

Mr. PUCINSKI. Would it be then perhaps wise for this committee to put some sort of age criteria so that we are not wasting the money? In other words, it does not make any sense to me, if your figures are correct and if I understand your testimony correctly, perhaps I don't, it does not make much sense to me to give a young fellow \$1,500, \$2,500 long-range loans if you feel he is not going to stay on the farm. On the other hand, if a man is beyond 25, he is now bedding down for a lifetime of some sort of breadwinning for his family—if the prognosis that he is going to stay on the farm is correct. Then, perhaps that is the fellow we ought to help because the chances are if we help him he will make good. Is there any merit to that?

Dr. BISHOP. Yes. I think it has a great deal of merit. I think it has merit in that if we are looking at young people who are retrainable, who could prepare themselves for nonfarm jobs, or who could do a competent job as commercial farm operators, we ought to ask ourselves how we can get enough resources for this young person to make a success in commercial farming or we should not encourage him to stay there.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Bishop, I want to thank you for your very fine testimony. You certainly have been frank in analyzing this bill. I think we are fortunate to have had your testimony. Thank you very much.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Dr. Bishop, I want to say to you that you may not have had the motion picture cameras and all the others around you, as have some of the high title officials, but you have given the committee more information that will help us in judging titles II and III, possibly I also, than has probably anybody who has appeared before us. I want to thank you very much for your cooperation.

Dr. BISHOP. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman from Georgia has requested that a statement by the Honorable Harlee Branch, Jr., be inserted at this point in the record.

Without objection it is so ordered.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF HARLEE BRANCH, JR., ATLANTA, GA.

My comments are limited to titles II and III of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (H.R. 10443 and S. 2642). I have not had an opportunity to study the complicated and far-reaching provisions of the other titles.

Insofar as my section of the country is concerned, the principal focus of poverty is in the rural areas. This explains my special interest in titles II and III.

The problem of rural poverty varies in intensity and even in nature from county to county and from State to State. It is undoubtedly less acute in my native State of Georgia, and in neighboring Alabama, than in some other sections of the region known as Appalachia. But even in Alabama and Georgia, there are numerous persons residing in rural areas whose skills have been rendered obsolete and unsalable by technological changes. Others are illiterate. Still others, despite good character, native intelligence, basic competence, and a will to work, are being forced to lead static and sterile lives simply because they lack the capital resources required to translate their energy and ambition into gainful activities.

Two quite contrary assumptions—both of them erroneous—have made us hesitate in this country to launch an all-out assault on poverty. One has been the assumption that somehow, someday, as national prosperity increases, poverty will either disappear or cease to be a problem of significant proportions. The other, and conflicting, assumption has been that no effective solution is possible. "The poor we have had with us always," it is said—the intended implication being