

a special subject field to be used in computer-assisted instruction, the subject-matter professional association might be the most effective grantee.

Funds could be used for development and operation of a series of inter-institutional arrangements:

Collection and sharing of curricular materials and information on modern curricular advances: This could take many forms, such as creation of a curriculum clearinghouse, for a geographic region or a specific subject-matter area. An institution which had conducted in-depth research into a facet of instructional content or technique could share its findings with other interested colleges and universities. Needless duplication in curriculum development could be avoided, if institutions were aware of the curricular materials available to them.

Development of effective systems of processing and maintaining financial and student records: Multi-institutional arrangements for standardization or simplification of record-keeping could prove extremely beneficial to a number of our colleges and universities. Perhaps such a simplified system could be combined with a centralized data processing facility, for which each participant would be assessed a pro rata share.

Joint use of facilities such as classrooms, libraries, or laboratories:

Library networks, providing access to collections of materials in the possession of a number of institutions: Some institutions of higher education have already established library consortia to reduce the costs of maintaining specialized library collections in a large number of fields. However, in the main such consortia have consisted of colleges large enough and wealthy enough that each would have a specialized, expensive library to "contribute" to the system. Federal assistance to a multi-institution library network might assure that the poorer institutions—those who need the most to share library resources—would be able to participate.

Establishment and joint operation of closed-circuit television facilities: Such TV networks would allow institutions to share their faculties by wire and could result in improvement of quality while limiting costs.

Planning and operation of electronic computer networks: Sharing of a single centralized computer by a number of institutions can cut the costs to any single institution significantly, while still providing sufficient computer-time for processing of financial or student records, student course work, or transmission of library or other materials, or providing a resource for faculty research. The scope of the computer's use, as part of an educational network, would be limited only by the imagination of the group of institutions proposing the project.

Exchange of faculty on a part-time or full-time basis: Less wealthy institutions may not be able to afford—or use—the full-time services of a distinguished professor. Again, sharing would enable more schools and more students to benefit from a single faculty member's knowledge.

For Fiscal Year 1969, it is requested that \$8 million be authorized to be appropriated for resource-sharing programs, with such sums as might be necessary for the next four fiscal years. Funds are not to be spent for providing capital equipment, library resources, or other assets to a single institution. These are intended, instead, to pay the costs of transmission or other changes incident to establishing a network.

EDUCATION FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE

I would now like to turn briefly to title XII of the Higher Education Amendments—the Education for the Public Service Act. It is designed to support graduate education for the public service through grants and contracts to institutions of higher education and to authorize a new program of fellowships on the graduate level for young men and women preparing for a career in Federal, State, or local government. It builds on past accomplishments of the Congress, which has enacted a varied and diverse list of fellowships, grants, and awards to help offset critical shortages in different career fields.

In the years between 1946 and 1966, the total number of government employees in the United States rose from 5,595,000 to 10,871,000. In 1946, the Federal government employed 2,254,000 employees, while 3,341,000 were employed by State and local governments. In 1966, the statistical breakdown consisted of 2,564,000 Federal employees, with 8,307,000 individuals working for State and local governments. The manpower demands of these governments are expected to reach 12 million by 1975.