The other argument advanced is that because business corporations have been successful, at least on the profit-and-loss sheet, therefore they would also be successful in the field of education.

I don't look on the investigations of drug companies or car manufacturers, nor do I look on the price fixing of General Electric, in such a way that I have complete confidence that when they get in the field of education their one and only concern would be the education of the child.

I am very interested in your testimony on HEW, and I am sorry we have not heard it in the last year.

I think your testimony on page 5:

> Research, demonstration projects, in-service education and information dissemination about worthwhile developments should be carried on, not by the Office of Education, but by schools, state education departments and institutions of higher education with funds provided through the Office of Education for the purposes which the grantees identified as most appropriate.

I think your next sentence is really crucial—

"Violation of this principle places a Commissioner"—we are not critical of Commissioner Howe; I personally have the greatest admiration for both Secretary Gardner and Commissioner Howe.

> Violation of this principle places a Commissioner in a position where 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.

I just want to say that I am so pleased finally to hear representatives of some educational group come up and have the courage to make that statement.

I have not heard from the NEA in regard to the requested funds, and I really place the same question to you I asked of Germaine Krettek. I was not referring to your organization when I said the president of a national association sent out the word that all groups were to wire and write about the Teacher Corps.

Is this your priority that the graduate teacher fellowship, authorized at the $275 million level, has a request for only 12 percent of the funds? If this is of no concern to you then you would not express concern to the Congress about the big cut here. At the same time would you place the Teacher Corps program in a place of far less importance?

Mr. LUMLEY. We have asked on the elementary bill, you will find in here we say there should be full funding. We go one step further, we object to the provision in here that would delete the sums of money and say that the money is necessary for the program. We do not believe that this lets Congress express what it thinks.

In other words, if the Congress decides that the fellowship program should have $250 million, we think the law should say $250 million so that the Budget Bureau and Office of Education, when they come back to you and ask for only a hundred million, they have to justify it. If you use the expression they use in here, such sums as are necessary, it throws it back into the hands of the executive department to come to you and say that is all we need.

Mrs. GREEN. May I make one comment on that?

This is traditional language in bills, but it does not prevent the executive branch from doing this. Anytime there is not full funding,