

UNITED STATES



U.S. CONGRESS

OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 117—PART 5

MARCH 9, 1971, TO MARCH 16, 1971

(PAGES 5461 TO 6806)

this subsection shall be regarded as wheat acreage;

"(4) the Secretary shall utilize the technical services of agencies of the Department of Agriculture in determining the scope and provisions of any plan and the acceptability of the plan for effectuating the purposes of the program. The Secretary shall also, in accordance with existing law, make those technical services available to the land owner or operator to assist in developing plans under this Section. In addition, the Secretary shall take into consideration programs of State and local agencies, including soil conservation districts, having for their purposes the objectives of maximum soil and water conservation;

"(5) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitations, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section, except that the total cost of the program (excluding administrative costs) shall not exceed \$150,000,000, and for any program year payments shall not exceed \$25,000,000. The funds made available for the program under this section may be expended without regard to the maximum payment limitation and small payment increases required under section 8(e) of this Act, and may be distributed among States without regard to distribution of funds formulas of section 15 of this Act. The program authorized under this subsection shall be in addition, to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such area authorized by this or any other Act."

By Mr. BELLMON:

S. 1159. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize a study of the feasibility and desirability of establishing a unit of the national park system to commemorate the opening of the Cherokee Strip to homesteading, and for other purposes" (84 Stat. 986). Referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, in 1970, Congress authorized a study of the feasibility and desirability of establishing a unit of the national park system to commemorate the opening of the Cherokee Strip to homesteading. The act authorizes not only a study of the Cherokee Strip but also the historical cattle trails which crossed this area and other arteries of commerce which crossed the Nation.

I am today introducing a bill to amend that act to provide that that study which will be conducted also include the area which was known as "No Man's Land." This area which lay outside the limits of the Louisiana Purchase was considered a part of Mexico until the formation of the Republic of Texas in 1836. The tradition that slavery should not exist above the thirty-six thirty caused Texas to give it up in 1850. As the boundaries of other States which surround Oklahoma were fixed, there remained literally a "No Man's Land" entirely outside the limits of any State or territory. By the Organic Act of 1890 this area was finally included as a part of the Territory of Oklahoma.

There are many historical features of this area that would contribute to the overall study. For example, the Old Santa Fe Trail crosses part of this area. Also there are dinosaur pits, lava formations, and Indian pictographs that might be lost without some consideration being given to their historical and cultural

value. More important this area was important in the expansion and development of our country during those formative years.

The enactment of this legislation will insure that this area will be considered when a study of the Cherokee Strip and the cattle trails is made.

Mr. President, "No Man's Land" was once one of the most colorful and historical areas in our Nation. A wealth of knowledge about the winning of the West and about life in Pioneer America is available there today. The lives of countless Americans living and unborn can be greatly enriched by proper development of this area for historical and tourism purposes.

By Mr. HANSEN:

S. 1160. A bill relating to the rehabilitation of areas damaged by deleterious mining practices, and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to provide for a Federal contribution through the Bureau of Mines for projects to seal and fill voids in abandoned coal mines and abandoned oil and gas wells and to reclaim and rehabilitate lands affected by the strip and surface mining and processing of coal and other minerals.

Similar legislation to aid in the rehabilitation of areas damaged by deleterious mining practices has been enacted with regard to the Appalachian area of our Nation. The Appalachian area has particularly suffered from subsidence problems resulting from the collapse from abandoned mines, and the Congress has recognized the disastrous effect this can have on the quality of human life and the economic growth of a particular area. However, Appalachia is not the only section of the country which experiences these problems. My own State of Wyoming has experienced subsidence problems. Other States such as Washington, Michigan, Oklahoma, and many others have the same experience. However, Federal assistance has been limited to the Appalachian area.

Recently, under the terms of the demonstration grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Dowell Division of Dow Chemical Co. backfilled an abandoned coal mine area under the city of Rock Springs, Wyo., using a new technique it had developed. The demonstration project was conducted last October and every indication to this date points that this technique has proven extremely successful. Official reports will be coming from the Bureau of Mines and the Department of Housing and Urban Development in the next several months. Of prime importance is the fact that the Dowell technique for backfilling abandoned mines provides greater surface support in potential subsidence areas and is much less expensive than previous techniques which have been used in the Appalachian areas.

Because the Dowell technique is a much more efficient and economically feasible method of tackling the subsidence problem, it is important that all

cities and towns in this Nation which face potential subsidence be given an opportunity to solve the problem. Justice and equity require that Federal assistance which was given to the Appalachian area to solve subsidence problems in populated areas be extended to the entire Nation.

Since the Dowell technique offers a much less expensive method of treating these areas, it is certainly within the means of the Federal Government to offer its assistance to all areas of the Nation which face these problems.

Mr. President, I respectfully request that this legislation be referred to the appropriate committee and that the Senate swiftly enact the legislation.

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 1161. A bill to assist in removing the financial barriers to the acquisition of a postsecondary education by all those capable of benefiting from it. Referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, it will come as no surprise to students, parents, and educators to hear that the cost of college education continues to skyrocket. Our country has increasingly recognized the benefits which come to the Nation and its citizens where higher education is broadly based. We have not been content to let postsecondary education remain a privilege of the wealthy few. We have sought to make college education available to young Americans willing and able to gain from the experience, but we have failed.

Mr. President, it is for that reason that I today introduce the Student Assistant Act of 1971.

Clark Kerr, who headed the Carnegie Foundation's inquiry into higher education has said:

Today a young man or woman whose family's income is in the top half of the national income range has three times the chance to get a college education as one whose family is in the bottom half.

It is more than mere coincidence that students coming from families with a high socioeconomic status are far more likely to attend college than students from families of low socioeconomic status. The tragedy is that this is true regardless of the student's ability.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record several tables to illustrate this situation.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TABLE 1.—DEGREE CREDIT COLLEGE ATTENDANCE BY FEBRUARY 1967 OF OCTOBER 1965 HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS WHO GRADUATED FROM HIGH SCHOOL BY FAMILY INCOME

Family income	[In percent]	
	Attended college	Did not attend
Under \$3,000.....	19.8	80.2
\$3,000 to \$3,999.....	32.3	67.7
\$4,000 to \$5,999.....	36.9	63.1
\$6,000 to \$7,499.....	41.1	58.9
\$7,500 to \$9,999.....	51.0	49.0
\$10,000 to \$14,999.....	61.3	38.7
\$15,000 and over.....	86.7	13.3
Total entrance rate.....	46.9	53.1

This table indicates the differences in entrance rates between students coming from low- and high-income families. Assuming that entrance rates are to be equalized between students coming from families with incomes below \$10,000 and students with family incomes in the \$10,000 to \$15,000 range, the following gap in entrance rates would have to be closed:

TABLE II.—Gap in college entrance rates—Degree-credit students

Family income:	Percent
Under \$3,000.....	41.5
\$3,000 to \$3,999.....	29.0
\$4,000 to \$5,999.....	24.4
\$6,000 to \$7,499.....	20.2
\$7,500 to \$9,999.....	10.3
\$10,000 to \$14,999.....	1.0

¹ Equals base.

Source: Factor's Related to High School Graduation and College Attendance 1967, U.S. Census Bureau.

It should be noted that this study includes only those students attending degree-credit programs in institutions of higher education. If the students attending vocational programs in colleges and universities were included, the entrance rates shown would be higher (approximately 6%).

COLLEGE ENTRANCE RATES

The following table shows the college entrance rates by SES quartiles and ability halves for full- and part-time students in 2- and 4-year institutions offering degree credit programs. It should be noted that vocational programs are also offered by such institutions and that students taking vocational programs in degree credit institutions are reflected in the entrance rates.

TABLE III.—ENTRANCE RATES, BY ABILITY AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS TO 2-YEAR AND 4-YEAR INSTITUTIONS—FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME STUDENTS

[In percent]

Ability	SES quartiles				Total enrollment rates
	Low 1st	2d	3d	High 4th	
Top half.....	58.0	66.3	78.3	87.8	74.5
Bottom half.....	31.2	33.9	44.4	59.4	39.5
Total entrance rates.....	44.0	51.8	66.3	81.1	60.7

Source: "Growth Study" conducted by Educational Testing Service, 1967.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the information in these tables simply puts numbers on what most of us know intuitively, that high school seniors coming from families with a low income are far less likely to go to college than those coming from families with middle to high income. The tables show that the factor which is most likely to determine whether or not an individual attends college is not his or her ability, but rather his or her family's economic status.

Once again those at the bottom of the scale suffer the most. They are the people described as disadvantaged because they have so little going for them. An inordinate number of them are members of minority groups—Negroes, Indians, Mexican Americans, Asians, and Puerto Ricans. Many come from rural areas or pockets of poverty in remote areas and urban ghettos. The chance to go to college is no more than a pipedream without the necessary support from their family, friends, and educational system.

By allowing these disadvantages to continue; by allowing the cycle of poverty to repeat itself without interruption; by allowing talent to go unused, we are squandering our Nation's most precious resource. But the problem does not stop with the lowest socioeconomic classes. A large number of working class Americans are finding it more and more difficult to finance a college education for their children. Although they work hard their salaries are not high.

The meager savings they manage to set aside are quickly eaten up by health and employment emergencies. Pay increases generally just keep them abreast of the rapidly rising cost of living. Keeping this in mind, we can understand their plight when we see that the cost of college education has risen even more rapidly than the cost of living.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table illustrating this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE IV.—INCREASE IN THE COST OF ATTENDING PUBLIC AND NONPUBLIC 4-YEAR UNIVERSITIES FOR 1 YEAR COMPARED WITH THE INCREASE IN THE CONSUMER PRICE INDEX, 1960-70

	1960	1970	Percent increase
Consumer Price Index (1967=100)...	88.7	116.1	31
Public university.....	\$881	\$1,390	58
Nonpublic university.....	\$1,701	\$2,993	76

Note: The Office of Education tells us that on the average, it costs \$1,248 to attend a public institution of higher learning for 1 year, which includes 4-year universities, 4-year colleges, and 2-year institutions. For all private institutions the average is \$2,722. Next year the costs will be greater.

Sources: U.S. Statistical Abstract, table 192 and Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the fact is that more and more Americans are not able to pay these prices. It is estimated that over a million young people must forgo college today, not because they lack ability or desire, but because they lack the necessary money. Unless we do something now to eliminate these inequities and end this waste of manpower, higher education may once again become the privilege of the wealthy few.

If a growing number of students and parents cannot stand the rising costs of education, who can? The findings of the recently published Carnegie Commission report, "The New Depression in Higher Education," make it clear that the schools are unable to avoid the pinch of increasing costs and decreasing incomes.

After visiting a substantial mix of 41 different colleges and universities across the Nation, the study concluded that 71 percent were either in financial trouble or headed for it. The author is understandably loath to make the sweeping generalization that this 71-percent figure would hold true for all 2,729 institutions of higher education in the country. Nonetheless, it is sobering to find listed among those headed for financial trouble such distinguished schools as the University of Minnesota, the University

of Michigan, the University of Chicago, and Harvard University. Among those determined already to be in financial trouble are Stanford University and the University of California at Berkeley. Our Nation's colleges and universities are clearly up against a financial wall.

A large part of the problem is that tuition covers only a part of the total expense of educating any given student. In 1968-69 students bore only 34 percent of the total cost of higher education. For private institutions, tuition and fees covered 64 percent of the cost of education, while in public institutions it came to only 19 percent.

The problem will not be solved simply by giving needy students the money they require for tuition and sending them off to school, because the schools cannot afford to take them if there is no other money coming in to meet the additional expenses. In short, the schools need nearly as much assistance as the students to meet the crush of rising costs. Clearly, we cannot expect the colleges to solve the problem unassisted.

Nor can we reasonably expect the States will step into the breach. Many observers have noted a decline in State support of higher education in the wake of student unrest during the past few years. However, a longer perspective shows that this is just part of a continuing trend. In 1957-58, State and local government support of higher education amounted to 33 percent of costs. By 1967-68, before a number of critical disturbances, the figure had dropped to 25 percent.

There are many reasons for declining support from State and local government, but one of the most important is simple financial capacity. The demands on State and local resources are constantly expanding in both scope and magnitude. As result, even where there is willingness to increase, or at least to maintain the existing level of support, other requirements often make that impossible.

One further point is worth noting. Individuals with college training are among the most mobile elements of our society. Investing money in the education of a person who then moves to another State, may be viewed from the perspective of an individual State as a bad investment and a loss to the State economy. Certainly such a view is unreasonably narrow, but it can affect the national manpower pool and individual lives.

What I am discussing is a problem with national dimensions and national importance. The State and local governments cannot provide the solution, nor can the colleges or individuals involved. Therefore, I am proposing legislation that will provide: First, grants to undergraduate and graduate students based solely on need, up to the national average cost of attendance for the type school they are attending, either public or private; second, assistance to institutions where these students enroll, to help offset the cost of education beyond tuition and fees; third, fellowships for graduate and professional students in their

third and fourth years of graduate study; fourth, a private nonprofit bank to increase the flexibility and assure the availability of student loans; fifth, outreach to identify and encourage high school students who otherwise might not seek further education; and sixth, and inter-agency coordinating committee to improve the administration of the various student aid programs.

I am not asking any of those who co-sponsor this proposal to support all of its specific and detailed provisions. My purpose is to find the best possible legislation for dealing with the problems of providing assistance to college students and institutions of higher education.

Before explaining the particular provisions of this legislation, I think it is appropriate to discuss the wisdom of this type of investment. The most important gain is also the most difficult to measure. How can we calculate what it means to a person when a blank wall is replaced with a broad horizon and when frustration is replaced with fulfillment? However, that might be measured, we know we can multiply it a million times just to get started. In human terms there is no question about the importance of the legislation I am proposing today.

In economic terms, this legislation is a bargain. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reports that in a lifetime of working, a college graduate will make \$213,000 more than a high school graduate. What that means to a family's buying power and how it affects the next generation's capacity to go to college are obvious.

For the economy as a whole, additional skills are put to use. More money is pumped into the economy, acting to spur the growth of still more goods and services.

With regard to the Government's economic interest, according to the Internal Revenue Service, approximately two-thirds of all taxpayers pay 15 percent or more of their income in Federal personal income taxes. At this rate the minimum tax return on the additional \$213,000 made possible by a college education would be \$31,950.

Another way of predicting the likely impact of this program on tax revenue is to look at the GI bill, one of the most successful education programs ever undertaken by the Federal Government. The educational benefits available through this law made it possible for millions to return from war duty and complete their education; 7,800,000 World War II veterans and 2,391,000 Korean conflict veterans participated in the first two GI bills. Among these, according to the count of the Veterans' Administration, in the last Congress there were 11 U.S. Senators and 116 U.S. Representatives. I am one of those who was fortunate enough to qualify for this assistance. The total cost of these programs was \$19 billion. The benefits of the first two GI bills ended in 1965 after approximately 20 years of operation. At that time, the Veterans' Administration concluded:

An analysis of incomes of veterans and non-veterans in the same age groups, made with the help of the Department of Labor and

the Department of Commerce, shows that incomes of veterans who received G.I. bill help in education averaged from \$1000 to \$1500 a year more than of those who did not. On this basis, we estimate that the trained and educated veterans paid additional income taxes in excess of \$1 billion a year. The G.I. Bill provisions for education covered a period of 20 years; the estimate of \$1 billion annually in added taxes totals a \$20 billion return in taxes alone on the \$19 billion cost of the program.

One billion dollars in added tax revenue per year. And this is continuing. By the time the generations who participated in the first two GI bill programs complete their work life the added tax return will more than double that of each tax dollar originally spent for the program.

The millions who have been fortunate enough to qualify for education assistance under the provisions of the GI bill have proved—in concrete ways—for all to see, what a national commitment to education can mean. We have seen how a Federal program which provides assistance directly to students has worked. This task before us now is to extend this successful approach.

WHAT THE BILL WILL DO

First. Student opportunity grants will be provided solely on the basis of need, directly to students who are pursuing postsecondary education at least half time. Eligibility will continue for 4 years—or its part-time equivalent—of postsecondary vocational or undergraduate study, unless the student is enrolled in a program that requires longer than 4 academic years for the baccalaureate degree. The longest period of eligibility is 5 academic years or its part-time equivalent.

Graduate and professional students will also be eligible for these grants for a period not to exceed 4 academic years, or its part-time equivalent enrollment beyond the baccalaureate degree.

The only requirement for eligibility in applying is enrollment in or presumed admission to a postsecondary—including vocational—or higher education institution. The student will attend the school of his or her choice, with the grant being dispensed through the institution.

Students will be able to apply for a grant as early as the 11th grade of high school. Although grants made at that time will be reviewed when the student graduates from high school, it is necessary that the student have an early indication of the amount available for postsecondary education. In a report to the President entitled, "Toward a Long-Range Plan for Federal Financial Support for Higher Education," the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare suggests that:

There is some evidence that changes in the cost of college have a greater impact on college attendance if these changes are made known to students early in their high school careers. If there were a fundamental improvement in the method of financing student's education, it is likely that the long range impact of this change would be to remove some of the barriers to college attendance which we identify as motivational in the short run.

The provision for part-time study is included to increase the flexibility of this program as it responds to the needs of students. There are some students whose families require that they engage in heavy part-time work loads in order to attend school. With part-time work, plus the aid available through this program, a student who otherwise could not, will be able to attend college.

The reason for giving money to the individual student is to provide the most assistance where it is most needed. An equivalent amount of money spent on aiding institutions of higher education—as opposed to students—would not have the same impact of easing the financial burden of college attendance on families or reducing this obstacle to college attendance. That kind of aid would help institutions meet their mounting costs. It would ease the pressures for increases in tuition. But it would not provide specific assistance for those who would not decide to attend college without assurance of financial aid. The prospects for raising the money they need for attending college would be as hopeless as ever.

The amount of the grant will be determined by the amount the student will be able to contribute toward his or her own education and what it will actually cost to attend the school of his or her choice. The expected family contribution and student savings, as determined by the Commissioner, will comprise what the student is expected to pay. The cost of attendance will be the actual cost of tuition, fees, room and board at the school the student chooses. If the student is eligible for the full amount of the grant, he or she can receive 100 percent of the cost of attendance up to the first \$1,400. This is more than the national average cost of attendance at public 4-year universities, which means the cost of attending most public institutions will be fully covered by the grant.

The maximum amount of any grant will be equal to the national average cost of attendance at nonpublic 4-year universities, which right now is around \$3,200. As the cost of attendance rises above \$1,400 the grant is increased by a percentage of the additional amount. The higher the cost, the smaller the percentage will be. One effect of this graduated scale, of course, is to provide a measure of cost control, because increasing costs are not fully reimbursed. More important though, is the fact that the doors of private institutions will finally be opened to all who have been denied simply because they did not have enough money.

If we are sincerely dedicated to the goal of equal opportunity for all students we cannot allow private institutions to remain forever beyond the reach of low income students. In addition, we cannot expect public schools to absorb all the new students this bill would create. Private schools throughout the Nation currently have vacancies which can be and should be filled by any expansion of the student population.

The student opportunity grants provided by this bill will guarantee every student with the interest and ability the chance to attend the school of his choice.

These grants will be a giant step toward making higher education a right not a privilege.

Second. A cost of education allowance will provide the additional money schools will need to educate the students assisted with grants. I have already noted that student charges do not nearly cover the cost of providing a student's education, and that we can come nowhere near solving the total problem unless we provide assistance to the schools as well as the students. Categorical grant programs offer some relief, but unfortunately they also tend unduly to alter the priorities set by individual institutions. The schools are encouraged to engage in activities which do not coincide with their greatest needs.

Therefore, institutions attended by recipients of student opportunity grants will be paid a direct cost of education allowance for each grant recipient, based on a graduated scale. For an undergraduate freshman, it would be 50 percent of the first \$200 of the student's grant and 25 percent of everything over that. Because it costs more to educate students as they progress toward their degree. The 25 percent rises to 30 percent for sophomores, 35 percent for juniors, 40 percent for seniors, and 50 percent for graduate students.

The result of providing these individual and institutional grants will be to give students the money they need to go to school, and give schools the money they need to maintain high standards of instruction.

Third. A Federal Fellowship program will provide awards to assist graduate students of exceptional ability, who also demonstrate financial need, to complete their final two years of study toward the Doctor of Philosophy, or equivalent degree. These fellowships, 15,000 the first year, will be awarded directly to the student, to study in the institution of his choice.

The amount of the stipend will be determined by the Commissioner of Education in accordance with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs, except that the stipend will not be less than \$2,800 nor more than \$3,500 for each academic year of study, not to exceed 2 years. An allowance of \$300 per dependent, not to exceed \$1,500, will be paid to the student if he has dependents.

A cost-of-education allowance will be paid to the institution in which the student is pursuing his study. This amount will be one and one-half times the grant to the student—not including the allowance for dependents—less any amount charged the student for tuition.

They will be based solely on ability and need rather than on the student's field of study.

The rationale for extending eligibility for the student opportunity grants to graduate and professional degree students is the same for making this aid available to postsecondary vocational and undergraduate students: to remove the financial barrier to higher education.

The cost of attending graduate or professional school is often higher than that of attending undergraduate school. The

student, moreover, often cannot count upon family support for graduate school. Students from high-income families are more likely than students of equal ability from low-income families to attend graduate school. This bill will seek to remove this inequality.

The new fellowships are provided for several reasons. First, graduate enrollments are increasing at a faster pace than undergraduate enrollments. This is putting an increasing strain upon present sources of graduate support, many of which are supplied by State governments, private endowments, and foundations. We must assure that the flow of this highly trained talent will continue.

Second, most of the present aid provided by the Federal Government for graduate education is tied to the field of study or the type of research a given graduate student undertakes. The effect of this has been to encourage graduate education in some areas while discouraging it in others.

Third, many of the present federally aided graduate benefits are available only through specific universities which have received the authority to grant these aids. This means that the student must be registered in an institution which participates in a program that dispenses graduate aid.

This bill will eliminate many of these deficiencies. It will not replace present federally aided graduate assistance. Many of these programs have performed successfully and will no doubt continue to do so. But this bill will make eligibility dependent upon ability and need, rather than the field of study or the particular institution in which a student is registered.

Fourth, a higher education loan bank will be chartered as a private, non-profit corporation. Its purpose will be to provide loans to postsecondary vocational, undergraduate, graduate, and professional students for a period of up to 5 years of graduate or professional study. The amount of the loan will not exceed the cost of attendance less any other Federal aid received.

Loans will be guaranteed against default, death, and disability by the Federal Government. Interest payments and repayments of the principal will be deferred until a student has completed his schooling and for a period of time up to 3 years after that time for such services as the Peace Corps, VISTA, or the armed services. There will be no forgiveness features similar to those of the national defense student loan program. The bank, however, will be eligible to establish for each year a low earnings cancellation provision providing for canceling, in whole or in part, or annual repayment in any year in which repayment constitutes a hardship. This will encourage persons who might be reluctant to undertake these loans, because of their fear of failure in college work, or because of their hesitation to undertake the obligation of large sums, to do so. Then if their income is very low, part of their loan will be canceled.

This bank would be an improvement on the present system in several ways. A student can now go to a local bank for

a guaranteed loan. However, there is often no money available for such loans. Even when there is money, the student is usually considered in relation to his or her family's credit rating with local lending institutions. Consequently some students with academic promise fail to receive these loans because of their family's credit rating. Another common problem is that loans are denied because the students' family has not had a long established account with the bank. The result, however, is the same, the student does not get the loan.

In addition, this bank will be able to tap larger pools of money than does the present guaranteed loan program. Pension funds, insurance investment funds, and other large pools of money may be available to a higher education loan bank. The managers of these funds, however, are unwilling to make this money available on a loan-by-loan basis to students at the present time. This bank will provide a structure whereby these funds may be channeled to students.

Finally, loans made by this bank should be somewhat cheaper than present loans. The provisions for the bank isolate its loans from the private market to some extent. The Federal guarantee of the securities sold by the bank and the Government guarantee of the loan itself will reduce the costs of these loans. The use of the Internal Revenue Service to collect these debts will substantially reduce collection costs.

Fifth. A student outreach program will supplement existing efforts. The present student outreach programs, Upward Bound and Talent Search, have identified and helped to motivate thousands of students during the last few years. Without the effort of these programs, thousands of students who are now in postsecondary education programs would not be there.

Nevertheless, I believe that additional efforts are needed. The number of able students who are not yet in postsecondary education programs indicates a large field that has yet to be tapped. In addition, the massive Federal effort envisioned by this bill must make its full impact felt by providing new efforts to identify and motivate students to attend college. I think that this can be done by striking out in several new directions.

We can involve high school teachers and students in these efforts more than we do now. We can do this by providing Federal training courses for high school teachers and counselors and for members of student councils. These courses can provide new ways that these trained persons can keep high school students up to date on postsecondary financial aid, study programs, and career possibilities. Many students need assistance in making their future educational plans. We must make certain that they have adequate information on which to base these plans.

We must also provide aid to the colleges for their recruitment efforts. Many sensitive educators have long remarked that if the colleges of this country would emphasize academic recruitment of students from low-income families as

much as they emphasize the recruitment of athletes, the opportunity disparities between rich and poor students would be much less today. We should take advantage of the skill and know-how of universities in recruitment efforts. This bill will provide Federal assistance for this purpose to colleges which develop especially effective efforts at recruitment.

When students and their parents are making postsecondary educational plans they need ready access to information about financial aid, career, and college possibilities. This bill will establish higher education opportunity centers throughout the country for this purpose. Most can use existing Federal facilities. Some can use roving recruiters. All can make printed information available at all times.

The paucity of information about those who do not attend college is truly amazing. We know little about how to identify these people or how to orient them positively toward postsecondary education. We know little about the mix of factors, such as motivation, finances, and ability, which determine who does and who does not go to college. As a result I think it would be well to establish a special Council on College Opportunities within the Office of Education which would have independent responsibility for examining and recommending improvements in this area.

With the advice of this Council the Commissioner of Education would first fund research projects—either institutional or individual—designed to develop better ways to identify and motivate students who might potentially benefit from postsecondary education; and, second, develop measures designed to monitor the change in the postsecondary and higher education opportunity structure. This structure should be defined broadly, but it should include measures of the improvement we are making in assuring a college education for all who can benefit from it. We know, for example, that the percentage of high school graduates who attend college each year is increasing. But we do not know whether it is improving as fast—or improving at all—for the poor and lower income groups as it is for the upper income groups, whether it is increasing as fast for our rural youth as for our city youth, and others.

Sixth. An interagency coordinating committee consisting of representatives from agencies administering student aid programs will be established.

We need a structure through which these agencies can regularly exchange information. I think they should have the opportunity to discuss their programs with each other. The committee should explore possible ways that they can identify individuals potentially able to benefit from further education and encourage them in this direction.

Mr. President, we have come a long way from higher education which was a privilege for the few who could afford it to higher education for all the talented who need and want it. Unfortunately, however, we still have a long way to go. And unless we act soon, much of the progress we have made will be lost to rapidly increasing costs. Both the stu-

dents and the schools need money. This bill will make that money available. Graduate students need help and the student loan system needs to be improved. This will make substantial improvements in those areas. Outreach and program coordination efforts need to be significantly increased. This bill will increase those efforts.

In short, the legislation I am introducing is a comprehensive attack on both the problems and inequities in our system of higher education. We can afford to wait no longer, and I urge the Congress to act now.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

S. 23

At the request of Mr. SCHWEIKER, the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) were added as cosponsors of S. 23, the Ethnic Heritage Studies Centers Act of 1971.

S. 423

At the request of Mr. McINTYRE, the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 423, a bill to limit Federal payments to individual farm producers to \$10,000 per crop per farm.

S. 424

At the request of Mr. McINTYRE, the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) were added as cosponsors of S. 424, a bill to require that certain articles of wearing apparel be permanently labeled with laundering and dry cleaning instructions.

S. 649

At the request of Mr. MANSFIELD, the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 649, a bill to abolish the Interstate Commerce Commission at a future date and to establish a commission to make recommendations with respect to carrying out the functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission after such date.

S. 1030

At the request of Mr. RANDOLPH, the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1030, a bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act in order to assure rehabilitation services to older blind persons, and for other purposes.

S. 1030

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of my senior colleague (Mr. RANDOLPH), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the junior Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL) be added as a cosponsor of S. 1030, a bill to amend the Educational Rehabilitation Act in order to assure rehabilitation services to older blind persons, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BELLMON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 1062

At the request of Mr. JAVITS, the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1062, a bill to establish a National Foundation for Higher Education, and for other purposes.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 9—SUBMISSION OF A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CERTAIN SENATE HEARINGS

Mr. STENNIS submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 9) which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. CON. RES. 9

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Armed Services two thousand additional copies of the hearings before the Electronic Battlefield Subcommittee of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee during the Ninety-first Congress, second session, entitled "Investigation Into Electronic Battlefield Program".

SENATE RESOLUTION 69—SUBMISSION OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT OF THE HISTORY OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 69) which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 69

Resolved, That there be printed, with illustrations, as a Senate document a compilation of materials relating to the history of the Senate Committee on Government Operations in connection with its fiftieth anniversary (1921-1971).

Sec. 2. In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed five thousand copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Government Operations.

Sec. 3. One hundred copies shall be bound with a buckram cover and gold lettering for the use of the Committee on Government Operations.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON THE TRUST TERRITORY

Mr. BURDICK, Mr. President, for the information of the Senate and others who may be interested in the matter, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will hold a hearing on Tuesday, March 30, to take testimony from certain residents of Micronesia, who will be in the city at that time, on two pending measures.

The first bill is Senate Joint Resolution 35, to authorize an ex gratia contribution to certain inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands who suffered damages arising out of the hostilities of the Second World War, to provide for the payment of noncombat claims occurring prior to July 1, 1951, and to establish a Micronesian Claims Commission. The second bill is S. 860, relating to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, which also embraces, among other things, the establishment of a claims commission to settle the outstanding World War II and post-World War II claims of Micronesians.