

Conducting experimental and pilot projects in continuing education and community service (sec. 107, p. 6);

Talent search projects (sec. 403, p. 13);

Attracting qualified persons to the field of education (sec. 504, p. 51); and

Providing preservice and inservice training for elementary and secondary teachers, including preschool, adult, and vocational teachers, etc. (sec. 532, p. 59). The latter is the most astonishing of all.

These things could be given out under title II on contract.

Mrs. GREEN. What about research? It seems to me if you are considering the possibility of Federal control that here is the greatest possibility of all because you can then select the corporations and the companies to carry out the specific research that you have already predetermined is important in building the curricula of the country.

The results of that research may have a direct bearing and a tremendous impact on the curricula for many, many years. If there is any chance of Federal control, it seems to me it lies in this particular area.

This is one of my concerns as I see the Bureau of Research more and more dominated by business people. I am not convinced that they are the ones who have the greatest knowledge about education nor the greatest concern about it. I have had discussions in the last few weeks with people in the educational community over this exact point. I don't know how many times I have been told we must turn to business because the schools have failed to do it.

Mr. LUMLEY. This is the story that has been given out, and this is one of the great concerns we have.

Mrs. GREEN. I think this is one of the most dangerous bits of propaganda being circulated in the United States today; the statement that schools obviously have failed or we wouldn't have the problems we have. We wouldn't have a million dropouts, or a million emotionally disturbed youngsters, it is said.

It seems to me this is really a dangerous philosophy because I am of the firm conviction that these schools have not done many of these things because they have not had the money.

In fact, the Office of Education hasn't done it. We could charge it with being no good, too, and say let's do away with it and get some other Office of Education. It has not done all of these things. The reason is it has not had the authority nor the authorization, and neither have the schools.

I am concerned about this line of arguing.

One of my colleagues, who is here today, even seriously considered that we should turn to a corporation that is not a school and set up competing programs. I said, "Would you have them set up under the same ground rules, have the program limited by the kind of money the taxpayers are willing to give, or would you have the public schools operate under those ground rules and a corporation work on a negotiated contract, a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis?"

His answer was, "Yes, let's have them do that and then compare the results."

This seems to be a dangerous trend.