

Eighty percent of the 87 are private schools and 20 percent are small or moderate-sized public schools.

My institution, New York University, is one of the private schools. Other institutions in this situation in New York State are Alfred, Columbia, Herbert H. Lehman, and Fordham Universities; Barnard, Brooklyn, City, Mount St. Mary, and Sarah Lawrence Colleges; Pratt Institute; and the New School for Social Research. Lists for other States would be available, I am sure, from the Office of Education.

The overall significance is clear. Private universities and smaller public universities and colleges cannot afford 50-50 matching, cannot "find" the matching funds. This is true in spite of the fact that many of these institutions are located in parts of the States not served by the larger public institutions.

In my own State of New York, where I am a member of the State advisory council on continuing higher education, I see clearly the harm that 50-50 matching will do. There is an unusually large number of private colleges and universities in our State with long-established continuing education and community service programs, including such large universities as the Universities of Rochester, Syracuse, Columbia, and my own institution.

Few of these can afford additional new projects for which 50-50 matching funds must be found, especially because they already have large budgets and consequently large deficits, so that when they undertake a new project over and above the regularly budgeted program, they must expect to find new funds for the new project. My own school, for example, has the largest noncredit continuing education program of any private university in the country, with an express budget more than eight times as large as the title I funds available for the whole State of New York. That does not make it easy to take on additional projects with 50-50 funding.

In addition, New York has many small public institutions, such as the separate campuses of the State University of New York, that do not yet have extension programs or public service programs of staffs or budgets. They have a very real problem in accepting 50-50 funded projects. Although we only have estimates on how many approved projects will be undertaken in the State at 50-50 funding, we do know there have been half as many proposals this year as there were last year.

The result of changing funding from 75-25 to 50-50 is not to make funds go farther, but to defeat the original purpose of the title I if I have understood that purpose. Under the title, it was intended that new projects be undertaken, that new institutions be involved, and that new moneys be used in order to find solutions to pressing community problems. The result of asking the institutions to find a larger percentage of the enabling moneys is to discourage some institutions from developing the new programs which the Congress intended, and others from entering the program at all.

If funds are available early enough and in not more stringent matching terms than 75-25, we most certainly urge the extension of title I through fiscal year 1973. In every State, title I has made possible new programs, new projects, new approaches to community problems