

If our local communities are to have the proper tools to solve their own problems we must not restrict their flexibility. In this light we believe that neither Congress nor the Office of Economic Opportunity should set all of the priorities for the programs which communities may operate at their level.

If we really believe in local community action and in a broad, flexible, innovative approach to combat poverty, earmarking of funds at the national or regional level should be held to a minimum.

Equitable distribution of funds among urban and rural, large and small cities, and among geographic areas must be achieved.

We must return to a 90/10 funding ratio with a provision for the pooling of non-Federal share among the several titles of the legislation. Any increase in local share places the greatest burden on our poorest communities who have the least local resources but need the programs the most.

Permanent jobs with salaries about above the poverty level must be provided also.

All levels of government must cooperate in this effort. It is the role of government to stimulate, educate, and provide incentives for people to prepare themselves for jobs in private industry and public agencies both.

In this context the legislation should provide for unified comprehensive training for work programs.

The most logical means of marshalling public and private resources at the local level and providing for the involvement of program participants is through community action agencies. Therefore legislation should make clear the intention of Congress for the CAA's to coordinate training for work programs at the local level.

While there have been recent efforts to develop comprehensive coordinated training for work programs, especially for urban areas, much more needs to be done in the field of research and demonstration programs, training and technical assistance.

Since we have not scratched the surface in rural training for work programs, it is especially necessary to have new resources available to our rural communities.

If we are to protect our investment in all antipoverty programs and allow our communities to develop more than stopgap projects it is imperative that Congress provide an authorization period of more than 1 year's duration.

If Congress is really serious about conducting a war on poverty it must reassess the financial resources that are being made available. The Council of Economic Advisers has estimated that it will take \$17 to \$20 billion per year over the next 10 years to reach our goal of eliminating poverty. We feel it our obligation to call on this Nation to face up to this deed.

We invite you to join us in our commitment to reach solutions to the problems of poverty in the midst of our affluent Nation.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me compliment you on your statement and say that I agree that we should have a longer authorization to give the program some stability, certainly more than 1 year.

I hope we will be able to achieve that goal. I certainly agree with you that we have only scratched the surface in the rural training for work programs. Would you care to elaborate on that just a little, why you made that statement?