

Mr. CLOWARD. Well, New York is a special case. Two years ago there were about 550,000 people on the rolls. That was also the time when the National Welfare Rights movement was born. The National Welfare Rights movement and Mrs. Sanders will be here to testify this morning, as she is its head in New York City, and a very effective head—has been extremely effective in New York City. There are dozens of local organizations in New York now. They have had a profound impact on that system, not only with respect to securing the special grants which are allowed by the law but rarely disbursed, but also in their impact on the discretion of intake workers. The rate of rejection of new applications in New York City has fallen substantially in the last 2 years through the efforts of this organization, with the result that the welfare rolls are now approaching 850,000.

So my own judgment is that the problem in eligible people who are not on the rolls has been largely solved in New York City. There may yet be another 100,000 or 150,000 who are eligible and not on the rolls, but the problem there has been substantially improved, largely due to the efforts of this new protest movement.

Representative GRIFFITHS. May I ask you, have you personally visited other American cities and rural areas to make a determination from those welfare departments just how they are administering the law, or have you not?

Mr. CLOWARD. Well, I have looked at some. I have not made a nationwide survey. I have looked at some, but I am in constant touch with persons who are very intimately connected with the struggle against welfare departments in other parts of the country, including Dr. Wiley.

Representative GRIFFITHS. Because I would assume that some welfare departments are considerably worse than others.

Mr. CLOWARD. Oh, I think there is no doubt about that.

Representative GRIFFITHS. I think there are many regulations in some welfare departments that do not really exist in others, that they are working harder at keeping people from getting on the rolls.

Mr. CLOWARD. That is right.

Representative GRIFFITHS. Now, may I ask you, if you had a guaranteed income, what other services do you think would be required? Supposing you had a guaranteed income that was really one that was sufficient?

Mr. CLOWARD. And guaranteed.

Representative GRIFFITHS. Yes, and sent from the Federal Government.

Mr. CLOWARD. Well, I think I would begin to answer that by saying that a guaranteed income, while it would provide for the bare necessities of life—food, clothing, transportation, a bit of recreation, educational supplies for children, and so forth—would not enable poor people to purchase decent housing. They can only purchase decent housing if they are permitted to enjoy the same housing subsidies that the middle class now enjoys—long-term, low-cost mortgages, for instance, tax abatements, and all the rest of it. The guaranteed income would not deal with the housing problem or with other needs. It would just deal with the bare necessities.

Representative GRIFFITHS. Well, I think it ought to do better than that. If you are going to be able to pay rent, you ought to be able to