

Dr. PFAUTZ. I think that is of first priority. Especially, as I say, will the problem become difficult, I think, in the area of graduate education, because you do have commitment to a certain kind of education which is quite different and, as I say, we must have courage.

I do not mean this as a criticism of the Office of Education, but in the case of graduate education most of the funds from the Government have come from what I would call operating agencies, the National Institutes of Health, National Institute of Mental Health, NASA, and operations like this.

Now the Office of Education is not itself a kind of educational agency in the same sense that NIMH is, constantly doing research. And I would certainly think that in some way or another the universities have to begin more directly—and I am not too knowledgeable about this, but just have some vague impressions—the universities might lean on occasion for a significant amount of time some of their personnel so that the communications and traffic will be meaningful and productive.

I think that this would cost the university something in terms of these people, but I think if the Office of Education gets into institutional development on the graduate level, this is the kind of thing that we would have to do in order to at least have a stab at what you are saying of making some of these decisions.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Unless there is objection, I would like to insert at this point in the record the text of Mr. Pifer's address to which I made reference.

(The document follows:)

[Congressional Record, *Extensions of Remarks*, May 1, 1968]

TOWARD A COHERENT SET OF NATIONAL POLICIES FOR HIGHER EDUCATION—SPEECH
BY ALAN PIFER TO THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES, JANUARY 16, 1968

I have sometimes wondered why foundation officers are asked to give speeches such as this one today and in the course of musing about this have posed two hypotheses to myself. Either, it is possible that proximity to great sums of money may be thought to be indicative of a special wisdom or capacity for philosophical reflection, rather the way the possession of a flowing beard once used to be. Or, these appearances may be considered to have fund-raising possibilities—a kind of identification parade of potential givers arranged for their constituents by conscientious presidents of educational associations.

But neither of these theories really stands up to scientific inquiry. After fifteen years in the foundation business I am still looking for any signs of a special prescience there, and the identification parade of big money men, any schoolboy knows, has to be made up these days not of foundation executives but of Washington bureaucrats.

Anyway, here I am, possibly under false colors, and I am going to speak to you for a few minutes this morning not, as I am supposed to, about new roles for old institutions within the framework of inter-institutional cooperation, but about the federal role in higher education, or, if you will, new dollars for old institutions. This, as you know, is a venerable topic on which everything anyone could possibly say has already been said many times. So all I can do is hope to bring to it the insights of one who is fortunate enough to be neither a dispenser nor a seeker of Washington's largesse.

BEGINNING OF A NEW ERA IN FEDERAL FINANCING OF HIGHER EDUCATION?

In recent months important policy statements on the subject of federal aid have been made by virtually every higher educational association in the country. Several prominent university leaders have made public speeches on the subject. A number of bills dealing either directly or indirectly with the financing