

Mr. GINSBERG. May I add just one more figure, Mr. Rumsfeld?

We average now an addition of 1,400 to 1,500 people a month. Between 80 and 90 percent of that group is within this category, the mothers and the children. So we can give you quite specific figures in this area, to say nothing of others.

Representative RUMSFELD. Am I correct that everyone on this panel favors the elimination of the categorical approach?

As I recall, that is what each of the individuals suggested.

Mr. WYMAN. Yes.

Mr. Hursh (nods in the affirmative).

Representative RUMSFELD. I would be interested, Mr. Carter, if you could comment just very briefly on something that is of concern to many studying this question. That is your remark where you say welfare is regarded by people receiving it as demeaning, incentive destroying, and inadequate. Let us accept that. How do your proposals mesh with the problem of trying to make sure there is an identifiable relationship between effort and reward?

Mr. CARTER. Well, it is at the heart of much of the discussion. Yet I am so sorry, because it shows, Mr. Rumsfeld, the difficulty of discussing this problem. Because, as some of the other speakers said this morning, this kind of differential of concern always extends to the poor but never seems quite to extend to other people. We do not seem to have any concern that farmers who take their land out of cultivation because we give them money are going to stop wanting to make more money.

Representative RUMSFELD. I beg your pardon; I have a great concern about it, and have so voted.

Mr. CARTER. Maybe you do, but many do not. At least, not enough in the Congress of the United States do to make any difference.

Of course, there are many other subsidies that one could point to. I think that all we can talk about is predictability—you know, we are a great nation for statistics, polls, things of that nature. Here again, I do not see why this should be any different. We know on the basis of statistics that practically every social indicator of social illness, whatever you want to call it, goes down as income goes up, and we all assume that one of the great things we want to do in the United States, and everybody is encouraged to do it, is to make as much as he can for himself and his family. Yet we somehow assume that there is a group of people for whom this is not true. I am talking of a large group. Obviously, there are individuals in all class levels for whom this is not true, and there is no question about the crippling effect of poverty on a large number of people who are poor. But I would suggest to you, and that is why I dwelt at such lengths on the statistics of poverty population, there is no indication that this is true for anything approaching the vast majority of the poor people, and I would say the vast majority of people on public assistance.

We talk about 8 million people on public assistance, but we fail to realize that we are only talking within the range of a million people when we talk about the employable population in that group. Obviously, everybody would agree that many of those should not work because they are at one time or another caring for very young children or have other reasons that would ordinarily be considered in any family adequate reason for not working.