

Mr. BRADLEY. Yes, I guess that is right.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I have one more question if you have any question on church and state of any other questions ahead.

Mr. QUIE. In this one sentence of yours, third from the last sentence, you said, "I share your demonstrated concern, however, that the legislated terms and conditions under which private colleges and universities are invited to serve these laudable goals may prove to be self-defeating."

Now, why are the legislated terms and conditions self-defeating? You seem to have a self-defeating frame of mind about what the courts will do.

Mr. BRADLEY. The private institutions, of course, have no source of funds comparable to the State institutions to go in for the matching fund requirements.

I know you probably heard much about matching funds but from the private standpoint, I have already described the increasingly massive and rapidly growing support. At my institution our success for competing for these funds, and then being able to carry out the programs of national and public interest under the terms of this legislation can, in fact, bankrupt us.

We feel that there is a point beyond which we cannot continue to match 50-50 on facilities grants; we cannot continue to match 70-30 on demonstration funds. We cannot do this because we do not have this massive sort of funds for matching.

We would have to restrict our programs to that extent and count up increased amounts which come available for these purposes. This money would then go to the institutions that would be in the best position to match, and these are certainly going to be the State institutions which can go to their legislatures to recapture the taxpayer's dollar to get back to the local by taking appropriate provisions for matching.

I think we had an example of this in the national highway program. Over a period of 15 years, we committed ourselves to spend \$15 billion for the State highway. Even that would tax the resources of the State. We put 90-10 on that program realizing that something more traditional, for instance, than the State highway—which was on a 50-50 basis—was not thought of for the Interstate System.

I think this business of bankrupting the private institution is as good as the possibility of bankrupting the State in terms of the Interstate Highway System, so we have this problem.

Mr. QUIE. Well, in the Interstate System, there was a national defense concept that got into that and I guess we looked at it differently.

In the Academic Facilities Act it was that the colleges would have the desire and feel their own responsibility to provide facilities for the growing enrollment. Heretofore, that had been done mostly without Federal help and this time the Federal Government decided to step in and help them with a job they would probably do anyway.

So I could see some reason for putting in 50 percent for some institutions for some States. I guess we just look at it from a different frame of reference than you do, because it surely can't be called strictly a national defense effort to construct all these institutions of higher learning.

Mr. BRADLEY. Our only reply would be that in our search for this in the 10 years that I have been directly involved in this, the University of Notre Dame has gone from the point where they were