

camp, the OEO loans, and we could go on—the Headstart program, too.

Mr. QUIE. Perhaps there was a misunderstanding. From the beginning the Job Corps was separate and the Neighborhood Youth was separate, and so on. But at its inception, programs for narcotics, for Headstart, for Nelson programs, for legal services and adult education, were all versatile programs. That is, adult education was earmarked as part of the community action programs and all versatile programs were to be funded by the local community action program as they felt the need.

These are the earmarked funds Mr. Steiger was talking about where there was a shift from the versatile to the earmarks, but not the originally earmarked programs.

Could I have your comments on this?

Secretary FREEMAN. You are asking within the funds that go to the local community action program is the tendency sound to earmark those funds and set down what they should be spent for as distinguished from naming them in general and leaving them up to the local community action.

I have mixed emotions about that, to be quite honest. I am sure the Congress would want and as Administrator, myself, at times I would want to give priority to certain programs that I think ought to have some emphasis.

On the other hand, you would not want to foreclose unduly the discretion of the local people in the program who after all are very close to it and who ought to have as much flexibility as possible, so I would be pulled both ways.

I would say I would tend to feel there should be a maximum of flexibility, but I would not myself want to be so handcuffed if I were administering this if I believed a program for what I felt to be a good reason should have top priority that I would not be in a position to do something about it.

Mr. QUIE. As I understand, the Administrator could have full authority to do what he wanted about this. As to whether the Congress should strap the Administrator and the community action agencies by putting in earmarked programs—I would say to you, Mr. Secretary, if the Congress does move in the direction of earmarked programs, and I don't believe they should, that you should start dreaming up some for the rural earmarked programs because 36 percent of nothing is not very much. Most of the earmarked programs go to urban areas and there only remains a small amount for versatile programs, 36 percent of that isn't going to be very much for the rural.

So, if the urban areas are out getting their earmarked programs, the rural areas had better go out and try to get their programs, too. For instance in the narcotic programs, we don't have much in the rural area—

Secretary FREEMAN. Headstart and training programs, however, are helpful to the rural areas.

Mr. QUIE. Rural services are not as much help to the rural areas as the urban area. This is my concern. I think the Congress in its trial run on earmarking programs last year made a mistake. I think we ought to leave it at versatile programs because what fits a community