

toward fulfillment of entry level requirements for permanent employment. An agency benefiting from government subsidy of work experience and training must rearrange its job structure so that the individual who enters at the lowest sub-professional level can look forward to an orderly progression to increasingly responsible jobs.

Increased flexibility will be given to both the New Careers and Mainstream programs under the proposed legislation by combining them into one program (the Community Employment and Training Program under section #122), by lowering the age eligibility from 22 to 16 years, by provision for on-the-job training in private industry, and by opening the program to all unemployed, underemployed, or low income persons.

The *Special Impact program*, also authorized in the amendments of last year, made it possible to put all of these programs together. In fact the development of the concentrated employment program is in response to the need to put these pieces together in a cohesive and concentrated entity.

I should report, too, that we have been able to effectively merge the manpower resources of the Department of Labor with those in HEW in the title V program as this Committee recommended and the Congress passed last year. It was a wise step and we will have in the coming year a title V program that seems certain to provide more effective rehabilitation of welfare clients.

But of more significance than the operation of single programs is the fact that all of them can now be put together. They are being put together in a way that makes it possible to give each individual whatever manpower services he needs to take him all the way from unemployability and dependence to a permanent job and independence.

III

Several more general matters, relating to the manpower aspects of the broad human development program, arise in connection with other provisions of H.R. 8311 or in connection with various other proposals which have been made.

"Coordination" has been a point of continuing consideration and criticism. It has also been a focal point of constructive action.

So far as the manpower program is concerned, there is today *effective* coordination at the national level. There is a rapidly improving situation, subject to some exceptions, at the State and local level. I shall be glad to report to the Committee on both of these situations in whatever detail is desired.

As an example of the improvement, the Federal-State Employment Service system, working with, business, civic and social organizations and with Community Action agencies, is now deeply involved in finding the hard cases, in providing counseling and coaching, in job development, in providing for basic education, employability training and vocational training and in making sure that persons who need supportive services can get them.

The provision in Title VI, Part B, of H.R. 8311 for the exercise of broader and more specific functions by the Economic Opportunity Council will meet effectively the need for relating the manpower to other aspects of this program.

The suggestions which have been made for statutory redistribution of various OEO programs among other agencies and departments, and for dismantling the OEO, have—in my judgment—no basis in operating reality. They come down to a worse than pointless kind of gerrymandering, and a strange inversion of the strategy of "divide and conquer." There is historical irony in the reminder that earlier "crusades" were in the main frustrated because responsibility for their conduct was divided up between too many kings and princes.

Poverty didn't develop in this country because anybody wanted it. It developed because the poor are the least represented group in the society, and because there was no organization, until three years ago, of the national concern about it. The time to end the present separate identification of a responsibility for eliminating poverty as such—and there will be such a time—will be when there are other *institutional* forms of effectively expressing their interests.

The suggestion that the time has already come to turn programs developed by OEO in these three years over to the established agencies and departments doesn't answer the question of how it can be properly assumed that these agencies and departments will continue to do aggressively what they didn't do at all for so long. The hard-headed, tough-minded considerations involved here aren't personal. They are institutional. It would be a mistake to assume that the inertial forces within the established agencies and departments which led them