Type of job now by Job Corps training

[Base: Working now equals 57 percent]

[In percent]

Present occupation	Trained for in Jobs Corps:						
	Professional, technical	Clerical, sales	Service	Farming, fish	Machine trade	Benchwork	Structural work
Professional, technical	34	10	3	----------	3	----------	4
Clerical, sales	15	36	8	8	5	----------	3
Service	23	19	38	38	7	28	22
Farming, fish	----------	4	----------	3	5	3	4
Processing	8	2	3	8	6	21	11
Machine trades	4	8	13	13	20	14	4
Benchwork	4	2	3	8	6	10	11
Structural work	4	----------	5	11	10	10	16
Miscellaneous	8	19	27	11	28	14	25

Secreary FREEMAN. I think we will have more in soil conservation and forestry but most of the permanent employment in those agencies are at a professional level.

I think we are finding a number of boys that want to go on and would like to become a forester or soil conservationist but they would not have had time to complete that.

Let me check that out for you.

I have checked this out and find that the 3-percent figure referred to by Congressman Quie includes farming, fishing, and forestry related work. We have found the emphases to be on the forestry related work. Further I have verified my statement that most of the corpsmen require further training in order to be foresters or soil conservationists but the program has not run long enough to complete.

Mr. QUIE. I think a lot of the information being furnished is useful. The idea of men being employed in the Forest Service has been promoted for a long period of time, long before the Job Corps came in existence. This was also long before it was even advocated in the early 1960's.

Let me finish by asking some questions on the versatile program.

I was surprised in your answer to Mr. Steiger that you did not appear in favor of eliminating the earmarking of the funds. You merely answered that the community action agency programs are versatile now and if there is more money there would be a substantial amount of money available for them.

There is a tendency for earmarking programs, providing money for areas in which Congress has the greatest interest. These tend to be programs mostly for the large urban areas with the exception of the Nelson program which is primarily for the rural areas.

As we move into earmarking programs, and if it continues to operate as unwisely as it did in the last Congress, I believe it tends to take money from versatile programs and puts it into earmarking programs which had been funded by versatile programs before. If we continue to do that don't you believe this will actually short the versatile programs for the rural area?

Secretary FREEMAN. I don't want to be misunderstood on this. What I meant to say was simply this: There are some of the programs which have been delineated like the National Youth Corps, the Job Corps