those who have the greater economic needs or special crises which call for special help.

The Congress made it possible many years ago to provide through the States minimal income maintenance. I use the term "minimal" advisedly in relation to the amount of assistance which may be provided with Federal matching; namely, $75 per month, on the average, for the aged or disabled and $32 for a child or a parent. Within this overall framework, we have given the States really total freedom in setting the level at which they would provide help. Consequently, we have an inequitable program, a very inequitable approach across the country. When we have tried to defend this, we have noted that States with low per capita income had much greater difficulty in providing for their citizens than States with higher per capita income. But actually, the data do not support this kind of explanation.

In a release of last month, for example, we were told that the national average amount expended per inhabitant for all welfare payments in fiscal 1967 was $34.80, ranging from $75.70 in Oklahoma to $10.50 in Indiana, although the States ranked just the reverse in terms of their per capita income and, theoretically, their ability to provide adequate programs.

We also know that the distribution of funds between the Federal and non-Federal levels of government is important, with the Federal Government now providing almost 60 percent of the cost of public assistance, but that more than 40 percent of non-Federal funds is also highly important in terms of any consideration of a continuing program. I think it is questionable whether we would want to move to a totally federally supported program at this time, but obviously, the inequitable results of the present system should be reformed. For that reason, I want to call your particular attention to the recommendation of the Advisory Council on Public Welfare.

The proposal was made by the council that on the basis of a purely objective formula each State would put in a certain amount of money as the bottom layer of financing public welfare programs. Then the Federal Government's contribution would come in on top to maintain nationally established standards. It would also take care of any additional risks or changes—such, for example, as the additional number of children who now become eligible for assistance as a result of the Supreme Court decision. Such a system would include not only public assistance but also administration costs, medical care for those unable to pay, and an increasing battery of social services which would be available to people across the board. Under this recommendation, there would be a single formula which would cover all of these items.

It is important to think in terms of a single formula that covers the gamut—not that we allocate certain responsibilities at the Federal level and other responsibilities at the State level, for the simple reason that we again would have great inequities. As long as we have Federal participation in all parts of the program, we have the leverage for national standards in all parts of the program.

You raised the question as to why we need uniform national standards. I thought it would be useful to point out well-known figures, but they certainly emphasize this. For example, in March of this year, the AFDC payment per needy individual ranged from $8.50 in Mississippi to $61.45 in New York. Another measure that is perhaps just as useful,