

Mr. QUIE. They are even worse than the U.S. Office of Education.

Mr. GRINDLE. Yes. The reason being that the Legal Counsel for the Interior Department has determined that since the appropriations bill to run the Interior Department, which is a public law, carries no specific reference to payment of money for these students, legally it cannot be done. We got stung.

The University of Alabama got stung the same way. They employed students under the auspices of the Bureau of Mines and they have not received their money either.

I know Congressman Hathaway is aware of this because we enlisted his aid to see if we could not resolve the situation. Two summers ago, we employed 21 students; this past summer, 17 students, at the park. Next summer it is doubtful that we will be able to employ any, unless some type of arrangement can be made for the park to fund its share.

Mr. HATHAWAY. On the economic opportunity grants you mention that you are relegated to a position of being a bookkeeper. You would like what, a 100-percent discretion at this time, limit the amount?

Mr. GRINDLE. I would like the opportunity to make this comment on that. This educational opportunity grant program as it is now in operation is a difficult one to administer fairly, keeping in mind that there is a great deal of difference between institutions. For instance, at the University of Maine, our total cost is \$1,650. Bowdoin's is \$3,450.

Mr. QUIE. Are you comparing the same costs?

Mr. GRINDLE. The same types of costs, total costs.

Mr. QUIE. Room, board, clothing.

Mr. GRINDLE. The whole bit.

Mr. MOULTON. Our difference being in tuition.

Mr. GRINDLE. Ours is \$400 and theirs is \$1,900.

Under present schedules, as I pointed out, if a student is eligible for a \$700 grant we must give him that. We must; Bowdoin must. If we give a student a \$700 grant and Bowdoin gives a \$700 grant, we are doing a great deal more, proportionately, for that student than Bowdoin is.

I am not talking about the final package now. I am talking about what the grant represents. So that we would like the opportunity to give that student something less than that, to possibly give that student only a \$400 educational opportunity grant; but the schedule says he is entitled to \$700, and you must give him \$700.

Mr. GIBBONS. We didn't intend it that way. I really didn't understand that, because that is not what we intended.

Mr. GRINDLE. That is what OE says.

Mr. MOULTON. I disagree with Bryce on this point, quite frankly. I think the guidelines for the U.S. Office of Education are entirely reasonable. The U.S. Office of Education is squarely behind the scholarship service method of computing financial need. In that method I think the financial aid officer has all the flexibility that he needs. He may accept or not accept the family income figure on the scholarship service statement. He may accept or he may grant or he may not grant the allowances that are usually taken into account on the system of computing need.

He may accept or not accept the contribution from income. He may increase it; he may decrease it. What he does in this process of