

ported and there is no discouraging factor there—thanks to the help of ADC—and I might say that ADC applies its effects. They are no doubt felt differently, for example, between the State of New York and the State of California. I think the State of California has a much more ambitious ADC program than any other States, so naturally there would be different effects. But this element of lack of discouragement from having a continuous series of illegitimate children, thanks to, in part, the fact that the person knows that these children will be supported in large part at State expense, not only prevents the use of birth control by such people, but it also, I think, in some part discourages attempts to remarry. These are the arguments, rather than that people actually produce babies as an income mechanism.

Senator PERCY. I am glad to have that clarified.

I have just two additional areas that I would like to explore for a moment. In your own testimony, Mr. Hicks, you mentioned that the first category, the class of poor people—the untrained, the blind, the mentally ill, for example—have need for specialized programs which can better be provided at State and local level. I certainly support the principle of doing as many things as we possibly can at those levels. I am worried, though, about the ability of poorer States, ability of some States and localities that have a very high proportion of poor, and I am worried about the heavy load some of those areas might have when it is a national problem, because people move. If they do not get an education in some Southern State and they cannot get a job there, their inclination is somehow to come North and they end up on the welfare rolls, not prepared for society there.

Could you give us some idea, considering the millions of impoverished people, how in your judgment, the States and local governments can support sufficient specialized training and welfare programs?

Do you feel that the income-producing capability of our States and our local communities today, with the pressures that they have had for mental health, highways, law enforcement and everything else, is adequate to do a good enough job in this area? Because you have dealt the Federal Government completely out of this field, a field in which they are now deeply involved.

Where are we going to get the money at the State and local level? Let us assume in principle we all agree, let us do it locally if we can. How are they going to do it? Where will they get the money from? This is a very specific policy position you have taken which is in sharp contrast with AFL-CIO, Chamber of Commerce, NAM—anyone else who has really studied this program—that you can be very specific on, I hope, because it is in your approved statement here and must have been approved by your board.

Mr. Hicks. Right, sir.

In connection with this, of course, we do feel that far too great a percentage of the taxable income of this Nation is coming to Washington, leaving far too little available to States and localities for use in programs of this sort. It is sort of illogical to say that money can only come from Washington, because in fact we all know that the money can come only from the people of the United States and their productive enterprises that are not located in Washington. They are located in California, New York, Texas, in all the States that somehow seem