

I refer specifically to the amendments to title I and title V of the act.

The deep and abiding interest of member institutions in title I of the Higher Education Act is exemplified by the fact that 105 members received title I grants under the 1966 and 1967 appropriations, out of 122 who were eligible. Over 64 percent of funds allocated during fiscal year 1966 were received by member institutions.

Because of our interest in title I, we would like to go on record in support of the administration's amendments.

We are especially interested in maintaining the matching requirements in the 75-25 formula. One of the great boons of this act is the opportunity it provides many public and private community colleges to develop community service-oriented extension and continuing education programs for their constituents.

Many of these schools were without the necessary staff resources and facilities for developing title I programs as intended under the act. Many were unable to be funded during the first 2 fiscal years because only \$20 million of the \$75 million authorized were appropriated. The schools which could least afford it would be hurt the hardest by a change in the matching requirement to a 50-50 formula.

In the well-established schools, continuing education programs have traditionally been self-supporting. At the University of California, for example, which has the largest budget in the Nation for general extension, State funds account for only 7 percent of the budget.

The managers of extension divisions have usually had to restrict themselves to self-supporting programs. The limited experience under title I during the 10 months it has been operating in the field has not enabled these schools to develop the necessary sources of funds to assume the burden of 50 percent financing.

We, therefore, urge you to give favorable consideration to extending the 75-25 matching requirement for at least through fiscal year 1969.

The amendment also provides for extending authorization through fiscal year 1972. In reviewing the implementation of many new Federal education programs, many of us are learning anew what we have always known: There is no such thing as instant education.

This is true at every level of education and is accentuated where we are dealing with the more complex processes of community development. Public officials, such as the honorable members of this committee, have often been acutely aware of the difficulty of educating the public regarding the complexities of many public issues and political processes.

The problem is essentially the same for educators, although in many instances they cannot gain easy access to adequate media coverage.

Extension of the authorization is necessary for another practical reason. Good administration is usually half the solution to any organizational goal. One of the more important elements of good administration is a reasonable degree of predictability regarding income.

General Motors could not run efficiently or effectively if its car sales were to fluctuate wildly and unpredictably each year. Universities are not exempt from this requirement. Professional staff cannot be hired or retained, space cannot be allocated economically, and program problems cannot be resolved with maximum benefit to the community if