

the concept of charity that I would like to eliminate. If by charity one means social justice or love of neighbor then this is another concept of charity, and certainly I would support that one. But, I am rejecting personal judgment as *the* criterion for giving or withholding of financial assistance to those in need.

I am talking about charity where we are back in the 18th century with what we in social work refer to as the "Lady Bountiful attitude" who goes and gives what she wishes to give in terms of her value system, in terms of her priorities as to eligibility, as to the kinds of people, the norms of behavior that she approves. It is this that I refer to, and we will never achieve the elimination of poverty in my judgment, and none of income maintenance programs will ever be successful or effective as long as that personal judgment element is part of the giving.

Representative GRIFFITHS. Senator Proxmire?

Senator PROXMIRE. Mrs. Burns wanted to comment, I believe.

Mrs. BURNS. I just wanted to suggest that Dean Dumpson is probably saying that the real problem is that this kind of charitable attitude reflects itself upon the recipient, that these people begin inevitably to feel themselves as less worthy, less deserving, rather as outcasts. I think one of our big problems with the continuing relief population, and more particularly with the aid to families with dependent children, is this feeling of the women themselves that they are somehow outcasts, that in the end, it saps all their initiative and all their feelings of self-respect, because they feel they are so thoroughly disapproved of.

I think both Mr. Dumpson and I would feel that one of the really important things is to deal with this feeling of hopelessness, of inability, of unworthiness on the part of the people that we support at the moment through the public assistance system. That is what is wrong with the charitable approach.

Representative GRIFFITHS. Thank you.

Senator Proxmire?

Senator PROXMIRE. Mr. Ryan, I want to join our chairman in commending you on an excellent statement. This is the most persuasive program we have heard in our hearings. I think it is so good because it is so practical. Your emphasis on the cost of the program, spelling out in detail what you think the cost is and giving us a chance to consider whether that is accurate or not, your very emphatic concern with providing work incentives and improving the incentives over the present situation. Many of us agree that there is now a very strong negative incentive against working. Then your recognition that this would not solve all of the problems. Income maintenance is a part of it, a beginning part of it, an important part of it, but only part of it.

I would like to ask you first, in connection with this, why do you argue that, as a second reason for the program, the income-supplement function would be divorced from social services? Is there not a danger that if you divorce the income-supplement service from social services, that you do lose a very positive and useful function in our society, and that you do not have a way of getting the social services to operate effectively where they should?

Representative RYAN. I do not think they have really operated effectively under our present welfare system.