

problem. They have never been able to touch this impoverished uneducated child and more than 90 percent of the youngsters that enroll in the area vocational schools throughout America are high school graduates or better.

Am I correct in that statement?

Dr. GOTTLIEB. We have compared youngsters in the Job Corps and those in other vocational training programs and the further up you go from Job Corps, the higher the income of the parents, the more advanced the educational background, the less likely they were to come out of poverty, the higher the reading, math courses, et cetera.

Chairman PERKINS. Don't you think that we might as well talk about the folly of misspent youth as to say today that we should dump everything into the hands of the vocational educators of this country, let them take over the job of training all the impoverished youngsters of this country, when the task involves specialists not normally associated with vocational institutions or programs?

Mr. GOODELL. Now, Mr. Chairman, let's not lay it on too thick.

Chairman PERKINS. My question is more reasonable than your question. Go ahead and answer my question.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman from Kentucky has been a long, long, long time supporter of vocational education and he helped—in fact, was paramount—in writing of landmark legislation such as vocational rehabilitation. He would not want the record to remain that the Vocational Education people have done nothing to help these youngsters who are not high school graduates.

Chairman PERKINS. They have done all they know how to do but they have never reached this hard core youngster.

Mr. GOODELL. That is a different statement.

Chairman PERKINS. To do something about him, and the Job Corps people are making progress in that connection and why should we be willing to curtail progress that is being started in the Job Corps. Sargent Shriver?

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. GOODELL. Do you want to get in between us?

Mr. SHRIVER. No, I don't want to get in between you. I was just wondering about these teenage jobs. I was just wondering if I would have permission to ask a question as to how many people in this room are doing now what they were trained to do when they were 17.

Mr. GOODELL. That is a little irrelevant.

Mr. SHRIVER. No, it is not irrelevant, Charlie. The point is this. When you train teenagers, your own children, for a job, the probability is that they are going to change their jobs many times even between let's say 17 and 25, because it is a natural thing at that age to be experimenting with different kinds of things.

Mr. GOODELL. I agree.

Mr. SHRIVER. So I honestly believe that to try to say that any kind of a vocational training—I don't care who gives it—is weak or a failure because a kid was trained to be an automobile mechanic and ended up doing something different, that is just a totally illusory idea.

Mr. GOODELL. I agree with the gentleman. All you are saying is that this shouldn't be the only standard. I agree. We have to get the facts clear as to how many are working in skill jobs for which they were trained.