

Dr. SCHOTTLAND. Yes; we will be glad to do that.

If I may take a few seconds to tell you why we are so concerned and why over the years we have tried to get the Congress concerned.

Take the average local welfare department; they take some young lad or some girl out of college and they give them a case load and they give them a little training. They know nothing about the complexities of the program. That young person goes out and obligates between \$50,000 and a quarter million dollars worth of public funds, just to give you a quick figure so that you can see the realities; let us say they have a case load of 200 people and the average grant is, say, \$75 a month. That is \$900 a year times 200, you can see that is \$180,000. We let them go ahead and do this kind of thing without the slightest training, without any attempt to tackle his problem realistically.

One of the problems that we have in this field is that many federally aided programs are draining off personnel, because they can get money for training—mental health, child welfare, and some of the others. We need the same kind of backstopping to train people in this particular field, because a young person today who does not have any money is going to go for training; he would much rather take a training program where he can get some stipend to assist him.

We will furnish the figures to the committee.

Mrs. GREEN. I do not know whether the committee wants them, but if you will send them to my office, I will appreciate it.

I think this is one of the most serious obstacles to the successful implementation of this program—the shortage of personnel in spite of the way it has been passed over by some of the witnesses.

On page 6, you discuss participation. Let me throw out a suggestion and see your reaction to it. In one of the titles we have language which would make possible the grant of \$1,500 to a farmer if it were going to improve his income or standard of living, and we also would have loans available.

What would be your reaction to language which would make a grant and/or loan possible if the people in a block in the slums of the city could get together and could map out a program for the self-improvement of the residents of that block? It might include repairs, painting, cleaning up of the area; but there certainly would be self-participation in it. I realize they are not the owners of the property, and this presents a real problem. But if the tenants in a block area were young families, and there are 100 youngsters, maybe they need most desperately a day-care center. But if they could get together, maybe with the help of a neighborhood house, map out this program, would it not make just as much sense, or more sense, to make them eligible for grants or loans as for a single family in a rural area?

Dr. SCHOTTLAND. I think it is an interesting idea. I had not thought about it, of course, until this very second. I rather like the idea.

I have two comments: I think if this were done, of course, this should be merely in the form of a recommendation so that you would not give to them the authority to obligate Federal funds. This would be a procedure subject to the approval of the appropriate authorities directing the program. I see this as something that could make a real contribution.