

Education Facilities Act, the Higher Education Act, and the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act. Each of these laws has significantly contributed to improving the quality of American education.

We are pleased to express NEA's support for the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 embodied in HR 15067. To the extent that provisions of the new bill are similar to those contained in HR 6232 and HR 6265 introduced during the past session, we respectfully direct your attention to the testimony of Dr. John M. Lumley, NEA Assistant Executive Secretary for Legislation and Federal Relations, presented to the Special Subcommittee on Education on Thursday, April 20, 1967.

Since one of the major goals of the NEA legislative program is to "establish full and early funding of all federal education programs", we strongly endorse the proposed five-year extensions of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Higher Education Act of 1965, and the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965. We support and commend even more strongly Section 908 of the bill which authorizes appropriations to be made one year in advance of their obligations for use, a provision similar to the advance funding principle so very wisely included in the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967. Congress has been consistently late in releasing funds for education, often several months after the beginning of the fiscal year, depriving educational administrators of the opportunity to plan ahead or to make firm commitments for educational expenditures. This has been a particularly serious problem as regards fellowships for teachers and scholarships, loans and work study funds for students since colleges and universities must make commitments in the spring for the academic year starting the following fall. We are indeed grateful to this Subcommittee for clearly pointing out the problems of late funding of educational programs in the excellent and thoroughly exhaustive "Study of the United States Office of Education". We urge you to persuade Congress to provide for this long-range authorization and advance funding to eliminate the waste and confusion caused by late appropriations. We shall be pleased to lend our strength to your efforts.

We support in general the proposal to consolidate the National Defense Student Loans, Educational Opportunity Grants and Work-Study programs into the proposed single Educational Opportunity Act in view of the apparent benefits and advantages of improved administration. The statement of purpose for the proposed Educational Opportunity Act—"to provide educational opportunities beyond secondary school to all our youth that desire such opportunities and can benefit from them"—is strikingly similar to a plank in the NEA platform. We continue to believe however that the National Defense Student Loan program, is, of course, the heart of the student assistance title. We believe there would be merit in the continued separate five-year authorization of each of the three programs. We likewise have reservations concerning the proviso that an institution could transfer up to 20% of its allocation for each program to one or both of the remaining programs. We are concerned that this may be another effort to "phase out" the National Defense Student Loans under the guise of "flexibility" in administration. The technical amendments proposed update the Student Assistance program and seem to represent reasonable improvements. We support the provision that the federal share of the Work-Study program be 90%. We support the Guaranteed Student Loan programs as a complement to the programs of the Educational Opportunity Act. We especially approve the inclusion expansion and extension of the Vocational Student Loan Insurance program.

We note with concern that with the exception of the first year's operation, the bill sets no dollars figures for the various programs it contains. The proposal that specific authorizations be scrapped in favor of the indefinite "such sums as are necessary" phraseology is a cause for real concern to us. Such a proposal surrenders the control of this Committee and of the entire Congress over the future of the programs.

It is with regret also that we must state once again that most of the established programs are too meagerly financed, and consequently too limited. It is apparent to us that this situation is not due to neglect nor to the actions of this Committee, for your recommendations to the Congress have spelled out in crystally clear terms what is advisedly considered to be the reasonable and minimal needs of the educational programs authorized by recent educational statutes. We do not underestimate the international danger confronting us nor the need to provide for the defense expenditures necessary to repel the threat of that danger. We do contend however that the funding of educational programs in the carefully considered amounts authorized by Congress is equally essential to our