

that. I work in a college where we have an opportunity to observe the performance of youth coming from various walks of life and we feel that our urban areas certainly do a better job of preparing students for working at the college level.

Title I of this bill does provide for an expanded education and training program; so, I assume, would title II, although it is not clear from title II just how much weight would be given to education.

But, to suit my own taste, I would feel better if part A of title I placed greater emphasis upon education and training rather than upon practical work in the forest and in other areas.

I am somewhat concerned that we should be specific in training youth here for jobs that will exist in the future and I am concerned that we may be inclined to take youth who are 16 to 22 years of age, put them in camps in rural areas, and find 2 years later that they are coming out without the proper training for employment.

So I would like to emphasize the need for specific job oriented training under this title. Under Title II—Urban, Rural, and Community Action Programs—I think we should recognize that more work on a multicounty basis is going to be necessary to break through this poverty cycle.

My point would be essentially this: That multicounty market areas and trade areas constitute a much sounder base for economic development and economic planning than is the case of single counties.

If we just stop for a moment and ask when these county boundaries were drawn in the United States, how they were drawn, why they were drawn, and where they were drawn, we will see that they are not really well adapted to our economic situation of 1964.

I would assert that if we were provided with the opportunity to restructure counties today, that we would lay these county lines out distinctly differently from the way they are now drawn. We would consolidate many counties into a much sounder economic base.

The point I would like to make, at this juncture, is that we do not get uniform growth throughout our society. We don't expect economic growth and development to come in a uniform way like a rain would across the land.

It comes more like a little pool or puddle that grows and spills over. So, that, what effects a county might experience from growth and development depends partly on where it is located.

It seems to me that we ought to recognize that by joining together a group of counties to work on a concerted program for development that rural areas may benefit greatly from growth and development that takes place primarily in urban areas; in fact, I suspect that one of the best ways to get rural adjustments is to stimulate growth and development of nearby urban areas because, in this growth and development, we create new markets, new job opportunities, and new income opportunities.

Title II of the present bill is a logical extension of the rural areas development program and it builds, as I see it, upon the local leadership which has been marshaled in that program. The poverty cycle, I don't believe, can be broken without effective and forceful community leadership.

I would emphasize that point: We need concerted action at the local level. The reason I would hold this view is because I feel the