

changes. Hence, we find the amendments in HR 6265 quite encouraging. Here are some specific comments which I will confine to those portions specifically related to Student Financial Aid in higher education.

1. *The extension of the various programs for another five years in advance* will add a great deal to the confidence in the programs on the part of students, parents, school counselors and college administrators.

2. *It is particularly important that the programs actually be funded in advance* so all of us can proceed with assurance. Students want to make definite plans and many don't really know whether they can go to college until they receive a firm answer about financial help. We should be able to tell the student in January what help he can expect the following September. I realize that funding is the responsibility of the appropriations Committee, but any support that can be given for this suggestion will be gratefully appreciated.

3. The Educational Opportunity Grant program is not yet through its first year, but at this point we think the preliminary unofficial reports sound quite encouraging. Thus far the dropout rate appears to be less than had been expected. This is a "high risk" group from the standpoint of educational motivation and they require a tremendous amount of individual attention and counseling. Most colleges cannot add staff fast enough to take care of the extra load and if this program has a successful year it will be testimony to a lot of good high school counselors and a lot of overtime on the part of many college staff members.

4. *Finding institutional resources to match Educational Opportunity Grants is quite a problem* and doing the matching on an individual basis is an immense bookkeeping chore.

*Section 402 which permits Work-Study earnings to be used for matching Educational Opportunity Grants is a real improvement* and will be a great help.

5. *I have a couple of suggestions on matching* which I wish you would consider very carefully. If work at the cafeteria or book store on campus is considered matching, why don't we consider work at the restaurant or book store across the street is matching? The owners are tax-paying citizens like you and me, and why not encourage them to have a part in student aid when they are providing good work opportunities at fair wages. Furthermore, why curb the initiative of the boy who will hustle out and help himself locate a job by telling him the rules say that he has to wait until we locate a job for him?

I still endorse the principle that the institution is obligated to continue to maintain its total effort to help students, and this should be rigidly enforced. However, our objective is to aid the student to get an education, and, if a few private dollars can be worked into the plan why not use them! Some of the smaller colleges can provide a very limited work opportunity and this could be a partial answer to their problem. If we're afraid of abuse on such a suggestion, then a reasonable limit could be put on the number, or percentage of such cases permitted at an institution.

*The other suggestion would be to permit an insured loan from any source to count as matching* the same as we now use NDEA Loans.

6. *Section 403 to continue the talent search program is good.* The job needs to be done on a larger scale and as we study the results of the programs now in operation, they will point the way to further improvement.

7. Sections 421 through 424 concerning the Loan Insurance Programs for higher education are further improvements.

The insured loan situation, in general, needs some very thorough thought given to it. However, since it is now being studied in considerable depth by a special committee, I will make no further comment at this time.

8. Section 432 authorizes the college Work-Study Program to change to an 80% federal, 20% matching after August 20, 1967. While it is recognized that this is still a good deal for most institutions, *we feel that the change from 90-10 will be particularly difficult for some of the smaller colleges.* There are places where it will result in a reduction of the work program. Also, some campuses will be having difficulty meeting the wage scale of the Fair Labor Standards Act and a shift to higher matching on Work-Study will further complicate their problems.

9. Section 433 provides for a liberalized combination of work and study during vacation periods. This is good. We'd like to suggest one other slight change. *This would be to provide for an average of 15 hours of work per week in a pay-roll period* in the weeks in which classes are in session. This would permit a student to work 13 hours one week and 17 another without having to shift two-