

Work Study Program under
Vocational Education Act of 1963 -
April 7

Support of Higher Education Act
of 1965 - Sept. 2

Federal assistance to Higher
Education - Sept. 28

National Foundation for Social
Sciences - Oct 11



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 112

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 7, 1966

No. 61

STRENGTHENING OF WORK-STUDY PROGRAM UNDER VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to strengthen the work-study program under Public Law 88-210, the Vocational Education Act of 1963.

Although this program has been in operation but a short time, directors of area vocational technical schools in Minnesota have been unanimous in their praise of what it has accomplished. Through providing work opportunities to full-time students at vocational schools, it has made it possible for many students to stay in school who otherwise would have been forced to drop out for financial reasons. And it has provided valuable work experience, often in the vocation the student is planning to enter after graduation.

In the United States, during the present year, an estimated 85,100 students from age 15 through 20 are earning \$25 million in jobs provided under this work-study program. In Minnesota approximately 825 students are earning \$447,000.

My proposal would strengthen this program in three ways. It would eliminate the requirement that, as of July 1, local educational agencies pay 25 percent of the cost of student compensation. It would remove certain unreasonable restrictions on monthly and annual earnings. And it would increase the amount of money available to State and local authorities for administering the program.

As the law is presently written, 100-percent Federal financing is provided for the first 2 years, but beginning in fiscal year 1967 State and local authorities would have to supply 25 percent of the funds for student compensation. Many are unable to do so, because of the growing squeeze on State and local revenues. In my State, the onset of 75-25 matching would mean that local school boards would have to pay this 25 percent out of their limited resources. And since about three-quarters of students at Minnesota vocational schools are not residents of the school district where they attend, it is likely that some school boards would not feel justified in themselves providing the 25 percent required. I, therefore, urge that 100-percent Federal financing be maintained, and my bill would accomplish this objective.

Second, my bill would remove present limits on the amount a student may earn in a month or a school year. There are no such limits for the in-school program under the Neighborhood Youth Corps, which is similar in its other provisions to the general purpose. Moreover, the present limits hamper the operation of the program. A student is allowed to work 15 hours a week while school is in session, but he is limited to earnings of \$45 a month if he attends school within reasonable commuting distance of his home. This means that, if he is earning \$1 an hour, he can only work 3 full weeks out of the month. Eliminating the earnings limitation, while retaining the limit on hours, will eliminate this undesirable consequence of present regulations, and my bill would so provide.

Finally, my bill would provide a modest increase in the amount of work-study funds available for administration at the State and local level. At present State departments of education are allowed 1 percent of their allocation to administer a State plan, whereas the Department in Minnesota could effectively use up to 5 percent to strengthen the State program. Similarly, local authorities need some money for administration, particularly when carrying on the program during summer months when regular school officials are not automatically available to supervise.

My proposal would provide a total of up to 10 percent of allotted funds for administration. It is the intention of this bill that this money be used at both the State and the local level.

Mr. President, a large number of directors of area vocational-technical schools in Minnesota, and other important officials in this program, have written to me in support of the changes which the bill I am introducing today would provide. I therefore ask unanimous consent that these letters be printed at this point in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3205) to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1963 to strengthen the work-study program for vocational education students, introduced by Mr. MONDALE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The letters presented by Mr. MONDALE are as follows:

HIBBING AREA TECHNICAL INSTITUTE,
HIBBING PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Hibbing, Minn., January 3, 1965.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: At this institute, we have been operating under the work-study provisions of Public Law 88-210. We note that there are a number of discriminatory provisions in the act when one compares it to the economic opportunity work-study program.

I am enclosing an information sheet which contains a number of the changes we would like to see made. Of particular import is the limitation on student compensation while school is not in session. This should be indicated by the term "vacation," since many schools operate under different vacation time schedules than as written in the law, from July 1 to October 1.

We feel, further, that it is discriminatory to allow earnings of only \$45 per month or a maximum of \$350 per academic year since the limitation is 15 hours per week. The school district pays the minimum wage scale of \$1.25 per hour. A student under the above provision would not be able to work the maximum of 15 hours per week during the academic year.

Since we feel that this program affords the opportunity of earning while learning, it should be a continued program. We are justifiably concerned that after the fiscal year ending June 1967, when each school district would have to expend 25 percent of this cost to carry on with the work-study program, that many school districts, including our own, could not absorb the financial burden.

There are other items in the information data enclosed which bear consideration for changes. I would appreciate it if you would use your influence to encourage Congress to revise this portion of Public Law 88-210 in accord with the information attached.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM E. MAGAJNA,
Director.

SOUTHWEST MINNESOTA
VOCATIONAL SCHOOL,
Jackson, Minn., January 13, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
433 Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: This letter is being written to you concerning the work-study program which began operations last year. In my estimation it is the finest program that ever could have been inaugurated for schools such as ours. Certainly it seems vastly superior to the OEO programs which are in existence. I would like to submit the following amendments to the bill which I believe would be beneficial and in order when compared to the other OEO programs.

1. I would request that 10 to 15 percent of the total budget be allowed for supervision of the program. That is, if the total budget would amount to \$20,000, I would like the supervisor to be paid from \$2,000 to \$3,000 per year, and this be reimbursed to us.

2. As it now stands nonlocal school residents can earn a maximum of \$500 during a fiscal year, while local residents can earn up to \$350. It seems to me that this is quite inadequate to meet the needs of many of the students at our school, and I would request that this ceiling be removed or raised to some more satisfactory amount.

3. Students today can only work during summer vacations and expect to get paid for 8 hours a day. I would like to have all school holidays included so that the bill would read "vacations" rather than "summer vacations."

4. The 1 percent supervision allowance at the State level is totally inadequate to meet the needs of supervisors, and it would seem much more realistic to raise this to 5 percent.

Lastly, because we do feel quite strongly that this is an excellent program, we would wish that it remain at 100 percent reimbursement rather than the 75 percent reimbursement that has been written into the bill for 1967.

Any consideration which you may be able to engender in this regard will be greatly appreciated. If I can be of further help by supplying more information, I would be most happy to do so.

Sincerely yours,
DELBERT C. SCHWEIGER,
Director.

GRANITE FALLS AREA TECHNICAL
INSTITUTE,
Granite Falls, Minn., January 14, 1966.

Re Suggestions for amending section 13 of Public Law 88-210 work study program for vocational education students.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: We, in the area technical schools of Minnesota feel that one of the most important pieces of legislation now in effect is the work study program for students attending vocational schools. The act provides for financial assistance to students who may not otherwise be able to attend post high training facilities without some aid. We employ these students at various nonprofit agencies and pay them for their services.

At the present time, the law has some unfavorable limitations which I believe should be amended as follows:

Section 13(c)(3) should not have a limitation as to an amount in an academic year. The limitation as to 15 hours per week is fine. This would enable a student to work for a full 9 months instead of only 7 months.

Section 13(b)(2) Take out 1 percent and insert 5 percent. To effectively administer the program, sufficient funds must be made available.

Section 13(e)(2) Take out the sentence concerning State matching.

I also believe that approximately 10 percent of the total funds for the program should be allocated for local supervision.

I hope you will give these suggestions careful consideration and I urge you to end the discrimination against vocational students in work study programs. The work study program is a fine piece of legislation and is really effective. The program is efficient, and the aid gets right down to the person who can really benefit from the aid so that he or she may receive post high school training.

Sincerely,
ELROY BURGESSON,
Coordinator.

WILLMAR AREA VOCATIONAL
TECHNICAL SCHOOL,
Willmar, Minn., February 1, 1966.

Subject: Section 13 of Public Law 88-210—work-study programs for vocational education.

HON. WALTER MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The present work-study program has provided a tremendous opportunity for Minnesota youth to earn and learn while developing their individual talents to the fullest.

The Minnesota area vocational technical schools are providing excellent educational experiences in the classroom and laboratory in training youth to contribute effectively in our world of work. The work-study program enables these youth to further develop their talents by providing actual work experience with a governmental employer.

The present law does restrict employment of students under the work-study program as it allows for noncommuting students a maximum of \$45 per month with a maximum limit of \$350 per year. A student from outside the city of Willmar with a room and board problem can earn no more than \$60 per month with a yearly limit of \$500 per academic school year. The law restricts vocational students in that it limits their work under the work-study program to about 7 months even though the student may be enrolled in a 9-month, 10-month, 11-month, or 12-month course.

Section 13(b) of Public Law 88-210 limits administrative funds for this work-study program. This limitation of \$10,000 is unrealistic because administration and supervision of the program statewide cannot effectively be done at this figure. Adequate supervision is necessary in order for the program to be an outstanding success.

Section 13(e) of Public Law 88-210 stipulates that the Federal Government contribute 75 percent of the total cost of the work-study program. One hundred percent payment from Federal funds would enable the State of Minnesota to offer an effective continuous opportunity for our vocational students that is not contingent on State legislation.

May I count on you to take the necessary steps to improve the educational opportunities of Minnesota youth through a better work-study program?

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT W. JACOBSON,

Assistant Director,

Vocational-Technical Education,

BRainerd AREA Vocational

TECHNICAL SCHOOL,

Brainerd, Minn., February 7, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,

U.S. Senate,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONDALE: During the past year, we at the Brainerd Area Vocational Technical School have been operating under the work-study provisions of Public Law 88-210. We feel this is a fine program and has done much to aid students in their educational pursuit. However when one compares our work-study program to the economic opportunity work-study program, many discriminatory provisions become evident.

A needy student electing to take a vocational program is discriminated against in relation to other programs for needy students that have no limitations on monthly or yearly earnings. Under our program:

(a) A resident student living at home and commuting can earn no more than \$45 a month and a maximum of \$350 per academic year.

(b) A nonresident student not commuting can earn no more than \$60 a month and a maximum of \$500 per academic year.

The result is that the vocational student is able to work only a little more than 8 months during the school year regardless of whether he is taking a 9-, 10-, 11-, or 12-month course.

Further, the work-study program under which we operate supposedly allows students to work a maximum of 15 hours a week during the academic year. The school district pays the minimum wage scale of \$1.25 an hour. Therefore, when the \$45 and \$60 a month restrictions are considered, it is mathematically impossible for our students to work the allowable 15 hours each week.

In view of the above obvious discriminations, we feel that the limits of \$45 a month and \$350 an academic year for resident commuting students, and \$60 a month and \$500 an academic year for nonresident, noncommuting students, be eliminated from the wording of the work-study provisions, Public Law 88-210.

We do feel that the provisions limiting students to 15 hours of work a week while school is in session is a good provision. However, we believe this provision should be waived during vacation periods (during Christmas and Easter vacations for example). For this waiver to be effective it again is necessary that the restrictions (a and b above) on allowable earnings be removed.

Also of concern to us is the provision to the effect that after the fiscal year ending June 1967, each school district would have to expend 25 percent of the cost necessary to carry on the work-study program. Many school districts, including our own, could not absorb the financial burden. The opportunity for "earning while learning" would no longer be available to our students.

I am enclosing an information sheet which explains in more detail the hoped-for revisions outlined above, and discusses two additional provisions needed to aid in the efficient administration and supervision of the work-study program.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY NYSATHER,

Director,

Area Vocational Technical School,

ALEXANDRIA AREA VOCATIONAL-
TECHNICAL SCHOOL.

Alexandria, Minn., February 8, 1966.

HON. WALTER MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: The Alexandria Area Technical School has been operating under the work-study provisions of Public Law 88-210. It has come to our attention that area schools are being discriminated against where the \$350 and \$500 limitations are placed on a student's earnings. A majority of our courses run for 11 and 12 months. Thus, a student ceases to earn any money for the last 3 to 4 months of his school year. We believe this to be a very worthwhile program and if a few of these inequities could be taken care of, it would be even better.

We have heard that President Johnson plans a reduction in the work-study allocations for next year. If this is true, I believe it would be a serious mistake. Many of our students that have been accepted for training next fall would have to drop out of school. This would come at a time when our country desperately needs technically trained people. Your support regarding the continuation and possible expansion, rather than reduction, of the work-study program would be appreciated.

I want to thank you personally for the kind attention you gave my son, Jim, when he visited your office as a delegate to Boys' Nation. His selection as the outstanding boy at Boys' State made Mr. Ahlfors and me very proud.

We all want to thank you for the excellent job you are doing as a Senator from Minnesota.

Yours sincerely,

RAYMOND A. AHLFORS,

Assistant Director.

CANBY AREA,

VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL SCHOOL,

Canby, Minn., February 10, 1966.

Re work study program, section 13, Public Law 88-210.

HON. WALTER MONDALE,

U.S. Senator,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: We at the Canby Area Vocational-Technical School are grateful for the work study program under Public Law 88-210. It gives low-income family students an opportunity to make some needed income.

I would have some suggestion for amendments:

1. Section 13(c)(3), strike out everything after the first comma and place a period in its place, so it would read as follows: "provide that no students shall be employed under such work study program for more than 15 hours in any week in which classes in which he is enrolled are in session."

The above would be easier to administer and also give the student a break.

2. Section 13(e)(2), strike out the following "from a States allotment under this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for the next succeeding fiscal year, such payment shall equal 75 percent of the amount so expended."

We hope that this program will continue at 100 percent for an effective program. I'm sure the Canby School District would drop the program if they had to help pay non-resident students for going to this school.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

DEWAIN L. ENGLUND,

Director.

STAPLES PUBLIC SCHOOLS,

Staples, Minn., February 15, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,

U.S. Senator,

Senate Building,

Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: The Staples Area Vocational School at the present time is serving 407 students from all areas in the State, and is also operating a work-study program for 100 of these students who are experiencing financial difficulty in continuing their vocational training. This work-study program is under Public Law 88-210 and there are some limitations and discriminations that exist in 88-210 that do not exist in other similar programs. (Economic opportunity work-study program for example) and these should be eliminated.

We have made several surveys to determine whether a work-study program is needed and what local area people think about such a training program. Almost 100 percent of the people felt that the program should be expanded, liberalized and above all continued. This is one program that is directly pointed at helping our youth to continue their education and eliminate pockets of unemployed and underemployed people. The work-study program survey has also helped us discover where past and present problems of poverty exist and now that we have discovered these people and their needs, there is a big job to be done.

Many of our school districts have expanded their facilities to the limits of their financial abilities, also, have furnished the work-study program with supplies, tools, and supervision, and would not be able to take on additional financial burdens as indicated in Public Law 88-210.

Enclosed you will find suggestions and justifications for amending section 13 (work-study programs for vocational education students) of Public Law 88-210.

I can think of no one better qualified to tackle this important problem, and I know you will assist in this matter. Whenever I can be of assistance in any way you will find me most willing to cooperate.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL J. MATANICH,

Director, Area Voc-Tech School.

AREA VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL SCHOOL,

Duluth, Minn., February 15, 1966.

HON. WALTER MONDALE,
U.S. Senate, Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As a counselor in an area technical institute, I feel that the work study program is very important to our students. This legislation provides for financial assistance to students who may not otherwise be able to attend post high school training facilities without aid. We employ these students in related work at various public agencies and pay them for their services.

The present law has some unfavorable limitations which I believe should be amended as follows:

Section B(c)(3): The limits on monthly and yearly compensation should be deleted. The weekly limitation of 15 hours work when school is in session would alone be a most effective limitation. This change would allow a student to meet minimum financial needs for a full school year.

Section B(b)(2): To effectively administer the program, additional funds must be made available.

Section 13(3)(2): Delete the sentence concerning State matching of funds.

Funds should also be allocated by Federal legislation.

I hope you will give these suggestions careful consideration as they will end the discrimination against vocational students as compared to the work study program for college students.

The work study program is an excellent, efficient piece of legislation. It gives aid to the students who must have it in order to receive post high school training and become employable in our society.

Sincerely,

GEORGE LARSON,

Vocational Counselor.

EVELETH AREA

VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL SCHOOL,

Eveleth, Minn., February 25, 1966.

HON. WALTER S. MONDALE,

U.S. Senate,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: The Eveleth Area Vocational-Technical School has been participating in the work-study program, re section 13, Public Law 88-210, since September 1965. This program has certainly been a great help to the students that are taking part in it. It is my opinion that to make a more workable program, some changes should be made in the law. These changes are as follows:

1. Section 13(c)(3): I feel that when classes are in session there should be a limitation as to the number of hours a student should work as is stated in this section, but limitation of compensation to the student should be dropped as they could conceivably reach the maximum in less than 8 months. There should also not be any limitation on student compensation while school is not in session (vacation periods).

2. Section 13(b)(2): Strike out 1 percent and insert 5 percent. One percent is just not enough to administer this program in Minnesota effectively.

3. Section 13(e)(2): Discussing the section with school board members and local leaders, it is a consensus of opinion that the board would be in no position to pick up the 25 percent required by law for this program after June 1967, in light of the local tax situation and the additional burden upon the local taxpayers. This is true especially in Eveleth because approximately 70 percent of our students are nonresidents to the local school district. Therefore, I feel it imperative that the Federal Government continue this program on a 100-percent basis.

In this section, thought should also be given to provide funds for local supervision. I would suggest that approximately 10 percent of the expenditures be allotted for supervision.

Except for the above changes, the work-study program has been very effective in Eveleth. Many of the students in the Eveleth Area Vocational-Technical School have been given a first experience in being employed and holding a job. The experience that they receive will develop in them sound concepts of work as well as form good work habits and the ability to be responsible.

I hope that I can depend upon you for your support on these changes which will make the program more effective. Any steps that you might take to remedy the situation will be appreciated.

Yours very truly,

EDWARD F. RUSS,
Director.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
St. Paul, Minn., March 9, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

The area vocational-technical school work-study program got off to a very late start even though it was enacted December 1963. Moneys for the summer program were not funded until July 1, 1965. Even then, we were able to start a summer work-study program with 8 schools and 144 students participating.

In the fiscal year of 1965-66, as of January 1, 1966, we have 470 students participating in the work-study program and by the end of the school year will have over 500 students participating in the program. There are at present over 70 percent of the students in this program doing work directly related to the subjects they are taking. These students soon will be on the tax

rolls instead of the relief rolls. If money is available, we will have well over 500 students who wish to participate in the 1966-67 summer program.

This fall we will have four new area vocational-technical schools operating in this State. This means that we will have over 600 students who will wish to and need to participate in this program during the regular school year.

We receive no moneys for supervision at the local level and we feel that at least 10 percent of expenditures should be provided for this very necessary work. During the summer, when most classes are not in session and instructors are on vacation, no moneys are provided for supervision of summer work-study programs at the local level.

At the State level we are allowed 1 percent of money expended for the work-study program or \$10,000, whichever is the greater. To be able to conduct the program it is the opinion of most that it should be increased from 1 percent to 5 percent.

The \$350 and \$500 limits that are imposed on the area vocational-technical school work-study program should be removed. The OEO programs, in contrast to the area vocational-technical school work-study programs, have no limits a participant may earn per year. The OEO also has much more liberal supervisory allowances.

Both the school directors and the needy students should know in advance how much money is available for this program. If they know this, both can plan ahead and make satisfactory arrangements.

Section 13(e) (2): Discussing this section with school board members and local leaders, it is a consensus of opinion that the school boards would be in no position to pick up the 25 percent required by law for this program after June 30, 1966, in light of the local tax situation and the additional burden upon the local taxpayers. This is especially true because approximately 75 percent of the students are nonresidents of the local school district. Therefore, I feel it imperative that the Federal Government continue this program on a 100-percent basis.

President Johnson has recommended in his budget that the area vocational-technical school work-study program be cut from \$25 million to \$10 million and at the same time asked for a budget increase of more than \$320 million for Job Corps.

You will note that the budget calls for \$177,500,000 for fiscal 1967 rather than the \$225 million as authorized under section 4, Public Law 88-210. You will also observe that the work-study program was reduced from \$25 million to \$10 million. The budget justification for this decrease reads as follows: "1967 estimates reflect reduction in work-study assistance as the Neighborhood Youth Corps program assumes responsibility."

The Neighborhood Youth Corps programs have not as yet successfully reached the smaller communities where 23 of the 25 area vocational schools operating and planned are located and where area vocational schools have work-study programs.

I am certain that a study of the vocational work-study programs being conducted in our State will disclose that these programs have been entirely successful whereas the Neighborhood Youth Corps cannot make this claim. We all recognize that something needs to be done for these youth. Why not, then, aid those students who have found themselves and who wish to further their training?

It is very evident that there should be an increase instead of a decrease in the amounts of money allotted for the administration of the area vocational-technical school work-study programs.

Enclosed please find information which bears consideration for changes. I would appreciate it if you would use your influence to encourage the Congress to revise this portion of Public Law 88-210 in accord with the information enclosed.

CECIL STENSURD,
State Supervisor,
Work-Study Program.

CANBY AREA VOCATIONAL-
TECHNICAL SCHOOL,
Canby, Minn., March 29, 1966.

Re work-study program, section 13, Public Law 88-210.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONDALE: I understand that students under the summer work-study program will be paid 75 percent by Federal funds and 25 percent by local funds. Our board of education will not accept the 25-percent tab in view that 80 percent of our students come from outside of the school district. Our board feels that we should not use local tax funds to pay for nonresident students. We hope Congress can restore the 100 percent reimbursement figure.

We have also lost our supervisor in charge of work-study because there are no funds available to administer this program. This places the whole supervision of the work study program on my shoulders and I don't have enough time to fully care for my own program now. We hope Congress can see fit to provide funds to pay this supervision. I would appreciate your checking into this problem for me.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

DEWAIN L. ENGLUND,
Director.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 111

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 1965

No. 162

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I rise in support of H.R. 9567, the Higher Education Act of 1965. I have long favored the enactment of this vitally needed legislation. And I am confident that the Senate will pass this bill by an overwhelming vote.

In his education message this year, President Johnson stated:

Higher education is no longer a luxury, but a necessity.

We are finding that more and more of today's jobs require the background and the skills that only college can provide.

Our young people recognize this. From 1954 to 1964, enrollment in institutions of higher learning doubled. It is expected to go up at least 50 percent more in the next decade. And our junior colleges have expanded even faster.

To provide all these young people with the quality education they will need will require the combined efforts of governments at all levels, and of the many dedicated teachers and administrators in universities and colleges throughout our land.

To meet this unprecedented challenge, there is overwhelming agreement that the Federal Government must play an increased role in supporting higher education. Thus we find that the bill before us this afternoon was reported out unanimously by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

H.R. 9567 provides many advances in our Federal higher education policy, so many that I could not hope to mention all of them this afternoon. Surely one of its greatest contributions will be the increased assistance it gives to students in meeting the increased financial burdens which college education imposes. Already, in the year 1965, it costs a student an average of \$1,560 for 1 year in a public college; for private colleges, the figure is even higher—\$2,370. And in the next 5 years, this figure is expected to rise to \$1,840 for public colleges, and 2,780 for private colleges.

This bill takes major steps to help students meet this burden.

It provides a program of general undergraduate scholarships, with the amounts in each case tailored to the need of the recipient.

It inaugurates a low interest, insured loan program to meet educational expenses, and it encourages States and private agencies to carry out similar programs.

To meet the growing need for buildings and needed facilities, this bill amends the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to provide increased grants to educational institutions.

In recognition of the vital need for improved library resources, the bill provides grants for the purchase of books, periodicals, documents and other materials, as well as funds for the training of library personnel.

To help our colleges and universities make a greater contribution to the solution of community problems, we are providing funds for a bold new program of university extension and continuing education.

To help institutions facing particular academic and financial difficulties, the Higher Education Act of 1965 will inaugurate a special program of grants to developing higher education institutions to assist in raising the quality of the teaching they provide.

To improve the quality of undergraduate instruction in the broad range of our colleges, the bill will authorize grants for the purchase of special teaching equipment, and for setting up workshops and institutes to train faculty personnel in the use of new educational media.

To improve the quality of teacher education, and to make this teacher education have an impact in the schools of our low-income areas, title V of this bill provides fellowships to prospective teachers, and grants to universities for the improvement of teacher education, and it establishes a new National Teacher Corps for service in schools with a high proportion of poor children.

And even after mentioning all of these provisions, I feel that I have only scratched the surface in my description of what this bill will provide.

I would, however, like to say some special words on behalf of the work-study program inaugurated by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. This program has made it possible for needy students to earn essential funds to support their college education. I believe that this program is in our best American tradition, of helping our young men and women to help themselves.

Yet, despite its unquestioned value, this program has suffered from a serious flaw, a flaw which has prevented many needy students from benefiting from its provisions. Participation in the program is restricted to students from very low

income families, because of the laudable desire to help those at the very bottom of our economic ladder. But as the report of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee states:

The rigid limitation of the original bill severely handicapped many universities which have large numbers of students requiring assistance, yet few who are technically from low-income families.

A considerable number of presidents and deans from colleges and universities in Minnesota have written me about this matter. They point out that higher education is a very expensive proposition, and that it is not only the very poor who need the benefit of this type of program.

So I have made efforts to secure a modification of this provision.

I believe that the bill as reported by the committee provides an excellent solution to the problem. It insists—and rightly so—that preference should be given to students from the lowest income families. But it eliminates the rigid income ceiling, and leaves it to universities and colleges to determine who among their students are in need.

I believe that this change will permit the work-study program to help many more students, without changing its basic purpose.

The bill also gives the Office of Education sole responsibility for the administration of this program at the Federal level.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 112

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1966

No. 164

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I wish to express my particular disappointment at the failure of the Labor-HEW appropriations bill to provide any funds to support title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, Federal assistance to colleges and universities for community service and continuing education programs.

Like many other appropriations for Higher Education Act programs, the amount provided in the House-passed bill was surely minimal. Public Law 89-329 authorized \$50 million for fiscal year 1967 for title I; the administration recommended \$20 million in its budget, and the House cut this to \$10 million. Surely one-fifth of the amount authorized by Congress last year is hardly an excessive amount to support a program which can make such a valuable contribution to universities and the communities they serve.

We have always believed that our institutions of higher education should be deeply involved in the vital issues of their communities and areas. Our land-grant colleges, one of America's great original contributions to education, are a monument to this recognition. Yet I think it is fair to say that, in carrying out their absolutely vital functions of educating their student bodies and expanding the frontiers of knowledge, our institutions of higher education have often not made the type of contribution they could make to the solution of community problems.

The programs undertaken in Minnesota, supported by title I appropriation in fiscal year 1966, show the potentiality for creative involvement of colleges in community affairs. Moorhead State College is developing a community social service program; St. John's University and Bemidji State College have inaugurated programs of community and regional leadership development. Mankato State College is becoming involved in community development in its home city, and Augsburg College has developed an academic town meeting committee to discuss community problems. And the University of Minnesota has developed a wide range of promising programs.

I feel that these efforts are the type we should encourage. I hope, therefore, that the conference committee which is formed on H.R. 14745 will give very serious consideration to this program and will restore the \$10 million appropriation voted by the House.

(g) shall apply to appropriations of the Council: *And provided further*, That the Council shall not be required to prescribe such regulations.

(b) The Council shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such additional personnel as may be necessary to carry out its duties, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949.

(c) The Council may also procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the executive departments by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates not to exceed \$50 per diem for individuals.

(d) The members of the Council specified in paragraphs (1) through (6) of section 201(a) shall provide the Council, on a reimbursable basis, with such facilities and services under their jurisdiction and control as may be needed by the Council to carry out its duties, to the extent that such facilities and services are requested by the Council and are otherwise available for that purpose. To the extent of available appropriations, the Council may obtain, by purchase, rental, donation, or otherwise, such additional property, facilities, and services as may be needed to carry out its duties.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF THE TARIFF SCHEDULES OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO WATCHES AND CLOCKS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1647, H.R. 8436.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8436) to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the dutiable status of watches, clocks, and timing apparatus from insular possessions of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rule of germaneness be waived for the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL MUSEUM OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the agreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the

bill (S. 1310) relating to the National Museum of the Smithsonian Institution. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report see House proceedings of October 4, 1966, p. 23994, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

CORRECTION IN ENROLLMENT OF SENATE BILL 1310

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in connection with S. 1310, I should like to submit a concurrent resolution which would merely authorize the Secretary of the Senate to make a pro forma correction in the text. It would simply change the date of the act from 1965 to 1966.

I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by the clerk.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 112), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (S. 1310) relating to the National Museum of the Smithsonian Institution, the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to make section 1 read: "That this Act may be cited as the 'National Museum Act of 1966'."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, for myself and Senators BAYH, BREWSTER, CLARK, GRUENING, INOUE, KENNEDY of New York, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, KUCHEL, MANSFIELD, MCCARTHY, MCGEE, MCGOVERN, MONDALE, MONRONEY, MUSKIE, NELSON, PASTORE, RIBICOFF, TYDINGS, and YARBOROUGH, I send to the desk a bill to provide for the establishment of a National Foundation for the Social Sciences.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill first be referred to the Senate Committee on Government Operations and then to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, last

year, accompanied by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], I made an extensive trip to four Latin American countries—Chile, Peru, Argentina, and Brazil. As a result of that trip, I became convinced that, among other things, there is a great need to "civilianize" the image of the United States in Latin America.

My trip to Latin America was in the wake of the so-called Camelot project, under which the U.S. Army financed a comprehensive study of Chilean social and socioeconomic factors of change and revolution in that country. As is well known now, Camelot was planned without the knowledge or approval of our U.S. Ambassador in Chile or the host country. It caused considerable bad publicity for the United States and was damaging to our image throughout Latin America.

Last February, speaking on the floor of the Senate, I called attention to a similar project, also financed by the U.S. Army, Project Simpatico in Colombia. As I pointed out then, after Camelot the President of the United States had instituted procedures in the State Department to assure that any such research project would not be carried forward except with the knowledge and consent of our country team and the local officials in the host country. These procedures had been followed in Project Simpatico. But, the resulting publicity in Colombia and Latin America from Project Simpatico once again emphasized the need to civilianize such social and behavioral science research in foreign countries.

In that speech on the floor of the Senate last February, I, therefore, stated:

I feel there is no reason why the bulk of such expenditures should be from the Department of Defense budget. Such foreign research expenditures—by direct appropriation or by transfer of funds—must be placed under institutionalized civilian control.

Since the time of that speech the Subcommittee on Government Research, which I chair, has held extensive hearings on the subject of U.S.-financed social and behavioral science research in foreign countries and on the broader subject of present and needed Federal support of research and scholarship in the social and behavioral sciences, generally. The bill I introduce is a result of the findings in those hearings.

We need an additional civilian agency for Federal support of research in the social and behavioral sciences, both here and abroad.

We have made great breakthroughs of knowledge in the natural sciences, but our understanding of man, himself, has not increased proportionately.

Man can accomplish so many things these days—not excluding world devastation—by merely pushing a button; we understand the button and the machine very well, but we are woefully weak in the understanding of the button pusher.

As a Member of the Senate, Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY, then the senior Senator from Minnesota, in a speech on the floor of the Senate on February 19, 1962, called for greater support for social science research and what he called a Magna Carta for the social sciences.

He pointed out at that time, as he has on several other occasions since, our great national need for more social science research, more insights and knowledge about our society. Our hearings have updated and confirmed this need, identified by him.

The bill which I introduce today would provide an extra source of funding for social science research and would give recognition to our continuing and growing need for knowledge and ideas, not only about our own society, but of others as well.

The bill would create a National Foundation for the Social Sciences, similar to the National Science Foundation, to encourage and support research in the social and behavioral sciences. The proposed Foundation would be separate from the operating agencies and departments of the Federal Government which now support policy studies relevant to their missions.

The Foundations would do no in-house research but would, in keeping with the precedent set by the National Science Foundation and the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities, underwrite, fund and support academic research in the fields of political science, economics, psychology, sociology, anthropology, history, law, social statistics, demography, geography, linguistics, international relations, and other social sciences.

The Foundation would be comprised of a Board of Trustees consisting of 25 prominent citizens from the social science community, both academic and practicing. There would, as well, be a Director and a Deputy Director, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, in addition to such staff as the Foundation needs to administer such funds as may be appropriated for these purposes.

The Foundation would: develop a national policy for research and scholarship in the social sciences; support research and programs to strengthen research in the social sciences in the United States, as well as in foreign countries; appropriately assist social scientists where such assistance would lead to strengthening colleges, universities, non-profit research organizations, and foundations; encourage development of social science capabilities and manpower in all parts of the country.

Further, an important aspect of the proposed Foundation would be its availability as a contracting agency for the operating departments of the Federal Government to use to secure unclassified scholarly research in the social and behavioral science fields, here and in foreign countries.

The bill carries an authorization of \$20 million, an arbitrary figure, chosen as a figure to be discussed in hearings, which are planned for next year.

In his speech September 29, 1966, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Brookings Institution, speaking of the ideas fostered by the academic and research community in this country, President Johnson stated:

Without the tide of new proposals that periodically sweeps into this city, the climate of our government would be arid, indeed,

I agree.

Therefore, Mr. President, so that we may increase our understanding of man, his behavior, his institutions, and his relationships with other men, I introduce this bill to establish a National Foundation for the Social Sciences which will provide funds for study and research in the social and behavioral sciences, both here and abroad, on its own authority and as a civilian subcontractor for mission-oriented U.S. agencies.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from Oklahoma on the initiative which he has exhibited in this field; and I am happy to have the opportunity to join him in this venture, to establish this study in the area of the social sciences.

I was fortunate enough to have the opportunity to accompany the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma on the visit to the four Latin American countries which he mentioned, and wish to attest to the validity of the judgment and the analysis which he has made of the impact of some of the unfortunate practices which have heretofore been a part of our policy in those countries. I share his concern to see that we do not repeat such mistakes.

With the emphasis we have placed on science, and through the efforts of the various technical schools, we have made vast progress in the areas of the physical and natural sciences. We have, indeed, reached the place where we can foretell the landing of a man on the moon and predict the ultimate conquest of outer space. From a mechanical standpoint, we have made great progress in our ability to look into the depths of a man's heart, even to the point where I suppose it is no longer ridiculous to look forward to the time when the automation of the heart will greatly lengthen the span of human life. The area in which we have not made the type of progress we must make is into a man's mind, to determine what makes him do some of the things he does and why we cannot live together on this earth in more harmony than we have in the past.

I think that the bill that the Senator from Oklahoma is introducing will make a great contribution to the governmental process in our country when it is finally enacted into law.

I commend him for the effort he is making in this area.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from Indiana for his cosponsorship of this bill, for his remarks today, and for his judgment.

I was very proud to accompany him on a tour last year to Latin America.

The Senator from Indiana projects an excellent image of this country wherever he goes. His judgment will be very valuable as we consider the bill next year in committee.

Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma for introducing the bill.

I know of the hard work, the great patience, and leadership shown by the distinguished Senator in the hearings held to appraise the need for this proposal for our country.

I am very proud to join him as a cosponsor.

Because of his leadership, future generations will be indebted to the Senator from Oklahoma for what he has done today.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am greatly honored by the cosponsorship of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, and for his very generous statement made on the floor today.

Nobody understands the needs in the social science field of this country better than does the Senator from Connecticut, who served as a great member of the Cabinet, as Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I appreciate what the Senator has had to say and for his support of the bill.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and referred, as requested earlier by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The bill (S. 3896) to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation for the Social Sciences in order to promote research and scholarship in such sciences, introduced by Mr. HARRIS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF THE TARIFF SCHEDULES OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H.R. 8436) to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the dutiable status of watches, clocks, and timing apparatus from insular possessions of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) paragraph (a) of general headnote 3 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. § 1202) is amended—

(1) by striking out "Articles" in subparagraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as provided in headnote 6 of schedule 7, part 2, subpart E, articles"; and

(2) by striking out "except that all articles" in subparagraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "except that all such articles".

(b) The headnotes of schedule 7, part 2, subpart E of the Tariff Schedules of the United States are amended by adding at the end thereof the following new headnote:

"6. Products of Insular Possession. (a) Except as provided in paragraph (b) of this headnote, any article provided for in this subpart which is the product of an insular possession of the United States outside the



MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org