

of Federal funds for construction of teaching facilities for continuing or advanced education.

Of even greater importance is the provision that would permit a single application for construction of facilities that, though substantially for teaching purposes, also would include research and library facilities. Certainly, this would eliminate a great deal of administrative confusion and red tape.

Indeed, these changes, and perhaps some others in the bill, are of such manifest value that we are sorry to see they will not take effect until the end of fiscal 1969. The committee might wish to consider moving the effective date forward one year.

A substantive improvement also would be made by the provision that will permit up to 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ percent Federal support for renovation or rehabilitation if, in the Secretary's judgment, unusual circumstances exist. In previous years, when testifying on these matters before this committee, we have voiced concern over the possibility that some dental schools might find it necessary to close their doors unless substantial assistance could be obtained. This concern, we are sorry to say, has now become a reality in the case of St. Louis University that has felt compelled, solely for financial reasons, to discontinue its dental school. Had broader financial support been available, the university might have felt able to continue. We are presently aware of four to six additional existing schools that are actively considering the termination of their dental educational programs. One has requested the American Dental Association to form a task force to study the feasibility of continuance. It is self-evident that the retention of an existing school, its faculty and structure and student body, is at least as important to the future as is the funding of a completely new school that will require 8 or 10 years before graduating its first practitioner. The closing of any existing school would be a crippling blow to our hopes for progress.

Institutional grants

Viewed as incentive programs for the improvement of dental education, the basic and special improvement grants of the past 2 years have been remarkably successful. In 1964-65, the operating dental schools spent approximately \$51 million on their teaching programs. In 1967-68, that total had mounted to \$77 million, demonstrating clearly that non-Federal expenditures have risen at a rate considerably higher than the amounts distributed by the Federal Government. In fact, current non-Federal expenditures are some \$14 million more than they were in 1964-65, while Federal funds have been increased some \$12 million.

With the funds available as institutional grants, combined with the non-Federal effort, 45 dental schools have added new courses to the undergraduate curriculum in 28 subject areas, pertinent courses that will significantly improve the services the new dentist can offer his patients. Additionally, 28 schools have reported expenditures of significant amounts for such purposes as new educational equipment and new clinical teaching aids.

With the funds available from the improvement grants, the Nation's dental schools have been able to recruit 173 full-time equivalent faculty personnel, thus enabling them to meet the needs of a student enrollment that has increased 10 percent since 1961.