

suffered from this fragmentation and that Rogers is a knowledgeable friend of biomedical research, the reform could bode well for the future of research.

Changing the present Science and Astronautics Committee into a full-fledged Science and Technology Committee on the lines of the Bolling prescription would hasten the transition away from the "space committee" image that the committee has sought to modify in recent years, but with only moderate success.

Equally major transformations would be in store for the Interior and Agriculture Committees, which would become, respectively, the Energy and Environment Committee and the Agriculture and Natural Resources Committee with the latter taking over jurisdiction from the Interior Committee of national parks, forests, and public lands.

Another sort of change calls for the splitting of the present Education and Labor Committee into two independent committees. A new Education Committee would assume authority over medical education now held by the Commerce Committee, but few other significant transfers are contemplated.

The split seems logical, particularly because the burden of education legislation and related matters is certainly heavy enough to keep a committee occupied. But there are both liberals and conservatives on Education and Labor who are reluctant to see the committee divided and whose reasons have little to do with logic or efficiency. The committee has traditionally attracted liberals sympathetic to social legislation and also some conservatives with exactly opposite sympathies. The frequently bipartisan action on education legislation seems to have helped prevent a bitter polarization within the committee on other more controversial issues. Some members feel, for example, that members who chose to join a separate Labor Committee might split into rigid pro-labor and anti-labor factions with damaging results. Other members who may be interested in education issues or social legislation in general but come from "labor" districts are reluctant to give up either education or labor as a specialty. Still others argue that a split might result in a loss of the support of organized labor on education legislation, support which has been crucial on some occasions in the past.

Similar, subsurface, "internal" objections affect many of the proposed

changes, and Bolling and his allies will encounter real difficulties if these objectors form an effective coalition, as there are some signs they are doing. There is no doubt, on the other hand, that Bolling will have the backing of his own coalition. His committee is holding "markup" sessions this month

and next, and he hopes to emerge with a bill which will pass the House by Easter. That date may be optimistic, but the jurisdictional plan seems to have strong momentum.

As for campaign reform, the prospects are somewhat murkier. The Senate has passed a bill (S. 372) to

## Financing Postsecondary Education

A congressionally created commission last month produced a report that it described as a beginning effort at introducing a new measure of rationality into fiscal policy-making among institutions engaged in postsecondary education.

*Financing Postsecondary Education in the United States* is a complicated document, 14 months in the making, which is supposed to give the federal government guidance and a comprehensive data base for higher education support policies.

Commission members stress that the report is unique in that it does not actually make any recommendations. Rather than add to an already crowded field of educational financing proposals, the report seeks to clarify matters by offering a "comprehensive analytical framework" that can be used by any and all policy-makers to find out whether their financing schemes will in fact achieve the desired objectives.

The framework is designed primarily for the evaluation of national educational financing plans such as those put forth by the Carnegie Commission and the Committee for Economic Development. It is based on a set of national objectives that boil down to affording everyone who wants it maximum choice in institutions and types of education and encouraging institutional excellence, diversity, independence, financial accountability, and solvency. Policy-makers who accept the framework's objectives, measures of their achievement, and assumptions of future trends can contact the Office of Education and arrange to have financing proposals run through a computer programmed for that purpose and packed with data assembled by the commission. State governments and individual institutions may also use the computer, although the commission emphasizes that they should be encouraged to develop their own analytical models in accordance with their needs and visions. The Office of Education has taken over the commission's computer contract, and the only cost to users of the service will be for computer time.

Another major thrust of the report is the recommendation that the government devise and adopt uniform national standards for estimating per capita costs of educating students in comparable institutions. Such a proposal (the commission has already concocted interim standards to be used on a voluntary basis), if adopted, could considerably tighten methods of financial accountability among institutions that wish to be eligible for outside aid.

Members of the 17-person commission, headed by Nebraska lawyer Donald E. Leonard, appeared to be very pleased with themselves over the report. But Representative John Brademas (D-Ind.), a commission member and a guiding spirit of the project, warned that the higher education community might find some of it hard to swallow. Many educators are "Neanderthals" when it comes to fiscal matters, observed Brademas, who said it is high time financial planning was put on a more scientific basis. The House Education and Labor Committee plans to hold hearings within the next couple of months to chew over the commission's findings and discuss how to get policy-makers interested in the approach it has created.

The 442-page report, which cost \$1.5 million, is available for \$4 from the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.—C.H.