

I refer you to the recent Bundy report which has specific reference to New York State, but it applies on a nationwide basis. It is not literally true, according to Mr. Bundy, that most of the private colleges and universities are actually in the process of breaking up and disappearing. They are in considerable risk of becoming underdeveloped institutions, however, in terms of not being able to do the kind of quality job that they should do if they don't find more assistance in terms of budgets.

Now, when it comes to the matter of community service programs of the kind that we are talking about here, many of the private colleges and universities have assumed over the years that they could afford to do nothing about this at all in terms of their ordinary budgets.

There are some of us that have been, we think, fortunate enough to have central administrations who have approved of this kind of notion and have tried to do something about it. It is really rather an anomaly that a private university like my own should have as large a program of this kind as it does. It is the sort of thing that one expects to find more often in the large State universities where a good deal of the money has been voted by a State legislature.

With the private college our only equivalent is, of course, what it is that we can get from philanthropy, from unspecialized grants from foundations. For us to operate an extension program does mean for us to be operating something whose operation cost is more than its income is, and when we are asked to find extra financing for extra projects, this pushes rather hard.

Now, it is true that the larger places can make some decision priorities about the deficit, where it is going to lie. In that sense the problem is comparable to what you have with Congress in deciding how big your deficit shall be and what things shall contribute to it. So that we do make decisions of this kind and so do go ahead with some programs.

What seems desirable is for the title I legislation to encourage people to do more of this. The more attractive the legislation is in terms of offering a considerable percentage of the costs of the program, the more likely it is that more places will make more good proposals and it will be possible to pick among very good proposals instead of having to take proposals from whoever is either rich enough or foolish enough to make one, which can be the case.

Mr. ERLNBORN. In the several different programs of Federal aid for higher education, I think we have established some priorities sometimes unmeaningly by the kind of matching provisions that we have. For instance, the work-study program was 90-10 and has now gone to 85-15. It must be much more attractive to put your money into a program like that when establishing your own priorities because not only do you get a higher Federal subsidy but you are also getting the benefit of the students' work under this program. All of these programs seem to start on the concept that the Federal contribution is seed money to get the program going. We make it attractive with the amount of seed money, and it seems quite clear that the Office of Education says this is seed money. We are going to have a high level of funding at the beginning and a stepdown built