

ment of Health, Education, and Welfare which would involve making three separate departments within it, the way the Department of Defense is. I understand that this would mean civil service upgrading all along the line. This would enable the Office in general to staff its top positions with a notch or two higher of civil service rated employees. This is one way of doing this. New positions would also mean that new people, perhaps attracted to the Department of Education or whatever it would be called, within HEW, would be recruited to a level and variety of jobs that don't exist now and perhaps another infusion of high-quality people could be obtained that way too.

Again along with Commissioner Howe, we wish to suggest that the present procedure of approving HEW appropriations in August or September is extremely detrimental to the operation not only of the Office but of the schools and universities in which the Office is more and more engaged. I am sure the superintendents have made their feelings clear to you about that. The Federal Government is out of phase with the way the school systems make their budgets. Universities with endowments are a little more flexible but you are out of phase with us too.

The Office also, you know, goes through a summer of almost paralysis, starting in May or June, not knowing what they can get started, hedging bets, talking without seeming to commit itself to everybody. A great deal of tension, anxiety and ill feeling builds up, with nobody knowing what they will have to work with.

Finally, I think it might be possible, and I am confused here and I would like to ask really that maybe you look into this. It would seem that a good bit of the decisionmaking and the hectic atmosphere could be alleviated if USOE were permitted by Congress or if the agency used the authority which it now possesses to enter into more than year-to-year contracts, on a multiple-year contract or grant basis.

I have heard that the Office does have this authority now and I have also heard that the Office does not have authority now—by people you suspect should know in both cases. I am very much confused. There are other agencies such as the National Institutes of Health which say that they have authority to make grants for 7-year periods. They don't usually go to 7, they still stop at 5, but this is still quite a contrast to USOE. And when many of the projects we are engaged in now are of a long-term nature, a 6 months' or 1-year involvement is often just enough to get started. It would seem to me that a more flexible arrangement, if it is not permitted by Congress now, or interpretation by the Office—

Mr. GIBBONS. That is a problem of Congress because most of these acts that we are operating under have 1- or 2-year terms, or perhaps 3-year terms. Elementary and secondary has been on a 1-year basis, now a 2-year basis. OEO is on a 1-year basis. NDEA is on a basis I don't really understand. It comes up for review so often that they probably don't have any statutory authority to go past that.

In drafting legislation for the future that is something to remember—to put the research and development part of it on a much longer basis than some of the operational phases.

Congress has been afraid if we got into the operational phase of some of these programs without getting an opportunity to review them, we might be creating something we were not sure we wanted.