

14 percent of them worked despite these disabilities—had to suffer a dollar-for-dollar reduction, had no provision made for her children, no provision made for training or adequate placement on a job, yet it was assumed that they were not working because they did not want to work. Yet the Congress, when it finally got around to passing these incentives to work, also felt that poor people could not be sufficiently trusted and therefore had to pass the compulsory provisions as well.

Now, there are several other valuable changes which I have not cited that could be made, such as the involvement of recipients in program operation and policymaking. While all of these changes which I have discussed would make for a more efficient and humane welfare program, it is my view that the current program—or even the program with the changes I have proposed—is not designed to and cannot fill the income gap between the poor, the near poor, and the affluent in our society. It is too stigmatized and has too many built-in handicaps for this kind of expansion. What is needed is a combination of approaches which will be flexible enough to meet the differing needs of individuals and families at different times in their lives.

In my view we ought to be considering ways of maintaining welfare as a residual program while continually shrinking its population. There have been many suggestions put forth as to how this can be done—negative income tax, guaranteed public employment, expanded social security benefits, and children's allowances are among them.

In my view, no one of these programs by itself is the complete answer. All of these proposals as well as others will be described and discussed by the experts who will testify before you. I would like to, however, offer to you for your consideration my view as to the most desirable combination of approaches.

First, we should have a program of guaranteed public employment. Such a program would offer opportunities for useful work to those whose skills do not qualify them for jobs on the market now. For much of our history we have relied on the relatively secure unskilled or semiskilled job to provide the base from which poor families could advance to a better level of living as their children got more education, and so forth.

Those jobs no longer exist in any significant numbers. Therefore it should be the responsibility of the public sector to replace this entry door to the main society. Jobs could be created to fill the wide variety of unmet needs in areas such as education, health, public safety, social service, sanitation, and other municipal services. The National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress estimated that there are 5.3 million potential jobs in this area.

However, even with an effective public service employment program, we still will not have closed the difference between a worker's productive capacity and the cycle of his family needs.

The United States is the only Western country which has not recognized this discontinuity and provided for it by means of a children's allowance. Canada, for example, has provided for such an allowance for more than 20 years.

Simply stated, a children's allowance provides payments to all families with dependent children for the purpose of promoting the welfare of children and strengthening family life. A children's allowance pro-