

responsibility for its total program and reducing the significance of panels and counsels and their particular prejudices and biases in the development program. We believe that imposing responsibility for program and substantive leadership of the faculty on the university administration will significantly improve both the morale of the staff and the balance of program for the student and the nation.

As a final point, may I suggest that additional attention should be given to the need to distribute research and program monies more widely among institutions throughout the country. At the present time a few universities get most of the support. Many of our colleges and universities, particularly of the emerging variety, now have high-quality staffs which offer great potential in research and program development. They are, on the whole, ineligible for many kinds of grants because they have not yet fully proved themselves, especially in the research areas. We do not argue that a substantial portion of the research funds should not be invested in the well-established university. A proportion of our capital should always be invested in the sure thing. What I do argue, however, is that another substantial sum should be placed in what may be called, if you wish, "risk investment." Potentially higher returns and greater long-range benefits to society might be much more pronounced if a larger percentage of research and program money were invested in these kinds of institutions. The Congress has traditionally adopted the view that a broad base of institution support is good for the American system and that "risk investment" pays off in our society. We hope that the Congress will continue to take the broad view that the investment in the smaller college and emerging university is sound and necessary. This can be done only if the legislation makes certain that promising institutions are sought out and developed.

The present large sums of money going to such things as research and development centers and regional research laboratories, as well as research monies in general, will benefit, almost exclusively, the large, well-established university. Additional money is needed for the development of diversified curriculums based on sound planning and directed to meeting the needs of students and society in general. One example would be a provision for monies to establish smaller research and development centers in these kinds of institutions. This would be especially desirable in the area of teacher education. One of the reasons behind my argument is that it is these kinds of institutions which are most likely to develop a balanced research, teaching and service program. It is here that the emerging university, which is at the present time teaching- and people-oriented, can make its greatest contribution. Unless funds are made available to these kinds of institutions, they have no choice, if they are to share in the federal bounty, but to copy the pattern of the already successful university. I see nothing in the amendments which will help correct this situation.

May I thank the committee for this opportunity to present my views relative to the proposed legislation.

Dr. COLLINS. Thank you. I am president of the State University of New York at Albany.

While my opinions are not representative of any official views of any organization or institution, allow me first to express my appreciation of the early extension of existing acts which are accomplished by the amendments of 1967.

When Congress gives colleges and universities, as it does here, time for advance planning, the usefulness of Federal assistance has increased.

In general I would join with my colleagues in expressing support for the general intent of the 1967 amendments and our suggestions and criticisms are minor as compared to the total provisions of the act.

One point I think not mentioned here this morning is one I am sure you have already heard testimony on from other representatives of higher education and that is the desirability of retaining the 3-percent interest rate on loans for the construction of college academic facilities and to raise the percentage as would result from the amend-