

Mr. BRADEMAs. I want to make one final comment, Madam Chairman, to Commissioner Howe. I was struck in the President's message by his statement last fall that more than 50 percent of our high school graduates went on to college and by 1976, only 8 years from now, he hoped we would increase that number to two-thirds. That is putting a very great challenge before us, it seems to me, and I hope that the programs you have suggested are up to it.

Mrs. GREEN. Congressman Esch.

Mr. ESCH. Thank you very much, Madam Chairman.

I would like to express my appreciation at your being here and discussing this problem. I was struck by the parameters of the problem which we face from the previous testimony. I hope that the profile will also include projections over the next 5 years as to what funds might be needed in the various programs to meet the goal. Your suggestion is that the current program will only meet from 6 to 7 percent of the real problem as it exists today. Have you projected those figures on a percentage basis?

Mr. HOWE. I am not sure how you arrived at the figure. We have not any comparable figure of meeting 6 or 7 percent of the goal, I don't believe. Perhaps we could formulate a 1975 objective and then assess what our present performance is in percentage, but I would suspect it would be higher than that.

Mr. ESCH. I would like to see it on the basis of the 75,000 more students which you indicated these programs might maximally include. I think it comes out roughly to 6 or 7 percent. I think it is very important for us, as a Congress, to assess what kind of need we are facing and how much of that need we are meeting. I think it is very good for us to present broad-range programs and make broad-range statements, but I would like to see just exactly and specifically what we intend to do this year about meeting the problem.

I think it is minimal.

Now, let me interject, if I might, and look forward to tomorrow. How inconsistent it seems to have a long-range program leading to 1975 and yet minimize the facilities need which we are aware is tremendous. I hope tomorrow you will present the projected facilities needs based on the great increase in student enrollment in the early 1970's and the larger increase that will result from an end to the Vietnam conflict. I hope you will be able to indicate to me how these two programs, the facilities needs, and the needs in terms of scholarships, might parallel or not parallel.

If we could turn specifically to the student loan provisions, in the long range, is your Federal reinsurance proposal a move toward nationalizing the entire student loan program operation? Do you look at nationalization as a goal?

Mr. HOWE. Let me comment on one aspect and Mr. Muirhead can comment in more detail.

Our whole objective in this entire program, as far as the guaranteed loans are concerned, is to reach for effective State participation, State administration, and indeed State provision of State funds for backing up a portion of the program. The reinsurance feature is simply a feature that makes those State funds go further. Would you comment further on this?