

more friction in dealing with the Department of Labor than with OEO?

Mr. CARTER. That question is so hypothetical, I really don't follow that question.

It seems to me that the issue is not whether there is more friction one place or another, but whether just out of some notion of moving everything together, or whatever the rationale is, we should just disband something that is ongoing and working, and working well, and move it somewhere else.

To that, I have to say resoundingly, no, we ought not to do that.

Mr. DELLENBACK. That which is, is best?

Mr. CARTER. No.

In this particular case, OEO, which has been in existence and has been in operation since roughly the beginning of 1965, I think, as the testimony we have tried to give here and the testimony which has been given by Secretary Wirtz and others shows, has made an enormous impact on the institutions of this society.

It just seems inconceivable to me that it should be said that we ought to abandon that today.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Why should we put Followthrough in the hands of HEW instead of placing Followthrough completely in the hands of OEO, because that is dealing with the same group?

Mr. CARTER. Let me say from the beginning OEO has delegated programs. The Congress is not putting Followthrough in the hands of HEW. The Congress is putting Followthrough in the hands of OEO.

The Director of OEO is saying candidly to you how he expects to administer that program. He says he expects to administer it by delegating it to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I am aware of this technical point you make.

Mr. CARTER. I think it is more than technical.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I am interested in your prior statements where you say you feel the value lies in an organization which can concentrate essentially in this instance on the problems of the poor. That it can deliberately decide that a phase of its problem, a phase of its task and responsibility—instead of administering it directly itself—will be subcontracted out to HEW.

Now, if the value really lies in this complete concentration on this group, would it not be better to keep it within its own aegis rather than to pass it along to HEW?

Mr. CARTER. No. I say from the outset of the Economic Opportunity Act there have been delegations of programs.

I am trying to explain the rationale for that as I understand it. And I think I have some knowledge because I, in a general sense, was responsible for these, some of these delegations in the early days of OEO.

The rationale is that there are certain kinds of programs that could be best administered on a day-to-day basis by agencies within the Federal Government that have the contact with the institutions through which these programs will be run primarily.

However, there is need for OEO to maintain a supervisory role with respect to policy, a control over the budget, evaluation of the programming, and a constant capability of taking the programming back if it does