

the very young, and the disabled—people who cannot reasonably be expected to work either at the present time or in the foreseeable future—and that the rest of those are by and large the people who have come on the welfare system because of the failure of other systems—the failure of health, of employment, of education. The welfare system itself and by itself cannot hope to solve all these kinds of problems.

Mr. Carter has already referred to the fact that only perhaps a fourth of the people eligible from an income point of view are currently receiving welfare. Furthermore, I think there is widespread agreement that the welfare problem in this country is a national problem. It is national in scope, it is by and large national in origin, and it will require national solutions. The notion that any city or indeed any State can develop a meaningful program that will really help solve these problems is to me a real myth.

Then I think we are in agreement that the categorical approach, the dividing people up among categories and providing assistance based on whether you happen to be in one category as against another, simply makes no sense. There is no justification for the Federal Government refusing to support families where there is an adult male in the family, when one of the basic objectives of the program is supposed to be to strengthen family life. I have never been able to understand how a program that is designed to strengthen family life achieves that objective by forcing a man out of the house in order for the family to get some assistance. It is one of the major paradoxes of the program.

It has also provided a major disincentive to work. It has provided a 100-percent tax. Until recently, the people on welfare were the only people in the country who suffered a 100-percent tax because of the fact that when they found employment, what they received from welfare was reduced dollar for dollar. There is no need to tell you what effect that has on incentive.

Then I think it is clear that the practices followed, whether meant to or otherwise, were designed to encourage dependency. We have said to them again and again, "We don't trust you, you don't count; we know you are trying to take advantage of us and if only you were something like us, you would have made it on your own and you would not have been living off welfare." When you start with that approach, it seems to me self-defeating that people would be able to move toward some kind of self-support and independence.

By and large, I would say people in welfare programs have been isolated from other programs. The truth of the matter is that poverty programs have had little or no effect on the welfare population. One of the reasons for that is that welfare recipients are tough to work with and tough to achieve results for. So you tend in poverty and other programs to look for people with whom you are likely to have quicker and more constructive results so you can show how well you are doing. This has inevitably meant, in my judgment, that by and large the welfare population has also suffered.

What can we do about it?

I share with Mr. Carter the feeling that no matter what is done, in the long run, we will not come up with a viable system that will provide—to quote the committee—the "opportunities for achieving a fair and economic welfare system through improvements that can