

The first I would like to touch on is not in the recommendations for this time. It is the one that relates to the Higher Education Facilities Act, title I. We call your attention to section 106 of that act as it was originally passed which has to do with institution eligibility. This is on page 2 of my testimony as written, at the bottom of the page.

There is a very heavy stress, as you know, almost complete stress, in this eligibility requirement on raw enrollment growth as such, as a requirement to become eligible to even be considered for one of these groups.

I would like to point out that we are talking here about basic institution eligibility, not the way priorities are to be established.

We don't want to change that. There are cases I think where a college or university we believe does desperately need to renovate or replace existing space or they will not be able to serve the student body they have already. And I think it must often be done in order to even establish a base for any enrollment increases for the future.

The most usual case, of course, is the "Old Main" that every campus has in the United States which was built at the turn of the century or before. It was built to last 100 or 200 years but yet by today's standards its utilization is not very great.

The size of the rooms are such that they do not match up to modern-day techniques. Frequently you can renovate a building like this and make it something worth using, something worthwhile.

The way it is now these kinds of buildings, frequently, because of the nature of section 106, cannot even become eligible for consideration.

So we do suggest that some rewording of this section be made if this is possible, which in effect will allow commissions, our proposal here is, or some other means if there is a better way, to make some judgments or some hopefully objective analysis if that is possible, of this particular kind of case.

That is the base to go from before you can make your enrollment expansions.

Mr. QUIE. May I ask a question here? It is my recollection that in previous consideration of the Higher Education Facilities Act we did that. Is there nothing in the act? Maybe it was in the report—but I do recall this coming up before.

Mr. MORTON. To my knowledge, Mr. Quie, there is no change that I know of.

Mr. QUIE. I guess we discussed it but did not actually include it.

Mr. MORTON. Right.

What we are trying to say in essence on this particular point is that nobody would suggest that we change the basic thrust which is to put the higher priorities where the enrollments are going to be but there are many cases where you can prepare an institution to take more students by doing things like this and this is all we are talking about.

I suspect this is enough on that point unless there are further questions.

I would like to turn now to the title VI amendments of which there are more proposed by the administration and also by us.

They are largely technical amendments, although I would like to say something later on about the general philosophical approach to this for your consideration.