sion. Note the term income *maintenance* rather than, say, income *adequacy*. Now we find that many families are on welfare for a long period. *But* not as many as implied in the facile discussions of the inheritance of welfare which seem to offer the conjecture that all children raised on welfare end up on welfare. This is decidedly not the case. As Podell's testimony has shown, there is considerable turnover on welfare in New York City; Martin Rein and I in chapter three of the 1968 *Manpower Report of the President* have reviewed the evidence of national surveys and have shown that welfare is not a way of life for most people who have received it.

The *clientele* of public welfare has changed. Welfare was originally intended to help the unemployed and the aged. It primarily benefited the white poor. The aged are still important in the welfare rolls, but two new groups are now important: the female-headed family and the employed poor. The former group is largely, though far from exclusively, Negro. And we have confronted deep-seated feelings about aiding black women and their children.

A curious and unnoticed evolution of public welfare has occurred in the United States. As Rein and I point out in the *Manpower Report*, many of those on welfare do work. The peculiar irregular economy of the poor means that welfare is for many a wage supplementation plan and that low wages and part-time work are welfare supplementation today. The familiar notion that it is welfare or work, employment or unemployment, fails to capture the complex financial arrangements of the poor in society today. A change in cash programs cannot be considered apart from the nature of economic and manpower policies.

The *goals* of welfare programs have been changing and we do not have unanimity on which are the prime goals. Many now expect welfare programs to deal with all of the poor, not just the quarter who now are aided by programs. This means principally including the working poor as a group that should be aided by welfare. But some are concerned with reform of the welfare systems and think primarily in terms of those concurrently on welfare rather than with changing the scope of welfare benefits by including the employed poor. Whether or not the employed poor are the focal concern is a central, though covert, issue in many discussions of welfare reform.

Equally important, but more subtle, is the shift in emphasis. Formerly, welfare programs were regarded as offering amenities, a better level of living for the poor. Now, as I have said earlier, many regard it not as a consumption program but as an investment in human resources, leading its recipients to move into work and their children into performing better in school. The Sixties have been marked by moving consumption programs into the camp of investment programs. This change is not a verbal one; it raises expectations about what the program can and should do (e.g., if people on welfare do not shift into work after a while, the program would be deemed a failure even if the work offered no more income than welfare). It transmutes programs formerly aimed at softening the impact of market forces into becoming adjuncts and instruments of the market with the consequence of reducing efforts to remold the market so that it achieves socially desirable objectives.

A third question of goal is that of poverty, inequality and adequacy. Is the objective to bring everyone up to some subsistence level? If so, then the debate is what should that level be? That question is always answered in partially social terms (the minimum level of living is seldom in the affluent society a question of only bare survival but is intermixed with social issues) and partially political (how much are we willing to spend on the poor).

Another way of looking at the question of adequacy, which overlaps, though not fully, with the fixing of the poverty line, is that of whether the concern is *poverty* or *inequality*. The poverty line approach that has been followed in the United States has taken a pseudo-scientific poverty line and up-dated it for price changes since 1960. Despite the fact that real living standards have gone up considerably since 1960, the poverty line for 1968 does not mirror that change. It is 1960 up-dated only for price changes.

A concern with inequality starts from the premise that the great issue of our society is not poverty but inequality, the *comparative* position of individuals and families. It is the relation of an individual to other individuals that is central to his feelings of well-being and satisfaction rather than his relationship to a fixed poverty line.* I believe that there has been insufficient attention in the Sixties to the fundamental issues of inequality. As a consequence, much of