

through intensive training in semiskilled jobs—the training camps and community work-training programs—to providing work-study opportunities which would enable young people with the highest potential to obtain a college education.

The volunteer program proposed in title VI is a somewhat more limited approach than the original legislation. When we testified earlier we indicated that one of the great values of this legislation is the endorsement that would be given to volunteer services by presidential and congressional endorsement of such services.

In my own State of Massachusetts some of you may be aware of the fact that the Governor of the State has proposed that we have a State domestic peace corps to utilize volunteers in the State and hopefully, if this is enacted, it would be able to be integrated with whatever is passed by the Congress.

We note with interest that at the end of February—more than 2 weeks before the President submitted his message on poverty—the six Republican members of the Joint Economic Committee proposed a seven point program for an attack on poverty.

Two of these proposals were: (1) Lifting children out of a poverty environment by federally assisted programs including residence schools for certain disadvantaged ones; and (2) upgrading schools in poverty impacted neighborhoods.

The first of these suggests a close similarity to the training camps in the pending legislation while the latter proposals could be pursued under the community action program.

The Republican members of the Joint Economic Committee also proposed “increasing the number of professionally trained public and private welfare and social workers” in order that the ranks of these workers, the statement continues “who are on the frontline of the war on poverty” may be increased.

This struck a particularly responsive chord for as we have earlier testified unless some action is taken to increase the number of foot soldiers in this war—the family unit through jobs and community action phases of this legislation will be severely handicapped.

We realize, of course, that the community action title provides that up to 15 percent of the funds may be used for research, training, and demonstration activities. Without knowing the details, however, it is probable that such training will be short term and inservice training since this is the usual pattern of similar provisions in other legislation. The realities of the manpower needs of this program quite obviously will require extensive utilization of persons without special education including quite properly some of the beneficiaries of the program who may be discovered to have a promising potential.

But special trained staff is essential to the overall poverty program and vital to the effectuation of public welfare services. We want the history on this legislation to record that the 1962 Public Welfare Amendments provided authorization for such training of public welfare personnel. However, no appropriation for this purpose has been made.

May I add a personal remark since I was involved in some of the original legislation which passed the Congress for the training of public welfare personnel, that I think it is particularly regrettable that we keep passing legislation to train such personnel but we do not make the