mended that the Federal Government "take immediate action to create two million new jobs over the next three years—one million in the public sector and one million in the private sector—to absorb the hard-core unemployed and materially reduce the level of underemployment for all workers * * *."

That recommendation for the private sector is double the size contemplated by present Administration plans. It adds the essential element of the Government's stepping into the employment picture in a massive effort to help solve our most pressing employment needs.

Employment through the Government of persons who can make meaningful and productive contributions to meeting our Nation's needs and achieving for themselves some measure of dignity and decency cannot be postponed: Now therefore be it

Resolved: The IUD calls upon Congress and the executive branch of Government to initiate forthrightly an employment program patterned along the lines of the O'Hara bill, the Clark bill, and the recommendations of the Civil Disorders Commission.

RESOLUTION ON INCOME MAINTENANCE

We are falling further behind in meeting the needs of those most in want. Despite the fact that our Nation is the richest the world has ever known, we are failing to ensure a decent, adequate income for all our citizens. We do not have an adequate, comprehensive program of income maintenance for the millions of Americans who live in poverty.

Under conditions of high employment there are still millions of workers consigned to poverty, even though they work full time year round, because of miserably low wage rates.

The increase in the minimum wage this year from $1.40 to $1.60 for some 7.2 million workers still left them in abject poverty with a potential annual income of only $3.200. Another group of more than nine million workers—primarily farm workers and workers in service industries—received a minimum wage increase of 15 cents an hour—from $1.00 to $1.15 an hour, which left their annual wage at $2,300, below the poverty line.

For those who work and whose income is interrupted because of unemployment, disability, retirement or other economic causes, our social insurance system fails to provide sufficient protection against their income loss.

Congress has failed to meet the problems of the elderly and other beneficiaries under the Social Security Act when it adopted insufficient increases in benefits last year.

The lifting of the minimum from $44 to $55 and the provisions for a 13 percent increase in benefits fall far short of what is needed to raise the elderly out of poverty to decent and dignified standards. The benefits provided represent an inadequate 4 percent increase in terms of purchasing power over benefits paid in 1954.

The level of benefits for our unemployed also fails to afford minimum standards of decency and self-respect to the millions of Americans for whom the benefits are either the sole or major source of income.

There are additional millions of Americans who are unable to work productively or whose family circumstances are such that further supplementation of their financial resources is imperative. Our public welfare program was designed to meet the problems faced by these needy Americans. But that welfare program is seriously inadequate and falls far short of meeting the needs of those who unfortunately depend upon it.

The money we are spending on public welfare is a smaller percentage of our gross national product than it was a quarter of a century ago.

There are over seven million people receiving public assistance. More than three million are children, over two million are older people, and well over a million are blind or disabled, and about one million adults are parents of children covered under Aid to Dependent Children.

Thus, the people on public welfare are the very old, the very young, the sick and disabled, and destitute mothers of children.

Last year a conservative Congress enacted repressive welfare program amendments which placed a freeze on Federal money available for aid to dependent children, imposed rigid work requirements for mothers on welfare, tightened the "man in the house" rule, and shifted the financing burden to local governments which often enact even harsher welfare restrictions.