

total bank loans volume under the Guaranteed Loan and Vocational Student Loan Insurance programs. I commend these facts to the committee's attention in support of the amendments strengthening the loan guarantee programs.

Obviously, if bank credit is to continue to be made available to the vast majority of those families who must finance a part of a student's cost of higher education, many more banks and savings and loan institutions than is presently the case must be brought into the program. Therefore, let us continue to support this financial aid program by enacting the proposals embodied in the pending legislation.

There are, of course, many other features in the legislation which deserve favorable consideration. One amendment, for example, is aimed at facilitating the planning and administration procedures of the institutions. A common but legitimate complaint of the colleges has been about the extreme hardship which higher education legislation imposes in terms of their preparation and execution of an annual budget. The amendment would authorize advance appropriation of all titles of the Higher Education Act, the Higher Education Facilities Act, and the National Defense Education Act. In other words, appropriations could be made a year in advance of their actual obligation for use. This would bring to higher education the long needed convenience of advance funding which we introduced at the elementary and secondary level through the amendments of last year.

The goal of equalizing educational opportunity has been foremost in the minds of the 89th and 90th Congresses. Title IV of the Higher Education Act is evidence of the seriousness of our intention to assist as many students as possible. And, generally, I am pleased with the effectiveness of the educational opportunity grant and the work-study programs. Under the 1968 amendments these would be extended through fiscal year 1969. Beginning in 1970, however, both programs would be consolidated with the national defense loan program in a title to be cited as the Educational Opportunity Act of 1968.

The purpose of the consolidation is to allow the colleges greater flexibility in the administration of their student aid programs. Funds would also be more evenly distributed among institutions which could apply to participate in one or more of the programs. Institutions would also be able to transfer up to 20% of an allocation from one program to another and 3% of an institution's total allotment, up to \$125,000 could be used for administrative expenses. The obvious advantage of these new provisions is that they give the individual institutions greater leeway in the operation of an overall student aid program.

The Higher Education Amendments of 1938 do, of course, extend other titles of the Higher Education Act through fiscal year 1973 and the Higher Education Facilities Act through fiscal year 1974. I have emphasized only several provisions of the amendments. The proposed amendments include several new programs which deserve serious consideration—the establishment of special projects to help disadvantaged students to enter or continue higher education; grants to strengthen graduate education; a "Networks for Knowledge" title to stimulate the sharing of facilities and resources through cooperative arrangements; and a program of grants to develop or improve graduate programs in public service education.

I cannot encourage the Committee strongly enough to weigh carefully the needs of our institutions and students and the respective merits of these proposed amendments. In view of my continuing interest and concern for higher education I thank the Committee for this opportunity to present testimony in support of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968. The approaching expiration date of the Higher Education Act makes it imperative that we proceed with all deliberate speed.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1968.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Education, Committee on Education and Labor, Rayburn Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MADAM CHAIRMAN: I have been following the hearings by your subcommittee regarding Selective Service policies affecting graduate students with considerable interest.

In an effort to solve the impending heavy call for young men enrolled in graduate schools throughout the country, I have proposed that a delayed induc-