

clear way to divide the sheep from the goats, those who should work from those who should not. But at any rate, a large portion of the poor are in essentially noneconomic opportunity programs.

But if we are sincerely interested in eliminating or eroding poverty, I think income maintenance is the program for these people. In addition to being the most direct program for this generation, it is a program of opportunity for the next generation. It is a program which supports other programs such as Headstart, such as the Neighborhood Youth Corps, supports them because a child in a family which is stable and which has a stable, albeit low, level of living, is, we believe, far more likely to succeed in these other opportunity programs.

So I want to make clear that we are putting income maintenance into a role in the war on poverty, but we are not putting it into an exclusive role.

Now, given this, my own feeling about the sort of income maintenance program that is most desirable is that it should be a universal, noncategorical one going to people on the basis of low income alone, with no further categorization. Nonetheless, I realize that both for fiscal and other reasons this may be very difficult to do. It certainly may be a very difficult way to start. I, therefore, would move from a belief in a completely noncategorical program to one which sets up some categories, but I am reluctant to set up any but the most obvious categories.

Age is such a category; whether there are children in families is such a category. Other categories shade off into questions of interpretation—whether a person belongs to the labor force or not, for example. I think one of the current difficulties with the welfare system is in these interpretations and who is to do the interpretation.

So I think we would start off, if we are going to categorize, with these very broad categories. I would suggest the priority categories are two—not necessarily in this order—the category of the aged and the category of families with children.

I pick on the aged for two reasons. One is, it is fairly easy to apply an additional income maintenance program to the aged over and above current social security. It is easy and not too expensive.

The second reason for picking on the aged is that this group among all, if we are to categorize by groups, depends on income maintenance—opportunity programs are less applicable to those who are reaching the age where work is going to be less likely.

The reason I pick on the families with children, and I am in agreement with Professor Morgan and Professor Brazer, was implicit in my discussion of categories. It seems to me that in an opportunity program these are the groups, the next-generation groups, which it is most necessary to reach with income maintenance.

A large portion of our own programs, a large portion of the total war on poverty programs do go to children. It seems to me these programs for education and training of, children and youth, must be supported by an income maintenance program reaching the families in which these children are, to unite the families, hold them together, and help to support the other opportunities we hope to provide the children. So these are the two categories.