

Dr. WEIL. I am not sure I can make a distinction between those under the Office of Education and the others. But take the whole student aid program; although this helps the institution in many ways, it requires a tremendous staff to handle it. There are various aspects of the student aid program. Many of the programs, such as Upward Bound, are under considerable pressure to contribute not only in terms of overhead but also in terms of direct costs toward the maintenance of a program.

Mr. QUIE. Does not the institute share some responsibility for bringing students to college who otherwise would not have attended an institution of higher learning, similar to the aid for Federal-State roads and county roads where 50-percent matching is the highest we go in the highway program?

Dr. WEIL. I recognize there is such responsibility; however, it goes beyond that. For example, you want to perform a task of educating at the colleges and universities young people who might otherwise not even attend college, and you have to go out into the high schools and try to identify those who could benefit from college education, especially in the inner city. Then you bring them in and you see to it that they get the package of aid which is now available. Yet if you take your financial purpose seriously, and if you do the thing we are doing, going out into the inner city schools to try to identify these youngsters, you have considerable costs when you bring them to the university that are in no way covered.

Mr. BRADENAS. If the gentleman will yield?

Is it essential, however, in achieving a national purpose that the Federal Government carry the entire burden? The private and public non-Federal sector, aren't they involved in helping achieve the national purpose?

Dr. WEIL. Yes. I am not suggesting that the Federal Government carry the entire cost; I am suggesting that they may carry the entire cost of certain specific programs. After all, your facilities available to go out and recruit staff, and you divert staff from other functions to the particular functions that the legislation asks you to perform. Some of these costs are simply not covered.

The Higher Education Facilities Act, of course, is another obvious illustration. I am all in favor of matching but there is so much of it that it becomes burdensome after a certain point. We have been involved now in all of the various facilities programs, the dormitory program, the Upward Bound program. In most of these programs we have had to put some of our resources into it, and I am not saying that this is not desirable, but it makes it extremely difficult for an institution that is not very affluent. We have to go out and raise money not only for our traditional objectives but now also for these particular objectives, which are terribly important.

I am particularly concerned with problems of the inner city. These are the greatest problems that I think the Nation faces, and it is not enough to say we are going to help a youngster who comes from the South Side of Chicago and comes out of the slum area if he ever gets to our institution. What are the chances of getting him to come to our institution? You have got to do something to get him there. This means that we have to advise and to confer with his counselors, his teachers, and with him.