which will add to the inadequacies and bureaucratic confusions which already exist within the program.

The President's Commission on Civil Disorders cites the inadequacies and injustices of welfare as a basic source of ghetto unrest. The Commission cited the needs for an adequate income maintenance as one of the basic elements for the solution of the problems of our cities.

When the ghetto fires begin this summer perhaps the nation will look to the Mills, the Longs, the Byrds in seeking to fix responsibility rather than to the Carmichaels, the McKissicks, and the Browns.

For the Mills anti-welfare law misses the whole point of welfare—to provide adequate income for the people in need—and talks about cutting the welfare rolls when 75% of the people living in poverty are unable to get help. It mounts an attack on the families of the most deprived and harassed people in the nation by continuing the policy of most states to deny aid unless the father is out of the home and now tries to force mothers out to work when there are already not enough jobs for the men in the ghettoes. It fails, not only to set minimum Federal standards for welfare payments, but ignores the Administration's modest proposals of requiring the states to meet their own definition of need.

Mills and the Ways and Means Committee claimed to be alarmed by the spiraling welfare rolls and attributed a very large share of the welfare growth to family break-up and illegitimacy.*

Far from being alarmed at increases in the welfare rolls, our organization is heartened by it. For it simply means that more people in need of public assistance are now getting it. In 1959, only 13% of all of the children in poverty received public assistance and in 1965 this had increased to 23%. In a humane society one would hope this figure could be 100%.

There might be cause for alarm if the number of poor "female-headed households and broken families" were rapidly increasing. But our investigations show that this group has remained roughly consistent at about 2 million since 1959. The number of children on welfare has grown by more than 50% since that period and the cost of AFDC welfare has increased by 80%, but this growth in the face of constant population of potential recipients simply reflects the fact that the program is reaching more needy persons which should, therefore, not be a cause for alarm.

Though our organization takes issue with the generally held definition of "illegitimacy," it is useful to point out that the "illegitimacy" rate among welfare recipients has been roughly constant at about 18% of the children over the past fifteen years.

Federal Responsibility for Income Maintenance

In 1930 the Federal share of the total tax dollar was 33¢, State 17¢ and local 50¢. In 1965, that relationship had changed to Federal 67¢, state 18¢ and local government 15¢. Despite its increasing share of the tax dollar, the Federal Government has been paying a steadily decreasing share of the welfare costs. In 1959, the Federal Government paid about 60% of the total AFDC bill, by 1965 this had dropped to 55%. This has meant that States and local governments, in spite of the squeeze of their limited tax space, have borne a disproportionate share of increasing welfare costs. This is validated in the fact that while total AFDC costs have increased by 80% over the past fifteen years, the Federal share has increased by 67% and State and local shares by 101%.

It is quite clear that the further shirking of responsibility represented in the Federal freeze could precipitate economic crisis in some states and local governments, not to mention the inhuman suffering that it inflicts upon welfare recipients. We have already pointed out that at a cost of a mere 11 billion dollars every American family could be raised to the "poverty line" and for about 20 billion to a somewhat more respectable level. It should be remembered that these costs are maximum out-of-pocket costs which would be offset perhaps even 100% or more by reductions in delinquency, disorders and crimes and by the stimulus to the economy that would be produced by pouring these amounts of money in through low income groups who immediately and almost quantitatively return it to circulation.

*Report of the House Committee on Ways and Means—1967.