

fathers never before reached or reachable under the AFDC categorical program. Projects which do not reach the minimum 50 percent male trainee ratio must submit justification, such as definition of unemployment being used, methods of recruitment utilized by the project, local rate of unemployment—particularly as it relates to needy unemployed male heads of households, number of families receiving general assistance or food stamps, etc. Despite these measures, the ratio of male trainees has declined and probably will continue to do so for the following reasons:

- a) Improved economic conditions which result in increased employment opportunities for males;
- b) Preponderance of females in the target population which the Title V program is intended to serve (see pages 4, 5 and 6 of the report transmitted to Senator Clark by Assistant Secretary for Program Coordination Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under date of June 6, 1967); and
- c) Increased facilities for child care.

Certainly the Title V program cannot be justly criticized on any of these grounds for not reaching the goal of at least 50 percent male trainees.

12. Trend in characteristics of trainees indicates most promising mothers being selected from AFDC rolls rather than unemployed fathers

The paper apparently assumes that female heads of families have greater potential for employment than males. While AFDC mothers may be slightly better qualified than male heads of families in terms of such characteristics as education and age, their potential for employment is adversely affected by child care problems and the double burden of holding a job and managing a household. This is borne out by the fact that for the 12-month period between January-December 1966, of the 44,595 persons who terminated from Title V projects and were unemployed 19,864 were male and 24,731 were female.

13. Half of the trainees who have left Title V (whether by "graduation" or drop-out) continue on public assistance

Of those back on public assistance, 17 percent are employed but receiving supplementation of earnings. In many of these cases, care of children has limited a mother to only part-time employment. Earnings are not sufficient to support a large family (see case example—attachment I). Three percent are enrolled in advanced training courses and need public assistance to provide support or to supplement the training allowance. Of the remainder, 30 percent need assistance because they have not found employment for the same reasons that prevented their completing the assignment—namely, lack of child care services, disability or illness, lack of transportation and similar problems. The remaining 50 percent which represents approximately 25 percent of all trainees includes individuals who were dropped by the project, who were enrolled in projects which were terminated and who completed the assignment and did not find immediate employment.

14. States tempted to shift unemployed parent cases to Title V to get 100 percent Federal financing

The paper argues that because the AFDC-UP caseload is decreasing while the number of those on AFDC is rising, States are shifting unemployed parent cases to Title V to get 100 percent Federal financing. There is little evidence to support this contention. From March 1966 to April 1967, the number of Group II trainees in the 22 States having the AFDC-UP program increased by only 300. The number of UP cases in the four States which adopted this program after Title V was established is shown below:

State	Became operative	Number of UP cases as of April 1967
Arizona.....	Jan. 11, 1966	15
Colorado.....	Jan. 1, 1966	1,693
Nebraska.....	Oct. 1, 1965	69
Wisconsin.....	Jan. 1, 1967	464
Total.....		2,241