Is there some way we can simplify it?

Mr. MARTIN. My own opinion is, Congressman Perkins, that there are certain elements of difficulty in a program in which you start out with 95, 90, 75, 50, because you hold the idea down the line here to the point where you are going to have to find substantial institutional resources elsewhere when the truth of the matter is that I do not think that the crisis will ever pass.

You will need in the future these programs at about the same level as you do at present. Generally the Congress has been good in that they have changed this scale once it has been adopted in the light of the realities of time. But it has always caused this kind of situation and an uncertainty with the institution.

Chairman PERKINS. Are there any further comments, Dr. Johns?

Mr. JOHNS. No, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. I hope I will see you gentlemen and we will be able to get together during the noon hour.

Mr. OSWALD. Thank you.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Congressman Quie, do you have questions?

Mr. QUIE. Yes, I do; Madam Chairman.

On page 5 you speak of the fact that there is going to be an increase in payments to the institution which should not be at the expense of the number of fellowships granted, and I buy that. That is good judgment.

But then over on page 15, you say that on the higher education facilities that we ought to be increasing the percentage of Federal grants to 50 percent and maybe even up to 75 percent on top of a reduction of one-third and then a reduction to $75 million.

It seems a bit inconsistent.

Mr. OSWALD. I will respond by stating that under present level of appropriation where it is so far below the authorization that I would say that it should remain where it is in order to get the maximum number of projects.

This is a longer range position if the appropriations anywhere came near the authorizations.

Mr. QUIE. I could remind my colleagues that would not be $75 million as proposed in the budget this year but something over a billion dollars. That would throw it in an altogether different light.

Do you think that we ought to continue requiring some local matching? You say perhaps even 75 percent. Then I begin to wonder, you know, someone would say if he could really have his "druthers," the Federal Government should pay 100 percent.

Mr. OSWALD. I think there should always be; yes.

Mr. QUIE. In your estimation you think it might even be better to have a 25 percent rather than 50 percent local share?

Mr. OSWALD. Yes, 25 percent local, yes; this is the position of the two associations on this.

Mr. QUIE. For all institutions or just a few——

Mr. OSWALD. No; all of this. This is a program administered by the different State commissions underneath the Federal general regulations. Of course, this would be for all institutions.

Mr. QUIE. Every institution would be able to secure eventually 75 percent of the cost from the Federal Government?