

worked for a minimum of 5 years have now sought employment. I think it is evident that if you provide training, if you provide an economic incentive, and if you do something about satisfactory day care—none of which we have done enough about—you can move toward employment of people on welfare without the self-defeating coercive aspects of the new social security legislation that was adopted last year.

The next thing I would urge is the simplified declaration or affirmation of need. The evidence of what we have done is so clear. We require our workers to spend 95 percent of their time on investigations. Then we call them caseworkers, whereas, the truth of the matter is that they don't have any time, overwhelmed as they are with investigatory requirements and with paperwork, to do the job. We expect our workers to say to a client on Monday, our job is to investigate, to check up, to make sure you are not taking advantage of us, and then to show up on Tuesday and say, but now we really want to help you; in what ways can we be of assistance to you? This is an impossible situation. Again, it does not work.

We have had a demonstration project in New York City just about a year where we have used a limited form of an affidavit or declaration. Not simple enough, from my point of view; a much simpler application could be developed. But it is a start. We have followed this up with a research project under the city university to try to determine at least whether or not it is true that a substantial number of people are taking advantage of the program.

Well, we do have the preliminary results and we will be glad to furnish the final results. Commissioner Jack Goldberg, current commissioner of social services, will be glad to give you the final report. But as of this time, the proportion of people who, on the basis of this independent research effort, are taking advantage of the program has turned out to be very small, substantially less than what it assumed to be the national proportion of people who take advantage of the welfare programs generally. Again, I would think this is some clear-cut evidence of the desirability of this kind of an approach, to say nothing of the advantage that lies ahead in the possibility of beginning to use our workers in the way that they ought to be used.

We have under this kind of program, as has been suggested, used a 10-percent sample on a random basis, very similar to that followed by the income tax people and, in fact, based on discussions with them. So I would urge extension of the declaration.

I think the evidence is crystal clear that this is the way we should go and that we are past the demonstration stage.

However, the declaration itself can only be a meaningful step if it is combined with the separation of income maintenance and service. The eligibility job should be done separately from the provision of services and by different personnel. In New York City and in New York State and in other States, we waste qualified personnel on what are fundamentally clerical jobs. I believe the eligibility job is at best a clerical task. I look forward to the day when it can be done by machines. But I certainly see no sense at all in the continued use of college graduates for a task that is simply clerical in nature and does not require people with those kinds of qualifications.

Well, these are some of the things. There are others, of course, that I do not have time to go into—involvement of the welfare recipients