

It is my understanding that the total expenditure this year for all governments—State, local, and Federal—for welfare is \$60 billion. Supposing that in place of giving back any money to the States, the Federal Government just took over the total expenditure, because, of the \$60 billion, a very large part of it is both State and local, comparatively a much smaller part is Federal.

One of the problems, it seems to me, of the tax return imposed upon the present situation is that New York's fiscal situation will simply become worse, because the human problems will be greater than they would have been, whereas if the Federal Government took over the total expenditure for both welfare and education, you might alleviate some of the human problems. You might keep some of the people in other areas than are going to New York, New Jersey, Detroit, and Chicago.

Would you care to comment?

Mr. YLVISAKER. I certainly would, Madam Chairman.

I think you caught the point that I was driving at. We have to look at this not only from the point of view of governments but from the point of view of the individuals being served. There is a basic constitutional and ideological commitment in the United States that no matter where you are born, no matter where you live you are entitled to equality of opportunity and equal protection of the laws. On that basis it makes a lot of sense for there to be a national system of floors, of minimum guarantees to individuals.

It turns out that if you are born either in Mississippi in poverty or in the ghetto in poverty, you are dealing with political jurisdictions which do not have the resources to provide those basic guarantees. Certainly if you are the mayor of New York City, you must every night pray in frustration when you realize that you are pledged to give to the people of your community these equal guarantees and equal protections. So it makes a lot of sense to provide national floors to individuals.

This also frees them and gives them mobility, so that they are not locked into their place of origin or their place of residence. If you go back to the basic premise on which this economy is based, which is the mobility of labor and capital, this does increase mobility and adds to the growth of the economy and it certainly also makes good political sense.

I recognize that it would be a great leap to move from one status to another, but moving transitionally in the right direction certainly makes sense.

Representative GRIFFITHS. Of course you would immediately hit the political problems of local control of education and the local control of welfare and so on. Let me give you one example.

In one of the statements—Mr. Maxwell's—"State-local governments can in my opinion handle most civilian functions more efficiently than can the Federal Government."

Now surely, if there is anything they can handle it is the police, and yet Mr. Ylvisaker and I can tell you right now that they cannot, and they are not good at it. So there have been three immediate suggestions made. One made by the Congress that we beef up local police forces, the second made by the President that we beef up the National Guard with riot forces. The third has been made by Mr. Cavanagh of Detroit that we have within the Army a Federal riot force.