

a great deal of success. If the subprofessional level of personnel were not available today many hospital wards throughout the country would have to be closed down and the ability of the public to receive medical care would be greatly affected.

The use of subprofessionals in nursing is only one of the many areas in the health field which depend upon the use of subprofessionals to assist in accomplishing their workload. The health industry can be used as an example of how subprofessionals can successfully be used to carry out important tasks which do not require the total skills of a professional. The main concern with the use of subprofessionals in the health industry is that we have not been successful in developing career ladders from which entry level employees can progress upwards. This has resulted in blocked mobility for many of the subprofessional jobs within the health industry. Some of the major barriers that have prevented the successful use of the career ladder approach in the health industry are:

1. Inadequate job analyses;
2. Lack of interest on the part of some professionals within the health industry to properly utilize nonprofessional help;
3. State licensure requirements;
4. Educational systems for health careers.

In reviewing Section 122 of Title I of the Economic Opportunity Act I would like to emphasize the importance of Sub Section 122(c) in which it is stated that "projects under this section shall include related supportive services including basic education". It has been our past experience that the lack of basic education has been the primary cause of employees not being successful subprofessionals.

I hope these comments will be of use to you in your Committee hearings.

Cordially yours,

MARK BERKE,
Executive Director.

TESTIMONY OF THE NATIONAL SHARECROPPERS FUND

The National Sharecroppers Fund appreciates this opportunity to testify before the House Committee on Education and Labor in support of the Office of Economic Opportunity and its conviction that expansion of resources and functions rather than contraction or dismantling of OEO is the continuing urgent need of the nation.

The National Sharecroppers Fund has two basic concerns in relation to the legislation you are considering. The first is with the overall effectiveness of OEO and the second with its particular impact on the rural areas, our field of concern and action for thirty years.

First, it should be clear that, despite criticisms we may have from time to time of specific developments in the war on poverty, we believe that the Office of Economic Opportunity has done a remarkable job in its first two-and-a-half years. OEO has focused the national attention on the shame of poverty in the midst of our abundance. It has pioneered in long-range innovative programming such as Head Start and the concept of subprofessionals, with on-the-job upgrading for the previously unskilled. It has established the essential democratic principle of representation of the poor in the determination of their own destiny. It has cut through much of the bureaucratic red tape that previously had prevented established departments of government from serving all people.

But OEO has been given neither the full authority nor an adequate budget with which to conquer poverty. It has been able only to direct attention, on the basis of its experience, to some of the fundamentals that lie beyond its present competence: full employment and a guaranteed annual income; remaking substandard environment as well as raising individual income; and in the rural areas, redevelopment of the economy to provide an adequate economic and social base to sustain rural life.

In support of the essential program and function of OEO, NSF believes: First, OEO needs—because the country needs—much more than the \$2.06 billion currently requested in the Administration budget. In one aspect of the program, OEO hoped to reach (in the current fiscal year) 30 percent of the children eligible for Head Start, 3 percent of the adult illiterates, 10 percent of young people in the poverty population and 10 percent of the adults in need of work and vocational training. Three or 10 or 30 percent is not good enough for the third year of the war on poverty. The budget ought to go up about ten fold, but that must now be