

trol program is a cost-effective antipoverty effort. For \$100 million a year we can buy all the birth control we need to help the poor who want it and to whom it is acceptable in accordance with their religious and moral values and beliefs.

I would also submit that a child care, or Headstart program is necessary. Professor Rees suggests that mothers on relief should not be favored above waitresses, and I fully agree. But if we are to encourage mothers on relief to work and supplement their income, their preschool children should be provided proper surroundings and be given a chance to escape from becoming candidates for future welfare programs.

We must have a better school system which should start at age 3 rather than age 6. We have fought the battles of a free public school education over a century ago, and decided that we are going to have a free public school system. At that time, we decided on starting the public educational system at age 6. I think the experience of the last few years, including studies outside of the poverty program, suggest very strongly that education should start at age 3, at least for children from impoverished homes. Since World War II we have emphasized free higher education and have made it, if not universal, reasonably within reach of anyone who gets a respectable average in high school. But we have done very little to expand free education at the lower age level.

Even if we decide on providing income maintenance it is not clear that a universal program is best. The in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps provides income maintenance to kids who might leave school if they did not get these subsidies. There is considerable evidence showing that the subsidies paid to in-school NYC participants—about \$15 a week—is enough of an incentive to keep them in school. I am not sure what they learn when they stay in school after age 16 but it is generally conceded that a high school diploma is a necessary credential for many jobs and that schools offer a more wholesome environment than streets.

The NYC experience shows that there are all sorts of ways for providing income maintenance. A guaranteed income though is appealing and does away with the bureaucrats, also costs billions of dollars, and part of the income maintenance will not be given to poor people. The welfare system must be improved before we can expect to provide a guaranteed income. As we improve income maintenance and essential services to the poor, the cost of a transition to a guaranteed income would become manageable. I do not think that we are ready for the change at this time.

The issue at this time is to provide a combination of income and services, including housing, job training, and job creation, in addition to the type of services I mentioned earlier. To say—as many are fond of saying—that we can do all these things and that in an economy of \$800 billion, or whatever the latest figure is, we can spend \$30 or \$40 billion for the poor does not do any good. Nobody takes that very seriously. It is nice for exhortation and for Solidarity Day speeches. We have other priorities and needs that we have to consider. What is needed, I would suggest, is to increase the welfare expenditures, but at the same time to judiciously divide the increments—and