

the States, as you know. All we can do is lend them encouragement and offer leadership in trying to make appropriate plans.

Chairman PERKINS. You are planning, though, through 1970?

Mrs. COUGHLAN. Right.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, could I finish with this last question here? I understand in talking about St. Paul that they are dealing with a much more hard-core group than they expected to be working with in 1964. Because of the increase in demand for labor they were able to secure jobs for part of this group that needed help in title V.

Do you find this to be the case around the country, or is it more the case in an area where the jobs are available? In Kentucky it would not be as much a figure, where 30 percent might find jobs?

Mrs. COUGHLAN. In the majority of the communities where the economy is good, we find that we are getting the really more disadvantaged people, because the others have been able to get into jobs.

Mr. QUIE. Also, I gain the impression that in title V in St. Paul they would probably work themselves out of a job out there in 2 years if it were not for the fact that the people come in.

If this is successful, why is it that the people on AFDC have increased by 14 percent between 1964 and 1967?

Mrs. COUGHLAN. Do you want to answer that, Elmer?

The major reason for the increase in AFDC there is legislation that has broadened the program coverage. Another thing is that the mothers on AFDC, the characteristics of the group on AFDC, are such that they are not affected, you know, by the economic condition.

In other words, you might have a very prosperous economy, but these women cannot work because they have to take care of their children.

Mr. QUIE. Do you break down this information on the 50,000, who either drop out or have left for good cause, on whether they are male or female?

Mrs. COUGHLAN. We don't have that breakdown. I think we might be able to get it.

Mr. QUIE. I think that would be interesting to have, if you would provide it for the record.

Mr. GOODELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. Yes.

Mr. GOODELL. Mrs. Coughlan, 3 years ago, Secretary Celebrezze testified before our committee. At that time, recalling the figures, I think it was estimated that we were spending around \$32 billion of Federal money for what he termed "poverty-oriented" programs.

I believe he included social security in that, all your old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and a variety of others.

Do you have a total figure comparable to the one Mr. Celebrezze gave us 3 years ago that applies today?

Mr. CARTER. I am not familiar with that figure or what went into it. The best estimate that we have of funds for programs that are directly assisting the poor, in one way or another, is roughly \$26 billion.

Mr. GOODELL. Obviously they are using a little different category. I will check the hearings in 1964, because I think I asked the Secretary to put in a breakdown of categories he was talking about.

What is included in your \$26 billion?