

Mr. NICKERSON. Strengthening of the Department of Education under 89-10. That is a recent action.

Fourth, we believe more flexibility should be allowed in the use of funds provided by various titles of a particular act. I mention as an illustration that Maine has lapsed sizable amounts under title III in the past but has been on a starvation diet so to speak, on title V, to meet the need for guidance.

It is all within the same act itself.

Fifth, it would be very beneficial if major Federal programs could be enacted on an ongoing basis and not subject to termination at the end of a 1-, 2-, or 3-year period. Such time limitations do not lend themselves to stability, confidence, and good budgeting procedures. By confidence, I am thinking of the employment of personnel in particular.

Delayed extension of Public Law 874 and NDEA is a good illustration of the need for long-range planning and budgeting. I recognize that you have had continuous resolutions and that they have filled the gap, but sometimes when programs are just getting underway and there is no previous level of expenditure to use as a basis they present their problems.

Failure to make appropriations on time. By that I mean prior to or at the beginning of a fiscal year—has proven to be costly in terms of employment of competent personnel—we have the problem, for example, of employing personnel in September or October. Under the terms and code of ethics, teacher personnel are not expected to make changes after the first of August. This has been somewhat restrictive—in terms of employment, personnel, and organizations, effectiveness in evaluating and reporting and probably has caused higher financial outlays.

We are much concerned with delays in approval of on-going programs. They have sometimes resulted in the loss of personnel, perhaps hasty or inadequate planning and in some cases in the inability to operate a program at a late date. Perhaps I should not mention this but, for example, as of today, December 1, Public Law 89-10, title I is operating without full guidelines for this fiscal year 1966-67. Eighty percent of the projects have already been approved for operation under the previous year's guidelines. If there are any major changes and revisions they will have to be made after they have been in operation for about half a year.

We would like to see an appropriation of the full authorization under the acts or if this cannot be done, possibly provide for reallocation among the States when any State does not use its full entitlement. There are some provisions in some cases for this but not in all cases. Some States may have unused moneys held in reserve that could be used in other places. We would like to see the full authorization under NDEA, title III, appropriated for the acquisition of equipment.

Mr. GIBBONS. May we pause there. We have had considerable discussion in this subcommittee about that one particular item that you just mentioned, equipment under NDEA. It has been the feeling generally on the subcommittee that we had about gotten caught up on the equipment seed money.