

Mr. GOODELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. Yes.

Mr. GOODELL. Do you have a category which you might call "employable recipients in public assistance"?

Mrs. COUGHLAN. Yes. That is the so-called "unemployed parent" segment of the aid to families with dependent children program, where the family is in need because of the unemployment of a parent.

Mr. GOODELL. I mention this because criticism has been made that we must put the 35 percent who get jobs, after going through work experience, into perspective and realize that a significant percentage of these people probably would have gotten jobs anyway.

I am trying to get a little perspective on the significance of that 35 percent. For instance, the statement has been made that in the category of employable recipients of public assistance—now, we all know there are unemployable categories, the elderly, the sick, and the children, and so forth—that the average time on relief rolls is less than 9 months.

If that is a true statistic, you could expect over a period of 9 months that virtually all of that group would be getting a job—

Mrs. COUGHLAN. Not with an average—

Mr. GOODELL (continuing). With or without work experience.

Mrs. COUGHLAN. Not with an average of 9 months. You know that takes in those who are on for a very long time as well as some very short-time cases.

For example, as a result of seasonal employment—

Mr. GOODELL. Is that an accurate statement, that employable recipients of public assistance remain on the relief rolls for an average of less than 9 months?

Mrs. COUGHLAN. Yes, it is.

Mr. GOODELL. Then the only point I am making is that we must try to get into perspective here what 35 percent getting jobs means. A certain number of those, it is hard to say how many, would have gotten jobs without any program.

Mrs. COUGHLAN. Title V is not strictly comparable with this under the employed-parent program, because in title V we have taken a good many of the AFDC mothers, who do not come into the unemployed-parent part of the program, as well as another small percentage of the other needy persons that are not, in other words, unemployed parents.

Therefore, it is not strictly comparable to the unemployed-parent program.

Mr. GOODELL. I understand that. Whatever the figure is, a certain percentage of this 35,000 would doubtless have gotten jobs over a period of 6 to 9 months without any aid at all. We just don't know how many.

Mrs. COUGHLAN. That is true. We do have a comparison that you might be interested in, with the Department of Labor, which is a report on MDTA training of public assistance recipients.

Mr. CARTER. May I make one or two additional points on this?

Chairman PERKINS. Before you leave this point, I think we ought to make it clear that when we wrote the Economic Opportunity Act and title V in 1964, just a few of the States had taken advantage of the jobless-parent category in the Social Security Act. For example, I know that Kentucky had not taken advantage of that category.

For that reason it was necessary to have a program of this type. There is no duplication here anywhere involved. Am I correct?