

as their situation changes. In 1967, cases closed represented 42 per cent of the average monthly case load for the calendar year.

If we are actually to meet basic need in this country, in terms of nationally adopted standards, it is essential that need for financial aid be the sole eligibility criterion and that a simplified method, often referred to as a declaration or affidavit, be adopted as the basis for determining eligibility. Reform to initiate the simple criterion of need as the basis of the individual's filing an application, with appropriate test checks, would increase substantially the number of recipients of public assistance. In much of the debate there is the assumption that most or all eligible people are receiving aid. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimated that as of June 1967, 8.5 million persons who were eligible under federal law were not receiving assistance. If we were to set national standards at the so-called poverty level, and supplement those earners unable to provide for minimum decency standards of living for their families, we know approximately what the increase in recipients of larger or smaller amounts of aid would be.

The affluent of our society have a tendency to question how assistance recipients both spend their current inadequate incomes and would spend any increased funds. In the first place, the mothers in AFDC families, taking into account the whole pattern of deprivation in which they exist, on the whole do a remarkable job in using the small sums available to them to eke out a daily living for their families. We do not ask how the old age insurance beneficiary or the recipient of an agricultural subsidy spends his funds. Why, then, this preoccupation with the way in which a mother of five with a total AFDC grant of perhaps \$240 a month spends her money and what she would do if that grant were raised to the poverty level or \$368 per month? We know that for large numbers of individuals and families just having enough money for the costs of everyday living would provide all the special public help which they require. Basically the social services needed by the poor are the social services needed for the population in general, with special attention to accessibility and availability such as provided by neighborhood service centers.

We hear a great deal about the cycle of welfare dependency. We have almost no hard data to support or refute the contention of a high proportion of third generation families on assistance. We do know that by the time they reach 18 years of age about one out of six of our young people has at some time been the recipient of aid to families of dependent children. Most of them move into the larger society as wage earners and tax payers and support their own families, although there have been few follow-up studies to document their progress.

With more adequate income maintenance so that children can attend school regularly because they are decently fed and clothed, we should increase the proportion who move into independence. Under the present laws we tend to freeze the destitute into lifelong poverty. The 1967 legislation which permits a working parent receiving AFDC to retain \$30 per month and one-third of the balance of any earnings is a very limited concession to the efforts of the very poor to better themselves. We do not put such strictures upon the beneficiaries of other types of income programs.

We have a blueprint for immediate reform in the report, "Having the Power, We Have the Duty," (1966) supported by the recommendations of both the President's Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty (1967) and the President's Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (1968). Even if we should opt for a different system of income maintenance in the end, it will still be necessary to bring about major reform for the residual load within the framework of public assistance.

In summary, among the steps to improve public assistance are mandatory national standards; a change in federal-state financing; the use of declarations in determining eligibility based on the sole criterion of need; inclusion 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 require them, irrespective of economic status. Substantial improvements could be made by certain changes from permissive to mandatory provisions in existing law and by repeal of the restrictive provisions in P.L. 90-248.

Representative GRIFFITHS. Thank you very much, Mrs. Winston.

Mr. Tobin, may I ask you, under your plan, if you had a family group on a negative income tax getting some support and a 15-year-