to meet needs. The Community Associates, Inc. report states that under the CAMPS all participants agree "not to relinquish any of their statutory powers" and hence implies the effort will not "yield satisfaction to income-hungry men in Eastern Kentucky." Obviously agencies cannot divest themselves of responsibility which has been assigned to them by law unless there is specific legal provision for this to be done. Nonetheless, the CAMPS holds promise for achieving closer working relationships among the various programs and for the more effective deployment of resources. The sharing of program information alone among the various agencies is one important benefit. In fact, if a local CAMPS coordinating committee had been operating in this area, the difficulty referred to in this report regarding difficulty in understanding policies, rules and regulations and criteria for referral to the various programs (Work Experience and Training, Manpower Development and Training Act, on-the-job training and Nelson-Scheuer projects) would have been largely eliminated. Since the CAMPS effort was initiated only this year by the Department of Labor on an inter-departmental basis, it is not yet fully operative in all geographic areas (such as this one).

The initiation of manpower programs (other than Title V, Economic Opportunity Act) came about largely as a result of the curtailment of the Work Experience and Training Program due to the imposition of a 12½ percent ceiling on the amount of funds which can be allocated to any one State. The impact of this in Eastern Kentucky was a decrease in funds from around $17 million in fiscal year 1966 to $12.5 million in fiscal year 1967. In terms of trainees, this meant a reduction from about 5,100 in February 1967 to 2,800 or 3,000 by September depending on how fast trainees could be phased out. Every effort was made not to disrupt trainee participation in vocational training programs which were underway or trainee enrollment in high school equivalency courses. At times, this presented problems as the programs, such as MDTA, which were being developed required higher qualifications which only the advanced Title V trainee already involved in a training or high school equivalency program could meet. The reaction of a Community Action Director is described in Appendix III of the report where he states "We were not even told what policy would prevail in making the selections. This caused a considerable delay since we were forced to fight for our rights. We simply refused to hire many from the first batch of referrals." This was obviously no solution for the former Title V trainees who are among this "first batch" who did not qualify for Nelson-Scheuer projects. Another hitch developed when question was raised about the eligibility for medical benefit coverage under Title XIX of the Social Security Act for former Title V trainees and their families who were transferred for Nelson-Scheuer projects and other manpower programs. This is now being straightened out so the participants under Nelson-Scheuer projects will qualify. However, in view of this uncertainty plus the lower level of payment and short-term nature of the Nelson-Scheuer projects, it is no wonder that the unemployed fathers originally on the Title V program have indicated their strong preference for *meaningful jobs* with *decent income*—not so much on training. They are critical of the *different income range* for differently sponsored programs. In their perceptions, there really wasn't much of a difference in the programs, except as they differed in income.

Their solution would be then, assigning enrollees to work programs based on *income needs* (size of family, e.g.) rather than on degree of education, literacy and potential for learning a skill.

In view of the characteristics of the group and the prevailing economic conditions of the locality in which they live, this seems a very realistic solution. It does not, of course, provide a cure for the widespread poverty in this region which requires, as this report recognizes, large-scale economic development. The solution recommended does, however, afford the means of meeting the financial and health needs of individual families at the same time the father is provided the opportunity to engage in constructive work activity and training where appropriate.

Among existing programs, the ones expressly designed to meet these requirements are AFDC-UP combined with a Community Work and Training Program under Title IV of the Social Security Act. Unfortunately, the State of Kentucky has been unable to come up with the necessary matching funds to implement these two provisions. Of the programs which are available without substantial State matching, the Title V Work Experience and Training comes closest to serving the purpose.

The Community Associates, Inc. report implies that another defect of the Title V program is that it is administered by the State public welfare agency. The main criticisms made in the report against the public welfare agency are: (1)