you propose the fiscal 1968 budget for OEO in terms of the versatile community action money versus the earmarked community action money?

Mr. SHRIVER. Yes, we can give you that right now or give it to you for the record.

Mr. STEIGER. Will you give us that kind of breakdown?

Mr. SHRIVER. Yes; we can. We have that. Versatile in the 1968——

Mr. QUIE. That is a book we have.

Mr. SHRIVER. Yes, you have it, fortunately, for more than 72 hours. Under the tab that says "Community action program C–4," there is a table on that page and the fiscal 1968 estimate shows $329 million for local initiative programs. That compares to $286 million in 1966 and $247.3. That is actually going to work out to about $247.3. That is what happened to us last year when we had these cuts coupled with all the earmarking. It went down. Under the current authorization request it would go up to $329 which is that third column there.

Mr. QUIE. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER. Just one moment.

So that in fiscal 1968 where you estimate local initiative programs as being $329 million, special emphasis or earmarked funds would be $614 million so that you are actually, again, in my judgment, continuing an imbalance between the earmarked funds versus the versatile funds.

Mr. SHRIVER. All we do is estimate what the communities are going to ask. So far as we are concerned, we would happily go back to the way the bill was when we started when there was nothing earmarked for anything.

Let me just say for the record that one of the reasons that the Headstart program got so far so fast, and I think so effectively, was that we had the money at our disposal to exploit the opening when it occurred so that we went from a program of maybe $2½ million to maybe $88 million without talking to anybody because we had money where we could respond to the local demand. But since that first time we have never had that kind of flexibility. We have always been bound. Some people would say hamstrung by regulations which prevent us from exploiting openings.

A good example is the neighborhood health services or legal services programs or any of six others. If we had the money, we would go further in terms of what the people want, so that this column does not represent an arbitrary ruling from Washington. It represents what we think is going to happen nationally.

Mr. STEIGER. The gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Yes. I understand your answer to Congressman Goodell's question to be that you would prefer nothing earmarked.

Mr. SHRIVER. That is right. When we started, we didn't have it.

Mr. QUIE. Then why do you request such a substantial increase in the earmarked programs when you could get along on the same amount of money by funding each of those programs you want to give a greater amount to with the versatile money?

Mr. SHRIVER. We don't earmark this. What we are trying to do in this kind of table is to explain how we think it is going to end up in terms of the applications that will be coming in.