tunities if we do not also train rural low-income people to take advantage of them.

Some of these gaps would be bridged by amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act now being considered by this committee.

Thus the proposal on community employment and training would extend to rural areas some of the benefits of job programs now available to urban centers where low incomes and unemployment have become crucial. Where large numbers of rural families live in abject poverty, as in Appalachia or the Mississippi Delta, special, impact-type assistance is urgent. We fully support this amendment.

We favor the general expansion of community action programs in rural areas. We approve also the proposal that OEO develop simplified forms and guidelines for use in rural areas.

We support the development of cooperative projects between rural and urban areas to help migrants from the country make a better adjustment to the city environment. Millions of the rural poor have flocked to the cities in search of opportunity. Few of them have had adequate guidance in making the adjustment.

We also believe that a start should be made on a joint funding and administration by two or more Federal agencies of local antipoverty projects.

As I mentioned earlier, about 11 percent of all rural loan borrowers under title III are receiving some type of public assistance when they obtain their loans. It is proposed that they be eligible to earn additional income from their loans without having an equivalent amount deducted from their assistance payment. There would be some reduction in payment, but not on a dollar-for-dollar basis.

Finally, we completely support the proposal to establish a new position of OEO Assistant Director for Rural Programs.

This would be a major stride toward full participation by the rural poor in the Nation's antipoverty programs.

Judging by some stories in the press, there appears to be a considerable misunderstanding about USDA's role—and performance in the war on poverty.

I am sure the members of this committee understand my personal unhappiness when some of the news media reports that it is a tragedy that USDA's $5 billion budget earmarks only $450,000 for rural community development and assigns only 26 of its 100,000 employees to this work.

To keep the record straight, let me present a few facts. The reference to $450,000 and 26 employees applies only to our Rural Community Development Service which coordinates and expedites rural programs at the Washington level. This is an extremely important operation—but it is simply ridiculous to imply that this is our total antipoverty effort.

Our Farmers Home Administration is advancing more than $1 billion a year in loans to rural Americans, many of them at the poverty level.

About three-fourths of our farm loans for fertilizer, equipment, and land purchase and development go to families living on $3,000 a year or less. Most of our rural housing loans go to low- and moderate-income families. Seventy percent of FHA funds advanced for rural