

and training of the people in these areas because to a very large extent the training of people in low-income areas is out of face with modern economic opportunity.

I think we have to have better training—training that is geared more to preparing people for the jobs that exist today and can exist tomorrow. What we witnessed, particularly among the youth in rural areas who are caught in this cycle of poverty, is that they have a rather bleak employment future either in agriculture or, unless they are given additional training, they will have very bleak futures in nonfarm employment.

In other words—and to put it rather succinctly—to encourage them to stay on the farms is to perpetuate poverty. To take them off the farms and send them to the cities without providing them with the requisite skills is to condemn them to a life of poverty and unemployment in our cities.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Would you permit an interruption at this point?

Dr. BISHOP. Yes, sir.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Do you believe that under title III, which provides two basic formulas—one to help the impoverished families get back on their feet without right grants, and the other provision to create family farms on very reasonable payment plans—do you think that these two proposals could help keep some of the people on the farm but in a much better economic and financial condition than they now are?

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt for a question here?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes.

Mr. BELL. Are you about through with your statement, Mr. Bishop?

Dr. BISHOP. I would like to speak especially to each one of the titles.

Mr. BELL. I think he has about finished his statement and he will speak to each of the titles. I would suggest that the chairman wait until he has finished.

Dr. BISHOP. I will come to that point anyway.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Very good.

Dr. BISHOP. I think, in short, a greater commitment to vocational training and to education is an essential element in breaking the poverty cycle. We see this: Numerous studies, numerous pieces of research have been done that show us that, as we close the education gap, we also tend to close the income gap. In the South, where I come from, we find that people who have college education get incomes roughly comparable to college-educated people outside the South.

So, to a certain extent, this income difference that we see in our society is a function of education. I would not, however, wish to convey the impression that education by and of itself would be sufficient to solve the low income problem.

I do not happen to believe that. The point I do want to make here, however, is the fact that rural youth are disadvantaged in our society because their education is not comparable with that received by youth in other parts of our society. This fact is well known. If you take the rural youth as a whole with an average education they have a median of 8.8 years; whereas, urban people have a median of 11.1 years.

That assumes that the quality of education is comparable between the rural schools and the urban schools. I don't happen to believe