

Mrs. GREEN. What would be your reaction if we, as I think there is some merit to the suggestion of getting these new programs on the books—if we wrote in a proviso for all of the new programs that they not be funded until existing programs are fully funded?

Mr. HOWE. I would regard that as a step backward. I think that these new programs have great hope for students and very great hope for higher education institutions.

I think that to attempt to legislate appropriation action in this fashion really removes from the administration and from the Appropriations Committees the duties they have to plan for appropriations. It would seem to me that that would result in less good planning for the use of funds. It would also deny the opportunity to students and to higher education institutions to benefit from programs that are very hopeful. I would hope you would not do that.

Mrs. GREEN. So that we would not be interfering with your appropriations we could certainly provide that the programs not be authorized until 1971.

Mr. MUIRHEAD. Madam Chairman, because the very largest cut in the higher education programs has come in construction, it might be helpful if we were to provide for the committee an analysis of the impact of that cut and what might happen under several options. What might happen, if, for example, expenditures for facilities were restored to the planned level, let us say in 1970 or in 1971, so that you could assess the impact of this cut on the accomplishment of the goal embodied in the Higher Education Facilities Act. That legislation has set as its goal, the closing of the gap, if you will, between the volume of facilities, needed to meet higher education enrollment and the construction capacity of the colleges and universities. We had hopefully planned to achieve that objective by 1973.

The program which had been laid out would have closed that gap, with the planned expenditures, by 1973.

If we could provide for you now information that would indicate what the state of affairs will be in 1973 as a result of this cut and how much longer it might take to fully close the gap—which was the original intention of the act—then I think you might have the choices before you.

(The analysis referred to follows:)

ANALYSIS OF THE IMPACT OF REDUCED HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT FUNDING LEVELS IN FISCAL YEARS 1968 AND 1969

As a result of reductions due to overall budget ceilings, a total of \$450 million has been authorized for new obligations in fiscal year 1968 under the Higher Education Facilities Act. The requested program levels for fiscal year 1969 total \$325 million.

Earlier Office of Education projections had assumed total new obligations under the Higher Education Facilities Act at a level of \$650 million in both fiscal year 1968 and fiscal year 1969, tapering off gradually each subsequent year through fiscal year 1973.

On the basis of the original assumption, it was estimated that the academic facilities quantity gap, which apparently reached maximum severity in the fall of 1967, would be progressively reduced to manageable proportions by the end of fiscal year 1973.

As estimated originally, the situation in the fall of 1973 would have been about as follows: