

ceiling and authorizing an increase to the levels consistent with the practices in other comparable federally supported programs.

We support the second proposal, with one reservation: That is, that the increase in payments to institutions not be at the expense of the number of fellowships granted in programs administered by the U.S. Office of Education.

The present grants to institutions are substantially below the cost of carrying on graduate programs at the Ph. D. level.

We also support the first proposal, the aid to development of graduate programs, but suggest one change in language. On page 13, lines 19 and 20, the institutions eligible to receive grants are identified as those "... having programs leading to a degree of doctor of philosophy or an equivalent degree."

Since there is no academic degree equivalent to the doctor of philosophy degree, we recommend either that the other degrees intended be specifically identified so that the meaning of the statute is clear, or that the words "or an equivalent degree" be stricken. Strengthening of graduate programs in Ph. D.-granting institutions not now identified as among the top-ranking group is desirable and in the long run essential.

Attention should be given both to geographic considerations, and to institutions within the various geographic areas.

In supporting this proposal, we at the same time point out that both the institutions thus strengthened and those already in the top-ranking group are faced with the problem of maintaining levels of quality once achieved. This proposal would give institutions funds to expand and improve over a short-range period.

The inevitable question arises: What happens then? An expanded fellowship program, with increased grants to institutions to cover the cost of education; plus expanded and dependable support of Federal research and graduate education programs generally, would be one way of assuring graduate schools of the ability to carry on after the temporary financial aid of project grants is withdrawn.

Without such support, universities having achieved high quality in graduate education are on the horns of a dilemma: One horn being to let the graduate program deteriorate, and the other being to sustain it by charging undergraduates more in order to finance graduate education.

The provision requiring the Commissioner of Education to consult with other Federal agencies conducting similar programs is desirable, and in fact we see it as essential, whether required by law or not.

Title IV: Student Assistance Act (Educational Opportunity Act of 1965):

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Our associations believe the statement of purpose proposed for title VI as a new section 400(a) should be revised, for reasons which I shall indicate.

We are strongly committed to the objectives set forth in the first two sentences of this proposed statement on page 17 of the bill:

The Congress hereby finds and declares that it is in the national interest to provide educational opportunities beyond secondary school to all our youth that desire such opportunities and can benefit from them.