

training programs, from a variety of Government agencies. And some Government agencies, like the National Science Foundation, already provide institutional block grants.

Therefore, it seems to me that unless the current pattern of Federal support of graduate schools and graduate education is analyzed, the inauguration of a new general program only invites chaos and costly duplication. Moreover, in terms of priority and given the current level of Government support for graduate education, it is our smaller colleges, which provide the students for our graduate schools, that are most in need at this point in time.

Finally, in the light of the costs of any proposal which would have any significant impact on any single graduate school, the level of appropriation mentioned for both parts of title III only suggests to me the need to give considerably more thought to the matter before any final decision is made. To place this program in title III is only the final questionable decision in my view.

I would conclude by emphasizing the point that graduate education is, in fact, "another country." To link the form and administration of its support with the concept of developing institutions is dangerous and misleading. Here, especially, we must have the courage to face up to the invidious choices that must be made in the allocation of limited funds if we are to maintain the integrity and insure the functions of graduate education in our Nation.

Mr. BRADEMAS (presiding). Thank you very much, Professor Pfautz, for your obviously very carefully prepared analysis of title III programs and your recommendations.

Mr. GIBBONS, have you any questions?

Mr. GIBBONS. I want to thank Dr. Pfautz. We seldom ever get someone who is as blunt and critical as you have been in some of these things, and we appreciate that.

Let me go back to your experience at Tougaloo. Perhaps I am the person on this committee who was most skeptical of title III, because at that time, with every institution under the definition we put in the act, from Harvard and Stanford and all of them on down—and I don't say they are the tops but just assuming for the sake of argument that they are—it looked like every institution could qualify as a developing institution.

You are very correct in saying that this was a direct aid for building of the facilities of the institution and, also, for its educational operation.

I was worried that we had not put enough guidelines and boundaries on the activities of title III. So I guess I am the person who probably objected most and had the most to do with cutting down the amount of money we put in the title.

Could you explain to me precisely what you did when you went down to Tougaloo, what went on there, how many people actually went with you?

Dr. PFAUTZ. Well, I think I should say first, Congressman Gibbons, that Brown was asked by Tougaloo if they couldn't find some way in which they might be helpful, given Tougaloo's problems, which were precisely the problems of any small underdeveloped college.

They knew that costs were rising, that they had no alumni constituency on which they could depend to raise funds, that they had problems relative to their ability to attract faculty.