

year when it was necessary to cut back on the budget the reduction should be made on material things rather than in programs that apply to young people.

Any decision on the part of the administration within the context of the Educational Opportunity Act that would tend to discourage seeking out disadvantaged young people would in such measure thwart that objective.

Mr. QUIE. Do you have proof that the change this year from 90-10 to 85-15 has actually discouraged the institutions? Can you submit that proof to us?

Mr. MUIRHEAD. We have no clear-cut proof except that by and large I think it would be reasonable to assume that if we required the institution to put less of its own funds into the student-aid program that it could use that money for other purposes, presumably to strengthen the program at the institution.

Mr. HOWE. I think we could get you some clear evidence at some institutions that is a definite problem to them. It is increasingly common knowledge, I think, that the higher educational institutions across the United States have a severe financial problem. This is the reason the President in his message directed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make a major study about the financial condition of higher education. I am quite sure we can get institutional evidence that even this small 5 percent does create a problem at some institutions.

Mr. QUIE. I don't know if I should take any more time if you want to go on to some others?

Mrs. GREEN. All right, Congressman Gibbons.

Mr. GIBBONS. Thank you, Madam Chairman, I will comment briefly on the subject that Mr. Quie raised, because I think it is a subject we see as a real problem because there is not enough money to meet the demands. It reminds me of the story told about the problem down in my part of the country where they said they didn't want any of this tainted money and now the song is "there just taint enough."

Now, I think this is the problem here, "there just taint enough" of this, the demand is so great, and the need is so great. I support most of the changes you recommend here on pages 6 and 7. I had some questions, though, about why do you recommend the change in item 4 on page 6 of eliminating reward for the student who performs better? Can you give me your arguments on that?

Mr. MUIRHEAD. That was not an easy decision to make, Mr. Gibbons. But, again, in a context of limited funds which must be stretched to accomplish a very large purpose, we felt that the practice of making an extra \$200 available to students who stand in the upper half of their class—though on its own a very laudable thing to do—was not clearly in accord with the purposes of the student-aid program, which is to use the money that is available to seek out as many able but disadvantaged students as possible and get them into college. So that money, in our judgment, would be used to better advantage by providing grants for entrance of students.

Mr. GIBBONS. But has there been any trouble in administering this part that gives a slight advantage to a student who is performing at a little higher level? I don't know whose amendment it was; I remem-