you our feelings on this matter are even stronger.

We do, of course, have other comments on this legislative proposal, and I shall return now to the beginning of the bill and make comments on items as they appear in the text.

We support the extension of the Community Service and Continuing Education Programs for an additional five years, the retention of the 75% federal matching provision, but regret that the request for an authorization of \$50 million is being dropped and that only \$16.5 million is being requested for appropriations.

We strongly object, I repeat again, to the granting of authority to the Commissioner to enter into contracts with private profit-making agencies for the purpose of developing experimental or pilot projects in the field of continuing education and community service. (Sec. 107, page 6, lines 15–21.)

We urge the extension of the College Library Resources program (page 8) for five years and the liberalization of the provision relating to matching for special purpose grants. We also support the extension of Parts B and C of Title II.

We support the extension of Title III of the Higher Education Act (Strengthening Developing Institutions) for five years and regret that the appropriation request is some \$20 million short of the authorization figure approved by the Congress.

The technical amendments to Title IV (Student Assistance) seem reasonable, except that again we strongly object to granting the Commissioner authority to contract with profit-making agencies to carry out the talent search provision of Part A (Opportunity Grants; Sec. 403, page 13, lines 16–23 end page 14, lines 1–2.)

We recommend substantial additional funding of the work-study program to at least the level of the authorization for 1968 as passed last year (\$200 million). We also suggest that the federal share of this program be 90%. We especially approve the inclusion, expansion, and extension of the Vocational Student Loan Insurance program in Part B of this Title.

Part D of Title IV, the National Defense Student Loan program, is, of course, the heart of the student assistance title. We urge that it be made permanent legislation and that the authorization of at least \$225 million be continued for the following five fiscal years. We resist any efforts which may be made to substitute a guaranteed student loan program for the NDEA loans, which have been of such great value to lower and middle-income students. The proposal that specific authorizations be scrapped in favor of the indefinite “such sums as are necessary” phraseology is a cause for concern. Such a proposal surrenders the control of this committee and of the entire Congress over the future of the program. We note with regret that the appropriation request for NDEA loans for fiscal 1968 is \$35 million less than the present law authorizes.

Part E of Title IV, as it permits extension of the period of study to four years under special circumstances, is a sound proposal. Also bringing the financial assistance into line with other federal fellowship programs is desirable.

Part F of Title IV (which becomes Part E to the Higher Education Act on page 45) provides for an advisory Council on Financial Aid to Students. We are becoming somewhat wary of the recent proliferation of “advisory councils.” Perhaps the advice received by the Office of Education in the Congressional hearing process might suffice in this instance.

Of major interest to the National Education Association is the proposal entitled Title V—Education Professions Development. The purposes of the proposal as outlined in Sec. 501 are certainly in accord with the objectives of the National Education Association.

Sec. 503, on pages 54 and 55, by expanding the definition of elementary and secondary teachers to include pre-school, adult, and post-secondary vocational teachers, improves the teacher fellowship program. Also, including a specific reference to educational and instructional television and radio is desirable. We particularly approve the addition of “child development” to the listing of career