

but when you support the amount of money authorized, do you consider that a minimum amount needed or do you consider that the ceiling and that any amount up to that would be appropriate?

Miss KRETTEK. In all cases I would say we consider the authorized amounts we have recommended that are incorporated in the bills a minimum. In order to meet standards the amounts of money needed are far greater than any amounts appropriated thus far and certainly those authorized in the bills are minimum amounts to accomplish what needs to be done in the face of rising demands.

Mrs. GREEN. Just this week I heard an explanation by a person high in education circles here in Washington suggesting that the justification for the much smaller appropriation by the Appropriations Committee is that the authorization is a ceiling and should be considered as such and, therefore, part of that amount would be justified.

Miss KRETTEK. I don't agree with that; it seems very unfortunate that impression has been given.

Mrs. GREEN. In your own case, for example, just under title II the authorization for fiscal 1968 is \$72.7 million, the appropriation is \$37.2 million. What effect is that going to have, do you think, on your programs? How are you going to adjust to the actual amount?

Miss KRETTEK. I think it is going to be very difficult because these amounts that are in the bill, and that we supported at the time the bill was originally before this committee, were carefully judged in terms of what the colleges could use, and what their ability would be for matching funds, under title II-A. It is a matching program and we took into consideration the ability of matching by the colleges as well as their needs.

In this situation of delayed funding there would be no possibility of the colleges using fully the amounts but in succeeding years, with increasing demands to be taken care of, full authorizations could be used.

As you look ahead, there are increasing enrollments, and with all of these larger demands, colleges need increasing amounts of money. So it was our expectation that instead of the program starting at half of the amount authorized, and staying at that amount, it would perhaps start at less than the full authorization in the first year, which has been a pattern, but hopefully in a year or so it would go immediately to the full authorization. By the time the act came up for extension, we hoped to see what the effects of that authorized amount had been and then be prepared to make judgment on what the additional amounts needed would be.

In the first year, unfortunately, the actual appropriation was only \$11 million with money just for basic grants. The second year we had \$25 million with supplemental and special-purpose grants allowed for the first time. We have not yet had an opportunity to really see the impact.

We did this limited survey, presented by Dr. Gelfand, which we were only able to do on a small sampling because the guidelines did not come out until recently and thus the institutions did not have an opportunity to make their plans in light of the actual formal guidelines and regulations.