

1972

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare – A Mixed Approach

Catholic University Law Review

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.law.edu/lawreview>

Recommended Citation

Catholic University Law Review, *The Department of Health, Education and Welfare – A Mixed Approach*, 21 Cath. U. L. Rev. 779 (1972).

Available at: <https://scholarship.law.edu/lawreview/vol21/iss4/9>

This Notes is brought to you for free and open access by CUA Law Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Catholic University Law Review by an authorized editor of CUA Law Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact edinger@law.edu.

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare—A Mixed Approach

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) is a mammoth federal agency which was created by the merger of several smaller agencies in 1953.²⁴⁴ Headed by a Secretary with cabinet rank, the Department consolidated virtually all of the existing federal activities in social and educational areas. As might be expected, its approach to legislative drafting reflects this consolidation. There is no single method used for formulating legislation; the approach varies with the problem.

At HEW, the bill enacting the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 was analyzed because the amendments presented several different approaches to the legislative drafting process. A number of separate amendments were drafted and combined into one bill.²⁴⁵ Most were very short,²⁴⁶ thus providing illustrations of the process of drafting routine bills, while another more complex proposal²⁴⁷ portrayed some of the processes utilized in developing more involved legislation.

On the shorter proposals, little can be added to what already appears in the HEW file summary section. Generally, all such proposals are drafted by personnel from the Legislation Division of the Office of General Counsel and are then circulated for comment to all interested and involved offices.²⁴⁸ On the other hand, the major proposal involved in this legislation, the Consolidation of Student Assistance Programs, does illustrate important characteristics of the drafting process with respect to important projects in HEW and permits a more thorough analysis of HEW's drafting philosophy.

244. Reorganization Plan 1, Act of April 1953, 67 Stat. 18, 5 U.S.C. § 623 (1964).

245. The amendments included were: Special Services for Disadvantaged Students, Aid to Graduate Education, Network for Knowledge, Medical Insurance for Members of the Teachers Corps and the Consolidation of Student Assistance Programs. HEW-HEA File No. I, II.

246. Medical Insurance for the Members of the Teachers Corps, Special Services for Disadvantaged Students, Aid to Graduate Education, Network for Knowledge. See HEW-HEA notes 1-19. See footnote 51 *supra* for instructions on the use of the file citation form.

247. Consolidation of Student Assistance Programs, HEW-HEA notes 20-39.

248. Intra-agency comment was quite extensive with major bills, See HEW-HEA notes 24, 25, 26, 27, 31, 32, 33; less extensive for minor bills, see HEW-HEA note 34; and sometimes non-existent, see HEW-HEA notes 18-19, Medical Insurance for Members of the Teacher Corps amendment. The decision to submit legislative drafts to a given constituent office for comment is made on the basis of the relationship of the office's functions to the proposal, or otherwise on the basis of the conclusion of the draftsmen or the legislative policy people that the office would have an interest. OMB normally makes this decision as between departments and agencies of the government. Circulation for such comment, if not carried to extremes, is ordinarily essential to assure that a proposal is both sound in policy and administratively feasible. It is also time-consuming.

The history of the Consolidation of Student Assistance Programs indicates that the initial recommendation for legislation came from the Secretary of HEW, John Gardner.²⁴⁹ In January of 1967, Secretary Gardner appointed a Grant Administration Advisory Committee composed of college and university business officers to work with the HEW Comptroller, on matters of mutual concern in the fiscal and administrative aspects of grant management.²⁵⁰ This committee recommended comprehensive legislation on student aid. The proposed legislation would consolidate existing laws affecting student assistance thus providing greater uniformity and ease of administration. The Grant Advisory Committee's proposal was ultimately accepted by the Secretary and as a first step in its implementation, in September 1967, a comparative table of student aid programs was compiled to be considered for inclusion in the consolidation.²⁵¹ This compilation was done mainly by Mr. Donald Hirsch, then Special Assistant to the HEW General Counsel, who was to be the principal draftsman of this section of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968.²⁵² It is significant that the draftsman was involved so early in the proposal's development. The interviews revealed that draftsmen consider it essential that they be involved in the policy development, at least of a major piece of legislation, so that their interpretation of the final wording of the bill will clearly reflect the policy desired.²⁵³ For this proposal the "task force" approach was used.²⁵⁴ A group, including representatives of all interested offices, was led by the Deputy Assistant for Legislation and given full responsibility for developing policy and

249. HEW-HEA note 20.

250. See HEW-HEA notes 20, 21, and 22.

251. Letter from Donald Hirsch, HEW, to CATH. U.L. REV., Nov. 17, 1971, at 10 [hereinafter cited as Hirsch Letter].

252. An example of the possible problems which may result from not involving draftsmen in initial policy discussions is Mr. Hirsch's recollection of the beginnings of the Networks for Knowledge proposal:

The Network for Knowledge proposal had its genesis (Mr. Howe once told me) in a conversation that he had with John Gardner as they were walking around the Washington Monument one afternoon. The sum of the conversation was that colleges and universities were not adequately communicating with each other, and that HEW ought to do something to facilitate their communication. Because of its initial conceptual vagueness, this proposal was probably the most difficult one for the Office of Education to translate into legislative policy specifications that could serve as a basis for legislative drafting.

Id. at 21.

253. As Mr. Saperstein, Ass't General Counsel for Legislation, has said, "[At the early conference stages] our staff can frequently make worthwhile contributions to the refinement or resolution of the issues involved. And our presence at the discussion not infrequently assists us in the drafting of the legislative language." Address by Mr. Sidney Saperstein to ABA Conference on Legislative Drafting, Catholic University, May 21, 1971.

254. Similar use of the task force concept is noted in the HUD section. See text accompanying footnotes 260-287, *infra*.

for drafting the final proposal.²⁵⁵ Mr. Hirsch, the principal draftsman, and Mr. Ellenbogen, a supervisory draftsman, were full members of this task force. The group was created in late August and by mid-October recommendations from individual task force members on items to be included in the proposed bill were circulated among the members and sent to the General Counsel's Office. Much of November was spent conferring on these proposals and drafts and comments on drafts were freely circulated among the task force.

At this stage, it is not uncommon for HEW to solicit comments from outside groups interested in the specific proposal. In this case, such comments were received from the American Personnel and Guidance Association and the American Council on Education.²⁵⁶

Also at this stage there was some input from OMB. Although they did not have a representative on the Task Force, since it was an HEW proposal, Mr. Stefan Plehn of OMB, was present at some of the policy discussions. Although not indicated by the files, this probably insured that HEW policy would evolve in a form that would be acceptable to OMB. This procedure is especially significant when compared with the confusion that resulted during consideration of the Networks for Knowledge proposal. In that case, the original bill drafted by HEW was not acceptable to OMB for policy reasons. Consequently, a counter-proposal was sent to HEW by OMB, and evidently only for convenience, was put in draft form. Because HEW considered the OMB proposal to be poorly drafted, it had to be revised by Mr. Ellenbogen. The ensuing series of correspondence proved difficult for the Project to analyze since it was not clear whose drafting was being revised by whom. It is a procedure that needs

255. Task Force membership included (at the time of their work on the Higher Education Amendment 1968):

- Mr. Halperin, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Legislation.
- Mr. Muirhead, Associate Commissioner of Education for Higher Education.
- Mr. Ellenbogen, Assistant General Counsel, Division of Legislation.
- Mr. Hirsch, Special Assistant to General Counsel.
- Dr. Rosinski, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Health and Manpower.
- Mr. Bacon, Assistant to Assistant Secretary for Education.
- Mr. Moore, Director of Division of Student Financial Aid, Bureau of Higher Education.
- Mr. Pfluger, Office of the Assistant Secretary, Comptroller.
- Mr. Murphy, Special Assistant to Assistant Secretary for Legislation.
- Mr. Lasker, Division of Grant Administration Policy, Policy Branch Chief.
- Dr. Alford, Office of Education, Assistant Commissioner for Legislation.

256. See HEW-HEA note 35. In this particular case, the correspondence from interest groups did not substantially affect the draft. However, this practice should be considered an important part of the drafting process. In other bills studied, substantial changes resulted from interest group comments. See Airport-Airways user's tax changes in FAA section, text accompanying footnotes 92-122. Political considerations and strategy considerations, in that case, influenced the final bill's content.

some improvement.²⁵⁷

The Consolidation of Student Assistance, however, evidenced no such confusion. There were no policy problems with OMB and upon being sent there, it was perfunctorily approved with only minor changes and transmitted to Congress on February 5, 1968.

257. Mr. Hirsch, commenting on the Project's first draft of the HEW study, remembered the incident this way:

[T]he original HEW Networks for Knowledge draft was a detailed working-out of the concept as originated by Commissioner Howe and his colleagues. Unfortunately, only a relatively small appropriation amount could be initially authorized for it. In such circumstances, the Budget Bureau [now OMB] took the position that a detailed and careful articulation of the proposal might cause the Congress to enact it with a higher authorization for appropriations than proposed. The BOB therefore suggested that we substitute for the HEW draft merely a page of vaguely-worded authorities. Although the Department was prepared to accommodate the Budget Bureau's concerns, it was Mr. Ellenbogen's view that the Budget Bureau language was so pitifully inadequate and unintelligible as to risk subjecting the Department to some embarrassment on the Hill. He therefore redrafted the proposal so that, although shorter in compass than before, it would still be meaningful.

Hirsch Letter *supra* footnote 251, at 13.

An explanation of the OMB markup of the HEW Graduate Education proposal (HEW-HEA notes 6-10) was offered by Mr. Hirsch:

In the draft that we submitted to the Budget Bureau we had included, if I remember correctly, on oral instructions from the BOB relaying a White House decision, a provision intended to have *the effect* of amending a number of statutes under which Federal agencies were authorized to make payments to educational institutions to assist in paying their costs of educating students who had received certain fellowships for graduate or professional study therein. The object of the amendment (or non-amendment) was to increase the size of the payment authorized under those statutes. It is my recollection that Mr. Ellenbogen and I raised strong oral objections to this sort of provision as being *technically* objectionable because the provision did not in terms amend the statutes to which it was addressed. We were of the view that, if time did not permit the taking of an appropriate survey to determine what statutes would be affected by (and should therefore be amended to reflect) the decision to permit increased Federal supplementary payments to institutions of higher education, then it would be better to defer handling the matter, and therefore omit treating it in the draft bill. If I remember correctly, the Justice Department supported our position. The Budget Bureau mark-up, which eliminates the supplementary payment provision, represented a White House/BOB concession on the issue.

The two provisions that the authors of item 10 of the files summary appear to believe were "rewritten" by the Budget Bureau are wholly new material to incorporate several minor policy decisions which had not been taken at the time that the original draft of the graduate education title had been submitted to the Bureau. The first provision was inserted at the request of the National Science Foundation and the National Foundation of the Arts and the Humanities. It required the Commissioner of Education to consult with those Foundations to promote coordinated planning of programs under the title. The proposed BOB language was revised by us before its incorporation in the final draft bill. The second provision was intended to provide a new authority to the Commissioner and to other Federal agencies to transfer funds to each other in connection with the administration of the graduate education provisions. This authority was simply copied

However, a mere outline of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 does not do full justice to some of the rather unique feelings of the HEW draftsmen on the question of how to produce quality legislation. For example, HEW spokesmen were somewhat skeptical as to the value of codification, indicating that too often the rigidity and forced uniformity of the codification process detracted from the clarity of a particular single statute.²⁵⁸ Also, there was a general aversion among the draftsmen to guidelines or drafting manuals although they do retain a stock of “boilerplates” for emergency matters. As Mr. Hirsch has so succinctly pointed out “[d]rafting, while more of a craft than an art, is nevertheless a creative enterprise. Creativity—the imaginative search for new drafting solutions to knotty problems—is not likely to thrive in an environment cluttered with the rigidities of formalization.”²⁵⁹ Perhaps in the final analysis, the rather unique opportunities for program creativity within HEW generally—at least as compared with the more rigid Department of Defense—dictate unique approaches to the matter of legislative drafting.

by BOB from § 2(c) of the Cooperative Research Act, which had been drafted by Mr. Ellenbogen as an amendment to that Act included in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. (According to his best recollection, that provision in turn was patterned after authority in the National Science Foundation Act.)

Several other changes were also suggested by the BOB to reflect policy changes. The mark-up (*i.e.*, the final draft) was indeed “clearer” than our original draft because, primarily at our instance, it eliminated the most difficult and controversial of its provisions [emphasis in original].

Id. at 14.

258. *Id.* at 24.

259. *Id.*

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE FILES
HIGHER EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1968 (HEW-HEA)**

- FILE NO. I (1/10/68-1/31/68)** This file contains correspondence and memoranda pertaining to four proposals that were drafted and consolidated as part of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968. These particular amendments, although "minor" pieces of legislation, illustrate the legislative process in the Department.
- FILE NO. II (7/13/67-2/7/68)** This file contains the Department's legislative material pertinent to a "major" education amendment—the Consolidation of Student Assistance Programs. A task force approach was utilized within the Department consisting of both policymakers and legislative draftsmen. Comments were solicited from outside interest groups, as well as other agencies affected within the executive. Liaison and cooperation with the DOJ and the OMB is noted.

NAME

POSITION

FILE NO. I

- | | |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. Gescheider | Chief of Planning, Evaluation and Reports, Office of Education. |
| 2. Dr. Alford | Ass't Commissioner for Legislation, Office of Education. |
| 3. Mr. Ellenbogen | Ass't Gen. Counsel for Legislation. |
| 4. Miss Harrison | Attorney, Legislation Division of the Office of the Gen. Counsel (a member of Mr. Ellenbogen's staff). |
| 5. Mr. Halperin | Deputy Ass't Sec'y for Legislation. |
| 6. Mr. Miller | Ass't Sec'y for Education. |
| 7. Mr. Murphy | Special Ass't to the Ass't Sec'y for Legislation. |
| 8. Mr. Chernock | (Acting) Ass't Gen. Counsel for Education. |
| 9. Mr. Cohen | Ass't Gen. Counsel, Welfare and Rehabilitation Division, Office of Gen. Counsel. |
| 10. Mr. Huitt | Ass't Sec'y for Legislation. |
| 11. Mr. Willcox | Gen. Counsel. |
| 12. Mr. Muirhead | Assoc. Commissioner for Higher Education. |
| 13. Mr. Rommel | Ass't Director for Legislative Reference, OMB. |
| 14. Mr. Hirsch | Special Ass't to Gen. Counsel (on special detail to assist Mr. Ellenbogen, the principal draftsman of this bill). |
| 15. Miss Lawton | Attorney, Office of Legal Counsel, DOJ. |
| 16. Mr. Wyatt | Chief, Higher Education Branch, Education Division, Office of the Gen. Counsel. |
| 17. Mr. Kelly | Ass't Sec'y, Comptroller. |
| 18. Mr. Graham | Director, Teacher Corps. |
| 19. Mr. Howe | Commissioner of Education. |
| 20. Mrs. Fonner | Attorney, Legislation Division of the Office of Gen. Counsel (a member of Mr. Ellenbogen's staff). |

| NAME | POSITION |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>FILE NO. II</i> | |
| 21. Mr. Gardner | Secretary John Gardner, HEW. |
| 22. Mr. Saperstein | Deputy Ass't Gen. Counsel for Legislation, a principal draftsman in the Department. |
| 23. Mr. Packer | Ass't Gen. Counsel, OASI Division, Office of the Gen. Counsel. |
| 24. Mr. Rourke | Ass't Gen. Counsel, Public Health Grants and Services Division, Office of the Gen. Counsel. |
| 25. Mr. Rosinki | Deputy Ass't Sec'y, Health and Scientific Affairs (Health Manpower). |
| 26. Mr. Bacon | Ass't to the Ass't Sec'y for Education (in connection with the Federal Interagency Committee on Education). |
| 27. Mr. Dixon | In the Bureau of Health Manpower of the Public Health Service. |
| 28. Mr. Moore | Director, Division of Student Financial Aid, Bureau of Higher Education, Office of Education. |
| 29. Mr. Pfluger | Staff, Ass't Sec'y, Comptroller. |
| 30. Mr. Lasker | Division of Grants Administration Policy, Office of Ass't Sec'y, Comptroller. |
| 31. Mr. Plehn | Budget Examiner, OMB. |
| 32. Mr. Richman | First Ass't, Office of Legal Counsel, DOJ. |
| 33. Mr. Jasper | Legislative Reference, OMB. |

**HIGHER EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1968
(HEW-HEA)**

FILE NO. I

SPECIAL SERVICES FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

1. Jan. 10, 1968 From Mr. William G. Gescheider, Chief of Planning Evaluation and Reports, BHE, to Dr. Albert L. Alford.
Subject: Summaries of legislative proposals relating to Higher Education.
2. Jan. 19, 1968 From Legislative Section of the General Counsel's Office (Mr. Ellenbogen and Miss Harrison) to Messrs. Halperin, Miller, Alford, Murphy, Chernock, Cohen, Huit and Willcox.
Subject: Written first draft for clearance or comment entitled "Remedial Programs for Students in Need of Special Assistance." It should be noted that the draftsmen have raised several questions on their own about the legislation. Mr. Ellenbogen, for example, questions scope of different words.
3. No Date From Mr. Halperin to Mr. Ellenbogen.
Subject: Comments and answers on first draft to what he considered were the major questions raised. Program would include graduate students and it was also considered permis-

- sible to permit contracts in lieu of grants.
4. Jan. 23, 1968 From Mr. Peter P. Muirhead, Associate Commissioner for Higher Education to Mr. Ellenbogen, Ass't General Counsel for Legislation.
Subject: Specific comments on the draft. Called for definition of projects to be aided at the undergraduate level such that it would be broad enough to include program for assistance during the pre-freshman summer to students who have been accepted for enrollment. Mr. Halperin made several small (penciled in) comments to Muirhead's suggestion on 23 Jan. 1968.
5. Jan. 24, 1968 From Mr. Ellenbogen to Mr. Wilfred H. Rommel, Ass't Director for Legislative Reference, OMB.
Subject: New draft incorporating the comments and suggestions of Messrs. Halperin and Muirhead was written. The bill was now entitled "Special Service for Disadvantaged Students."

GRADUATE EDUCATION

6. Jan. 22, 1968 From Mr. Ellenbogen to Mr. Joel Cohen.
Subject: Mr. Ellenbogen had been requested to draft a legislative proposal that would authorize an increase of any such federal payment to an institution under a fellowship program for training in any field. In the meantime, draftsmen would put in catch-all phrase. Answer made by Mr. Cohen on the same day stating that no such statute existed at the current time.
7. Jan. 24, 1968 From Mr. Hirsch to Messrs. Alford, Halperin, Wyatt, Ellenbogen and Miss Mary Lawton, DOJ.
Subject: Draft of Graduate Education amendment is circulated for comment.
8. Jan. 25, 1968 From Dr. Alford to Mr. Hirsch.
Subject: Limited comments penciled in on the back of the bill by Dr. Alford.
9. Jan. 26, 1968 From Miss Lawton to Mr. Hirsch.
Subject: Comments on proposal, which were very limited.
Comment: Brings into question again the OLC's function of commenting on the draftsmanship and substance of other department proposals during the last two years of the Johnson Administration.
10. Jan. 26, 1968 *Subject:* Draft with many substantive changes. Two of the sections were completely rewritten by the OMB. Changes were not technical suggestions but essentially of a policy character.

NETWORK FOR KNOWLEDGE

11. Jan. 22, 1968 From Mr. Ellenbogen to Dr. Alford and Mr. Halperin.
Subject: Draft on a proposal which was not yet complete.

- Origination of proposal is not indicated in files.
12. Jan. 24, 1968 *Subject:* Draft completed. Substantially written by Mrs. Fonner of Ellenbogen staff.
13. Jan. 26, 1968 From Legislation Office to Messrs. Rommel, Asst. Dir. of Legislative Reference Bureau, OMB, Miller, Halperin, Kelly, and Chernock, and Miss Lawton, OLC, DOJ.
Subject: Draft of Act entitled "Networks for Knowledge Act of 1968" forwarded for comment. Draft had already been reviewed and processed by the Office of Education.
14. Jan. 29, 1968 From Mr. Miller to Mr. Ellenbogen.
Subject: Calls for a broadening of some provisions relating to communications such that all telecommunication transmissions would be included in the bill.
15. No Date *Subject:* OMB sent back a counter-proposal to HEW on the idea. Desire was to compress the draft because of the rather insignificant initial program ceiling of \$8 million.
16. Jan. 30, 1968 From Mr. Ellenbogen to Mr. Halperin.
Subject: Contains a revised draft prepared in light of discussion at a meeting with OMB in which draft above (item 15) was given to HEW. Mr. Ellenbogen believed the Bureau of the Budget's counter-proposal to be fuzzy and tried to make the draft shorter while retaining much of the specificity of HEW's earlier draft.
17. Jan. 31, 1968 *Subject:* Final version of the bill. It had been cleared by OMB but had not yet gone to Congress.

MEDICAL INSURANCE FOR MEMBERS OF THE TEACHER CORPS

18. Jan. 12, 1968 From Mr. Richard A. Graham, Director Teacher Corps to Dr. Alford.
Subject: Medical insurance amendment.
"We need a revision in language that will permit us to pay for medical insurance during such times as a person is a provisional or regular member of the Corps but is not covered by a policy provided teachers in the school systems by which they are employed."
19. Jan. 16, 1968 From Dr. Alford to Mr. Ellenbogen.
Subject: Asks for a draft of the above proposal. Simple draft of 10 lines was drawn up the same day and included in the draft bill submitted to Congress.

FILE NO. II

CONSOLIDATION OF STUDENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

20. July 13, 1967 From Secretary John W. Gardner to Messrs. Huitt and Howe.
Subject: The Secretary requests that there be developed comprehensive legislation on Student Aid, which combines existing programs. The Grant Administration Advisory Committee had expressed concern over conflicting administrative requirements in the various student aid legislation.

- p08 21. Aug. 31, 1967 From Mr. Halperin to Messrs. Muirhead, Ellenbogen, Hirsch, Rosinski, Bacon, Dixon, Moore, Pflugger, Murphy, Lasker and Alford.
Subject: Memorandum on Task Force on the Consolidation of Student Aid Programs.
22. Sept. 1, 1967 *Subject:* List of student aid programs to be included in comparative analysis.
23. Sept. 1, 1967 From Messrs. Saperstein and Ellenbogen to Messrs. Chernock, Packer, Rourke and Cohen.
Subject: Asks for brief summary of program in order to comply with Secretary's request for greater uniformity in requirements, conditions and other aspects and perhaps solidation of various student aid programs.
24. Sept. 18, 1967 From Mr. Halperin to Task Force.
Subject: Asks for comments on Office of Education and Public Health Service justification of differing program requirements.
25. Sept. 19, 1967 From Dr. Alford to Mr. Huitt.
Subject: Letter which includes specifications for amendments proposed by the Bureau of Higher Education which had been reviewed by Commissioner Howe and Dr. Alford.
26. No Date *Subject:* Several memoranda followed containing recommendations of the members of the committee during the month of October. Some members put their suggestions in draft form. Several drafts were sent in for discussion at the task force meetings. All of these memos and draft proposals were being sent to Mr. Halperin.
27. Oct. 23, 1967 From Mr. Halperin to Task Force.
Subject: Calls for review of specifications for Office of Education legislative proposal (HEW-HEA, memo 25) and completing agreement on Public Health Service bill so that attorneys could proceed to more detailed drafting.
28. Oct. 27, 1967 *Subject:* Proposed calendar by OE's Bureau of Student Financial Aid on consolidation of student aid; outlined meetings, etc., through congressional passage. No indication it was adopted by Task Force.
Comment: It should be noted that the draftsmen have been in the process from a very early stage.
29. Nov. 14, 1967 *Subject:* Task Force discussion of draft and other issues.
30. Nov. 17, 1967 From Messrs. Matthias and Lasker to Mr. Halperin.
Subject: Describing some budgeting trends.
31. Nov. 19, 1967 *Subject:* Fifth draft of specifications for Office of Education combined Student Assistance Program.
32. Nov. 20, 1967 *Subject:* Sixth draft.
33. Nov. 20, 1967 From Mr. Halperin to Task Force.
Subject: List of advantages of new program. He sent specifications and a list of advantages to be circulated for comment within the agency task force.

34. Nov. 27, 1967 From Mr. Halperin to Task Force.
Subject: Progress to date. Public Health Service and Mr. Hirsch were continuing to revise health specifications in light of the Office of Education proposal. Mr. Stefan Plehn of the OMB was present at the meeting as well.
35. Dec. 13, 1967 From Mr. Moore to Mr. Halperin.
Subject: About criticisms received from selected outside groups that attended the meeting on Dec. 7, 1967. During early December there was much correspondence from various financial aid associations such as American Personnel and Guidance Association, American Council on Education and CEEB.
36. Jan. 22, 1968 From Mr. Ellenbogen to Mr. Rommel.
Subject: A draft of the proposed consolidation of the educational opportunity grant, national defense student loan and work-study programs. Draft had been reviewed by Mary Lawton of the Office of Legal Counsel of the Justice Department. The draft was 29 pages.
37. Jan. 26, 1968 From Mr. Martin F. Richman, First Assistant, OLC, DOJ, to Mr. Herbert N. Jasper, Legislative Reference, OMB.
Subject: Comment on proposal. Not very substantial, e.g., renumbering and changing positions of bill provisions.
38. Feb. 5, 1968 *Subject:* Bills sent to Speaker of the House.
39. Feb. 7, 1968 *Subject:* Acknowledgment from Speaker McCormack of receipt of the bill.