

I would like now to read quickly from the written submission the requirements for such a program. These requirements apply primarily to the program for the families with children, and with some qualification to programs for the aged—but I believe there are six requirements any such plan should fulfill.

First of all, it must provide an income floor for all beneficiaries based on national standards. It is unreasonable for persons to be eligible in one jurisdiction and ineligible in another a few miles away. It is illogical for the standards of support to be as much as 10 times larger in one area of our country than in another. Indeed, I think some of the recent court decisions having to do with the residency rule are pointing in this direction.

Second, the burden of support should be distributed among the population in a manner which reflects the ability to bear that cost, and not be governed by the numbers of poor within certain areas. The States which have the smallest resources are now generally those which must make the largest relative financial effort to provide welfare benefits, and even then they can only establish support levels which are far below the level of assistance maintained by their richer neighbors. Poverty is a national problem and I think this should be a national program for ending poverty.

The third requirement I would suggest is that financial assistance should go only to the poor initially, although perhaps in a later phase it might reach above the current poverty line. But realistically, now we are talking about a program which goes only to the income-defined poor.

Fourth, we would need to abolish residence requirements and relative responsibility provisions permitted under the present law and replace the present investigative apparatus with a system of random audits similar to that prevailing under our current positive income tax system as a mode of enforcement.

Fifth, we should not require persons receiving assistance to accept counseling by a social worker. For one thing, we do not have enough social workers to go around, and many of the poor need only income assistance as a second reason. Counseling in such conditions may be only disguised meddling. If people are incompetent to run their own or children's affairs, the law provides remedies already. If they are competent, society should encourage the exercise of such competency. It seems to me that is a basic requirement for changes in current income-support programs.

Finally, and I think the most important requirement, and this is one that applies perhaps less to the aged than to the families with children, is an incentive system which encourages the recipient to obtain work, rather than penalizes him for working.

In a small and insufficient way, we have already begun on this. The amendments to the social security bill passed during 1967 effected many changes in the welfare system. Many of these changes were opposed by the administration as undesirable, but one made extremely good sense. Beneficiaries under AFDC will be permitted to keep the first \$30 of their income without having their AFDC payment reduced. Income larger than that amount will reduce AFDC benefits by 67 percent of additional income. Today, the normal practice is to reduce