

difficult and complex questions, but I am here to urge you to consider them so that we might know what we are doing and, correlatively, maximize our chances of success.

Parenthetically, not every institution, despite its desire has, in fact, the potential for making a substantial contribution to our higher educational resources. This is true especially in the light of my previous observation that there is, if anything, a greater and increasing gap between our best and least developed colleges.

Moreover, beyond the reality of our commitment to share, to make an honest effort at serving the total universe of colleges, institutional grants for higher education must be of significant size as to make an impact and closely reviewed, in the case of the smaller institutions, so as to be not so large as to constitute a burden of absorption and administration, especially in regard to the implications of such grants for future commitments.

Thus, in my own experience in regard to the Tougaloo College-Brown University cooperative program, one measure of whatever success we might have achieved has been, through Federal and private foundation grants, the doubling of Tougaloo's operating budget in less than 3 years. In a manner of speaking, this is what the inauguration of a development program means. It changes an institution from one that has been kept going to one that is going places.

This not only costs money, but there are obvious risks insofar as we have not been able to secure the kinds of funds that will guarantee continued operation at the new and higher level. Now, Tougaloo is truly in trouble; now, we have a real challenge on our hands.

There are other, minor observations I would make in regard to the administration of title III. For example, in cooperative programs I see no reason why a faculty member who serves as a consultant should receive a consultant's fee of \$100 per day. To be sure, his expenses should be paid, but there is little meaning in the concept of cooperation as defined in the title—drawing on the resources of the coordinating institutions—if its personnel are paid twice for their time.

I also feel very strongly that there is one tradition in the research-grant model which should be adapted to the institutional-grant program; site visits. Where an institution receives a grant of \$100,000 or more, I believe that site visits should be made, if only in the interests of the taxpayers.

Finally, I would remark briefly on the addition of part B, "Improvement of Graduate Programs," to title III. Frankly, I was shocked by the inclusion of this function in this title, especially at this time.

This is not to say that I disapprove of direct Federal aid to graduate schools in the same manner that I have been speaking of such aid to undergraduate colleges. But it is self-evident, I think, that such a program would be vastly more complex, perhaps even more costly, and certainly involves more contentious issues.

Here, especially, the concept of higher education cannot be diluted. In part, the difference is explicitly recognized in the title by proposing the formation of an Advisory Council on Graduate Education. In any case, however, it is not the concept but the timing and the almost unserious nature of the proposal for such a program that disturbs me.

In fact, our graduate schools are already receiving considerable support, especially in connection with their research operations and