

The major disadvantage of this location of the agency is that, even with separate budgets for the Library of Congress *per se* and the National Library Agency, under this arrangement the National Library Agency budget still remains on the Legislative Branch side rather than on the Executive Branch side, and thus gives an unfair impression of the actual purpose of the expenditure. A second disadvantage lies in the bifurcation of the responsibilities of the Librarian of Congress himself.

Balancing the advantages and disadvantages of these several possible locations and forms for the National Library Agency, we believe that although any one of them can be made workable, the administrative and budgetary relationships will be more logical and less conflicting if the Agency is made a separate office with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. But we emphasize again that wherever located, and whatever form the National Library Agency takes, responsibility for assuming all national library/information needs are satisfied must be concentrated in a *single* agency; its function must not be weakened by combining responsibility for service to the nation as a whole with responsibility for primary service to the federal establishment itself; the agency must have broad authority to act directly or through grants or contracts with other federal, public, and non-profit, agencies; and policy and program guidance must be provided by a board or committee representing the immediate and ultimate users of the system, to insure responsive and responsible guidance in the national interest.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., February 15, 1968.

HON. EDITH GREEN,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: AS you know, the Library of Congress is responsible for the administration of Title II-C (the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging) of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

As I testified before your Subcommittee in April of 1967, I support the amendments to this Act in regard to Title II-C that were included in H.R. 6232 and H.R. 6265 and more recently in the omnibus education bill, H.R. 15067.

I would, however, like to reiterate what I said in April about the length of extension of Title II-C. I urge that Part C be extended for a 5-year period as are parts A and B of Title II, rather than for 2 years as provided for in H.R. 15067. Great progress has been made in the centralized cataloging program at the Library of Congress but, because of limited funding, the far-reaching effects of the program are just now being felt by the research community in the Nation. A 5-year extension would give the Library, I believe, sufficient time to put this very important cataloging program on a sound operating basis and would greatly increase the benefits it can bring to higher education and scholarly research.

If you desire any additional information, I would be very happy to provide it.
Sincerely yours,

L. QUINCY MUMFORD,
Librarian of Congress.

THE AMERICAN PARENTS COMMITTEE, INC.,
Washington, D.C., March 21, 1968.

Re H.R. 15067, Higher Education Amendments of 1968.

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

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GREEN: For the purpose of inclusion in the record of hearings on the above legislation, the American Parents Committee wishes to express our support for the following programs:

Title I, Community Service and Continuing Education programs. We support the continuation of 75% Federal share through FY 1969, and 50% for the following four years.

Title IV, Part E, NDEA Teaching Fellowships. We strongly support the provision increasing from three to four years fellowships to encourage recipients to enter or continue teaching, especially in the primary and secondary systems.