

To shake loose a regular member of a faculty, I think you can appreciate particularly in a small institution such as Brown the kind of nuisance impact that losing a man from a department has. It is not the easiest thing in the world to set this up. That is one of the reasons why we have kept it at a level at which I hope we can continue to operate.

Mr. GIBBONS. How do you suggest the Congress set some reasonable boundaries on these developing institutions?

Dr. PFAUTZ. This, I think, is the most difficult thing in the world to do. As I say, we have over 2,000 4-year colleges. As you say, from one point of view they are all developing.

But I think, and I certainly agree with you, that it is probable that we cannot support them all. And I suspect that a number of small grants are just utterly meaningless.

As a private personal individual, I have felt from the very beginning that a program like this understandably has to serve as many as possible. But perhaps within the university one might get agreement to support a small number of these colleges in a significant fashion. Then at the end of 10 years you might have 10 new first-rate quality colleges, which would be a magnificent achievement. But it would take a considerable amount of courage and a considerable amount of cooperation to make this kind of decision.

Yet, certainly, I think it is quite true that if you spread your funds very far you begin to get grants of \$10,000 and \$15,000, which may have no impact, which do in fact have no impact whatsoever. And the same problem, I think, you will have to face when we get into the graduate education.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Just in that connection, Professor Pfautz, I was reminded as I heard you in colloquy with Mr. Gibbons of the extremely provocative and thoughtful speech delivered in January at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges by Alan Pifer, the president of the Carnegie Corp., in which he remarked that by the year 1975, in his judgment, higher education in this country would be depending on the Federal Government for about 50 percent of their support.

He made the proposition, therefore, that we should begin to think about some kind of a mechanism which would enable us to establish a national policy for higher education. He was, of course, not suggesting any kind of Federal control but, on the contrary, was trying to urge leaders of higher education to consider that if they are not going to be able to get enough money to meet the problems of higher education from State and local sources, from student charges, and from philanthropy and would therefore have to call more and more upon the Federal tax dollar, they would all the more need to develop some way of making sure that their views were heard by people such as those on our committee and by people in the executive branch of Government. The point he was making was, for example, that when decisions are made about whether it is wise to give more support to developing institutions or not, those decisions are made against a backdrop of considering all the needs of higher education and all the pressures on it.

Have you any comment on Mr. Pifer's suggestion?