programs of financial grants to students in proprietary business schools. The USOE should not have any particular difficulty in administering NDEA loans to needy students in accredited proprietary schools.

A SYMBIOTIC RELATIONSHIP

Less than half of the 3.8 million youngsters who entered the ninth grade this fall probably will go to colleges, and only one in five is likely to stay long enough to win a degree, according to data prepared by the USOE.[10]

We have a society publicly committed to the college graduate ethic. But this ethic does not coincide with the fact that less than 20 percent of the high school graduates earn a bachelor degree.

Proprietary education is an important, if often unacknowledged, segment in the whole complex of postsecondary vocational education. To the bewilderment of some theorists and to the satisfaction of their graduates these business, trade and technical schools continue successfuly to train people for jobs.

One reason why the contribution of these schools is not recognized is because they have never and do not now come to Congress asking for money for institutional support. Proprietary schools have long recognized and affirmed that the present public policy of our nation limits institutional aid to public and non-profit schools. Please see 1960 exchange of letters with USOE attached as Exhibit "D."

The increased enrollments in and continued growth of proprietary education can only be explained in terms of a symbiotic relationship with the tax supported schools. These two corporately dissimilar educational organisms are obviously existing together in an intimate, but unacknowledged, association which is advantageous and necessary to both and not harmful to either.

SUMMARY

1. We wish to affirm our general support for the Higher Education Amendments of 1967.
2. We wish to indicate our particular approval of the cited sections which would be of aid to students in accredited proprietary schools.
3. We respectfully request an amendment to the Title II NDEA loan program to help needy students in accredited proprietary schools because—
   - (a) The Vocational loan program does not and will not meet the needs of some students,
   - (b) With a USOE projected $50 million NDEA overage, budgeting for fiscal 1968 can be achieved without disruptive effects on the NDEA program itself and would redound to the benefit of the overall educational picture.
   - (c) This is an issue of student aid and not of institutional aid. It has long been public policy to use Federal resources to help people via the facilities of proprietary taxpaying institutions.
   - (d) The direct loan provision of Sec. 10 of the insured loan program has never been implemented.
   - (e) Any problems of "loan forgiveness" are purely of a technical nature which can easily be resolved by amending the language of Sec. 205(b) (3) of the NDEA. The proposed amendment in this bill to the Sec. 435 Work Study program proves that if the goal is to help people that with a little thought and care language can be amended.

CONCLUSION

The need of a student should not be measured by the proprietary corporate form of the educational institution in which he is enrolled. Student aid is not institutional aid.

In 1960 HEW Secretary John W. Gardner wrote:

"V

"INNOVATION IN EDUCATION

"All the organizational arrangements, all the methods and procedures that characterize American education today were originally devised to help us ac-

[10] USOE press release, Thursday, January 19, 1967.