Mr. LUMLEY. For the other members, we start on the bottom of page 2 and on the top of page 3 we say 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 or 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 nonprofit education agencies and deal with profitmakers is, in our opinion, the most dangerous proposal ever to come before the Congress.

Potentially it would authorize the Commissioner to use taxpayers' 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 nonprofit 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. Profitmaking agencies are in business primarily to make a profit. If the permission to contract with profitmaking agencies is granted, nothing prohibits the Office of Education to hire persons to accomplish objectives, to conduct slanted "research," and to conduct well-financed Madison-Avenue-type promotion campaigns to achieve purposes which the public education sector, and the ethical private nonprofit institutions would never consider becoming involved in. This seems to us not only a totally unnecessary practice, but indeed a frightening one.

Now, you will recall at the ESEA hearings last year we also raised this same question and it was only in one research section last year we tried to hold it off. We probably were a little more gentle. This year we are making it as strong as we know how.

We say, this type of activity, that is, contracts with profitmaking agencies, was first proposed as an amendment to the Cooperative Research Act (title IV, ESEA) in 1966. We objected at that time. HEW spokesmen claimed that the purpose of providing authority in the Cooperative Research Act to contract with private profitmaking agencies to train research personnel was necessary because such training was not available from nonprofit sources. The emphasis was on need for skilled workers and researchers in the use of computers. Perhaps there is some validity to that argument, although we believed then, as we do now, that direct contracts between the USOE and profitmaking agencies are inherently wrong and that the objective of increasing the supply of computer experts could be achieved by subcontracts between nonprofit agencies receiving Federal grants and the computer training agencies. In addition, we questioned the practicality of training such researchers in a situation isolated from the education community.

We lost that argument but not our concern. At that time they told us it was just for the computer processes with IBM, General Electric, or some other corporation like that.

Mr. GIBBONS. Will the gentlelady yield?

Mrs. GREEN. Yes.