

ernment compounds the problem by compelling us to withhold income taxes from the money he does earn and you divert money intended for student aid in other directions.

Mr. QUITE. Isn't this true of all the other students to whom you might give a scholarship?

Dr. UMBECK. I don't follow your question.

Mr. QUITE. Suppose there was no Economic Opportunity grants, and you provide scholarships.

Dr. UMBECK. In the case of every student who has full need of the type that qualifies for the Economic Opportunity grant, this would be true. But you see, the number of such students we can take is limited. For example, last year out of an enrollment of 1,250 we had 150 students where the total family income was less than \$5,000, but these were people handpicked on the basis of high ability. Under the Economic Opportunity grants the basic is need. In token fashion it costs us over \$2,000 per student, whereas that same money could be diverted to students who could pay part of their way.

I would be glad to discuss that with you if you wish.

The last point I want to make is that the very modest grants for non-project-oriented science research has given great impetus to science departments on liberal arts campuses. It is amazing to note how much full-time teachers in humanities and social sciences, as well as natural sciences, can accomplish with a little money for special library purchases, travel to major library collections, microfilm, appropriate apparatus, and undergraduate assistants, and so forth. I would urge expansion of programs designed to support such work at those institutions which have demonstrated their capacity to conduct distinguished teaching programs. It might be fruitful to utilize such objective measures as those described in House Report No. 1158, October 1965, pages 42-43.

In closing, two comments. I was startled when I made a list of Federal programs in which Knox was involved, in excess of 20; a small institution like ours.

The last comment, sir, you raised the question earlier with your staff about communication. Grassroots communications have been superb, the opportunity to consult has been free and easy and informal. We have had ready and easy access to the people. We have no problem at all keeping up with new legislation. Our services on this are very good. Our real problems stem from the changing interpretations and definitions of legislation.

Thank you for this opportunity.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much. I have some questions but it would be helpful if we could try to give everybody a chance to summarize his statement.

The Chair observes our distinguished colleague, one of the most active and able members of the committee, Congressman Pucinski of Chicago, is with us. In view of the elections we have a very narrow platform. [Laughter.]

After we have heard from the witnesses this morning with their summaries, the Chair would like to invite Mr. Pucinski to come up and join us.

Next can we hear from Mr. Johnson, of Illinois State University.