

mendations of the President's Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty in 1967, and of the Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders in 1968. Even if we opt for a different system in the end, whatever that may be, it is still necessary to bring about major reform for the residual load within the framework of public assistance. Here in this report we have many of the major steps that would be necessary.

In summary, along with steps to improve public assistance that are long term in their connotations, I would like to emphasize the importance of moving now toward mandatory national standards, a change in Federal-State financing; the use of declarations across the country in determining eligibility base on the sole criterion of need; inclusion in the public assistance caseload of all who are eligible for financial aid under Federal law; more cash incentives for those who become employed; and a strengthened program of social services available to all who might require them, irrespective of economic status. Substantial changes could be made if we simply made mandatory certain provisions of Federal law which are now permissive, and if we moved promptly to repeal the restrictive provisions in Public Law 90-248.

(The prepared statement of Mrs. Winston follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ELLEN WINSTON

Madam Chairman and members of the subcommittee: My name is Ellen Winston. My comments represent my own views based on experience as the former Commissioner of Welfare of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and prior to that the Commissioner of Public Welfare for the State of North Carolina. I welcome the opportunity to discuss some of the problems of our present welfare programs and some of the methods for effecting change.

We know the statistics on the number of the poor we now have in this country. We know the extent to which the public assistance programs partially meet the basic maintenance needs of some of them. We know the public assistance federal legislation which is both differentially and not fully implemented by the states. Hence there is no need to summarize the current situation.

Rather we need first of all to emphasize the fact that there are millions of poor who need help *now*, not next year, not after we have gone through the process of lengthy discussion and debate around adoption of some system other than public assistance for much of the income maintenance problem. The most obvious way in which to help the very young, the very old, and the disabled *today* is by providing more money for those now receiving assistance and extending financial aid to those who are eligible under existing federal law but not receiving assistance.

In addition, there should also be available, to those who wish them, services to help raise the level of living and strength family life, irrespective of financial status, such as a vastly expanded homemaker service program from the paltry 12,000 homemakers we now have to some 200,000; extension of day care to provide for 3,000,000 young children; intensified counseling and help in using already available community resources while seeking to expand the range of such resources. Such vitally important social welfare programs need to be bolstered by expansion of other programs readily within our immediate ability to provide, such as literary education, intensive skill training, and related services.

In the second place, we need to evaluate and program in detail what we shall require as a continuing public assistance program, and the expanded community services which will be necessary, so that there will be a net of provisions to undergird those persons who for any reason are the most vulnerable in our society. This includes an objective, practical, basically routine public assistance program whether this is the continuing method of economic aid for the poor or whether it is reduced through introduction of a new income maintenance program to those who have the greater economic needs or special crises which call for special help.

Historically, the Congress through the Social Security Act has made it possible for states to provide minimal income maintenance, and I use the term minimal advisedly, related to the fact that the federal government now matches up to \$75 on the average per month for an aged or disabled individual, \$32 for