pended primarily on the demand for coal and the primacy of the coal miner as the principal instrument of production. Increasing production costs, the competitive situation, and technological change in the mining industry combined to force many men out of the mines. The new equipment made it possible to mine coal more cheaply with less labor and the demand for coal and other products produced in that Region did not expand sufficiently to absorb the men who were displaced.

Superficially, the solution to such a problem within the market economy seems simple. You attempt to locate new or growing industry in such areas, or you attempt to move workers to areas where labor is scarce. Since programs to motivate private employers to locate in geographically depressed areas are not under the purview of DHEW, we will duck discussing the problems involved in that approach.

Moving workers from areas of labor surplus to areas of labor scarcity is beset with difficulties which stem from strong ties to present locations, however, bad they may be, and the uncertainty surrounding the kind of life which is possible in a new location. The problem is rather accurately defined by the old political adage, "A known devil is better than an unknown one."

Second, individuals may be barred from jobs available within a community because they lack the occupational skills required for satisfactory job performance. Often times, this difficulty is compounded by a lack of basic reading, writing, and computational skills which are necessary to profit from training programs designed to up-grade unskilled workers. For example, in the Eastern Kentucky Title V Program, 86 percent of all trainees are enrolled in Adult Basic Education classes because of the high illiteracy rate among participants. Moreover, some individuals are unable to obtain even very low-level jobs because they have had no previous employment experience. In a situation where there are few low-level jobs and many people who qualify for and seek such jobs, those who have worked before are likely to receive preference over those who have not. It is important to note in this respect that over one-third of all Title V trainees have had less than six months work experience prior to enrollment.

Third, alleviating poverty via the investment approach is often complicated by the presence of more subtle factors having a direct bearing on the employability and productivity of the poor. Often times, good work habits have been lost over long periods of unemployment. In comparison to past jobs, working conditions in the available jobs may require a dramatic adjustment on the part of workers in terms of routine, hours of employment, regular working days, strict adherence to reporting on time, etc. In addition, some individuals have poor attitudes towards work and towards themselves. They may have had a long history of failures in school or in the labor market and may lack the confidence that they can get and hold decent jobs. For some, living on welfare may have become a way of life, and given the wages in the jobs available to them there may be no incentive to seek work as a solution to economic problems.

Poor health and uncorrected disabilities also frequently complicate the problem. For example, in the Cleveland Title V project, a medical program started in May 1966 revealed that approximately 40 percent of those examined had health problems that needed attention before work training could be started.

Fourth, one of the most serious impediments to improved income and employment for female headed families is the availability of adequate child care facilities. In the Title V Program for example, an estimated 5 to 10 percent of the female trainees fail to finish their assignments because of the lack of day care services. In the April 1967 *Manpower Report of the President,* it was reported that "almost one out of every five of the slum residents who were not in the labor force but wanted a regular job gave inability to arrange for child care as the principal reason for not looking for work." According to a national survey sponsored jointly by the Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Labor, 20 percent of working mothers from families with incomes of less than $3,000 were combining work with looking after their children. The great scarcity of day care centers was also evident from the survey. It showed that only 3 percent of the working mothers were using group care arrangements for their children. Moreover, these mothers were mostly from the middle income brackets because the cost of such care (estimated by the Children's Bureau at about $1,000 a year per child) is prohibitively high for poor families.