

It may well be that looking at the problem, as I say, on an institutional basis, and providing Federal grants on an institutional basis, may be useful.

The reason this hasn't happened up until now is that medical schools themselves were afraid that an institutional grant might involve Federal control of the medical schools. During the whole development and passage of this legislation, while Senator Ribicoff was Secretary, medical schools were assured that money would come to them without any Federal dictation or control over how they operated.

Representative REUSS. Hasn't this had the following ironic effect? In the process of assuring the medical schools that there wouldn't be any Federal control or supervision or skewing of what they are doing, haven't we achieved exactly that? We have skewed them in favor of the exotic in the use of Federal funds, and we have impoverished their central budget, which should be devoted to the job of producing more good, modern, all-around physicians and surgeons, the people who comprise 90 percent of the physicians of this country, who actually treat patients.

Mr. COHEN. First, I think institutional grants would give the institutions greater freedom and less Federal control. When you have categories and subcategories, as you say, the Federal Government is really prescribing the area where that money ought to go. I think institutional grants may be given without control.

Quite frankly, I think they are less attractive to Members of Congress. That is the difficulty. In going through the congressional process of both the legislative committees and the Appropriations Committees, my experience has been that the first question they ask is, "Mr. Secretary, what will this money be used for specifically?"

When you say "it will be used to provide a better medical school" or "more medical schools" that usually isn't a specific enough reason. Thus the legislation tends to become categorical, subcategorical, more limited, more prescribed. I think the Members of Congress have to be convinced consideration of the problem may be in the national interest.

Now there is one other problem. If you use institutional grants for medical schools, you might well have to consider this approach for institutions generally. A wide variety of other types of fellowships, scholarships, and so on, are earmarked through many different kinds of grants in education. Now university presidents are asking Secretary Gardner and me why we do not have institutional university grants generally. I think the question merits attention.

Representative REUSS. We may need some education of the Congress.

Chairman PROXMIRE. May I point out we have a terrific attendance here of committee members—with no television—which I think speaks both for the attractiveness of your subject and your capacity to present it, and also, of the quality of the members of this committee.

Mr. COHEN. I see many members of the committee who are on other legislative committees that I am to appear before during this session of the Congress, so I sense that this may be a little preview of what will come later. I am glad to have this opportunity to see what will be forthcoming.

Senator JAVITS. It is always good to have humility, Mr. Secretary.

Mr. COHEN. Yes.