

authorized to strengthen graduate and undergraduate education programs including those for non-teaching personnel. In addition, the 1967 amendments would establish a National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development.

Finally, the 1967 Higher Education Amendments would extend the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965 to provide loan insurance to new borrowers until June 30, 1973 and to borrowers making loans prior to that date until June 30, 1977. The maximum annual loan would be \$1,500, with a maximum aggregate of \$3,000 to any student whether his loan is insured under a State, private agency, or Federal Government program. The 1967 amendments would also establish a minimum annual payment whether under a State, private or Federal insured loan program, and would authorize uniform deferments irrespective of the loan program.

Madam Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, these are the major 1967 Higher Education Amendments. I support them enthusiastically and I urge their favorable consideration and speedy passage.

Thank you very much.

COMMENTS OF DR. L. D. HASKEW, THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

Title I. The University of Texas System has great interest in advancing the intent of Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as we understood that intent. All three amendments proposed in HR 6232 seem advantageous from the practical standpoint. It is especially necessary to keep as low as possible the percentage of costs to be borne by local funds (as Section 102 does). Title I calls for activities relatively unrecognized in state legislative appropriations and in funds budgeted by private institutions, and it will take time to build up the sources of local support.

For an institution such as The University of Texas, the amendments proposed in Section 103 should be a real boon. Under existing arrangements a project of any long range significance and innovative character has little chance of being funded because it requires such a large proportion of the State's allotment. Yet, this is exactly the character of projects most needed.

Quite frankly, after our high hopes for what Title I would make possible we are somewhat disenchanted with what has occurred in its administrative implementation. The difficulties appear to arise in differing interpretations of Congressional intent. One hopes consideration of HR 6232 may provide occasion to clarify that intent.

Title II. The amendments proposed are desirable, we think. However, see Section 222(a): "and, (2) for the planning or development of programs for the opening of library or information schools . . ." It would be most unfortunate if the Commissioner proceed to make such grants without recognition of the plans of such state bodies as the Coordinating Board, Texas College and University system.

Title IV. The amendments under Parts A and B concern areas in which we have little experience, but Section 402 is endorsed by our specialist on student aids.

Part C: We argue strongly that the Federal share for the Work-Study program for jobs in nonprofit enterprises should be continued at 90 percent and that institutions should be permitted to use 5 percent of their Federal allotment for administrative expenses (see Section 432). However, eighty percent is better than 75 percent. Section 404 is an especially desirable amendment, from our experience. We find nothing objectionable in the others, although we have no information of their justifiability in terms of cost.

Part D: As long as "forgiveness" is extended for some positions of subsequent employment, the extensions by Section 452 appear proper. Section 453 deals with loans for which we have no statutory authority to apply, and hence we have not studied its implications. None of the amendments get at our basic concerns about the National Defense Students Loans, but this is not the place to express these, but we are glad to see that basic features of this highly useful program are being continued.

Title V. This new Title and its provisions are warmly welcomed, and the approach represented by it is a decided forward step, in our opinion. Of course, its usefulness depends heavily upon the administrative acumen of the Commissioner, but the conception involved is very fine, in our opinion.

The remaining Titles in HR 6232 have not been examined in detail, but on the surface the approaches appear to be constructive.