Mr. PURDY. These technicalities which really burden the administration of the programs and really don't accomplish anything compensatory with the time it takes to do it.

I think one of our pleas here is to relieve the programs of some of the annoying technicalities that increase the administrative load tremendously without accomplishing anything in addition. I think we would like to get the most for our dollar.

This whole guaranteed loan program is, shall we say—a kind word would be to say it is confused. It needs an awful lot of study and I understand a committee is going into it in depth and maybe I should say no more at this point until we see what is coming out. Lord help us if we don't come out with a clearer picture.

Mr. GIBBONS. What committee is studying it?

Mr. PURDY. I understand there is a bar committee on a pretty high level, the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury is working with the American Banking Association. Another fellow is Kenneth Greer, who is national chairman of State student loan programs.

Mr. GIBBONS. When are they supposed to be finished with their work?

Mr. PURDY. I have not seen the report. If it is out, I have not seen it. I have been looking for it. Maybe I am behind on that but I have not seen the results of their study.

As I say, this thing needs a tremendous lot of work because this past year there were some fundamental mechanics in it which kept it from working on the level that it needs to work so I think that is all I need to say on that.

On the work-study, the proposal is for the 90–10 matching to go down to 80–20. Any of us know 80–20 is still a good deal for the institution. However, we also face the fact that the smaller institutions—some of them are struggling a lot now even with the 90–10 and 80–20, I would think, would further increase the workload in some of the smaller institutions. Maybe there needs to be a provision for some of the weaker institutions to have special consideration. I don't know the answer.

The meeting of the Minimum Wage Committee on the Fair Wages Act is going to put a further crimp on that. I think the larger institutions are not voicing this same concern. I think they can take it either way, but certainly the smaller institutions would have a problem there.

On work-study, here is a little technicality I wish could be straightened out; that is, we felt in the original, in the wording of the original, the word "average" may have been lost somewhere. We say a student should work not more than an average of 15 hours a week while in school. The law, as written, I believe, says he shall not work more than 15 hours. This means we have a boy on work-study and he has a series of examinations this week and he says, "May I work 10 hours this week and I will make it up next week?" Yet under the work-study program, if he works 17 hours, we have to take 2 hours off that payroll and put it over on another payroll. This type of little picayunishness is killing us on administrative costs. This type of thing I don't think would cost the program hardly a recognizable amount and yet it would relieve the burden and, if the time ever comes when the Office of Education auditors or Government auditors want to come in and