

and educational handicaps. Indeed, by studying the techniques that have proved successful in rehabilitating and habilitating the physically handicapped people, we can learn a great deal in properly structuring the programs for the culturally or educationally handicapped.

This extensive rehabilitation must be viewed in proper perspective. Because skills at all levels are becoming obsolete, there needs to be continuous job escalating at all levels. Everyone across the entire industrial landscape should be continually preparing himself for a new and better job. In particular, rehabilitation of the handicapped depends on emphasis of our present success—the man in the middle who has a job, is educating his children and is paying taxes. It is he who must lead the way in this job escalation process. Too many of our present federal manpower programs have ignored the working man with a job, and have concentrated instead on the “hard core” unemployed, trying to train him for a job where there is no demand, or leap frog him far up the job skills ladder with very unsatisfactory results. Rehabilitation and total job escalation are mutually supportive and must be closely integrated.

This rehabilitation and job escalation is most properly undertaken in the private sector of our economy; but government can help—mainly by stopping impeding programs. Tax laws should be amended so as to treat private training and retraining—and all forms of education—as capital expenditures. We have been unnecessarily slow in recognizing that upgrading the skills of our working people is an investment which pays rich dividends not only to them but to the entire society.

I have also advocated other changes in our tax laws to promote further upgrading. The Human Investment Act which I introduced in 1966 would provide a tax credit of 10% for expenses borne by industry for job training programs. The Employment Equalization Act I proposed last year would increase the employment opportunities for individuals of low productivity whose lack of skills and adequate education acts as a barrier to employment at or above the Federal minimum wage. Finally, the Veterans' Employment and Relocation Assistance Act which I introduced with Senator Javits would assist veterans who desire meaningful employment to obtain jobs which require skills they learned while serving in the Armed Forces and provide financial assistance to help them relocate in areas where these jobs are available. With these and other measures, we can stop inhibiting private capital expenditures for all forms of education and job training.

Government must do its job by collecting the data and information necessary to make any manpower training program work. Such data as can be assembled in monthly Job Vacancy Statistics on both a national and regional breakdown level. A looseleaf Dictionary of Occupational Titles, the common nomenclature of jobs existing in the society—those phasing out and those coming in—is essential. The Johnson administration, though required by the Manpower and Development and Training Act and urged repeatedly by this Committee to do this, has not done it on a regular basis.

Finally, the federal government should cease its excessive spending—which does not equip a single person with skills required to take one of the many new jobs available today—and stop perpetuating outmoded and artificially-created jobs. Only responsible spending and taxing levels will allow industry to accumulate and invest the capital so necessary to a solidly expanding economic base. With this freedom from government shackles, industry can create and fill meaningful, productive jobs at all skill levels. All of American society will benefit.

Our final goal is the prevention of new poverty. Here the focus should be on all children, not just those of the poor, with the objective of minimizing school drop-outs who later become the unemployable adults. It has been said many times before, but it bears repeating that the key is high-quality education and training, all along the rungs of the ladder of skills. Among students who left school in 1964, for example, the unemployment rate in 1966 was almost twice as high for those who dropped out as for those who graduated—33.6 per cent as compared to 18.7 per cent. Also needed is a better understanding among the self-styled intelligencia in our society, that technical training is just as socially dignified as liberal arts training. By this statement I do not mean to minimize the importance of liberal arts training which in the past—and still in the minds of all too many in the present—has suffered from both envy and misunderstanding. I do mean to say that in many important educational and social circles there has been an unfortunate down-grading of vocational and technical training which has been a deterrent to getting both the number and quality of persons needed into these