

in need, without respect to categorical distinctions. (The working poor, for instance, are those who work full time and still remain poor, still remain in need. It must be formally recognized that having a full-time job in this country doesn't guarantee a living wage and that it is essential that the working poor be treated on a par with all other recipients, receiving the same benefits on the same terms.) Finally this plan is designed to meet current needs and to reduce the incidence of poverty in the future.

The plight of the poor is pressing but their cause is not advanced by regressive legislation. In consequence, the National Urban League would prefer to deal with the present welfare system, recognizing that emergency fiscal relief to the states and major metropolitan areas must be provided until such time as a sound and equitable system of income maintenance for those in need is agreed upon and enacted into law. Such a system of income maintenance is the only means to appropriate compensation for the economic and social dislocations of an advanced economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Senate is voting, and so I would suggest that those of us here should go and vote and, as soon as we can return, we will call the next witness, who will be Mr. Clarence Mitchell, an old battler for many causes involving the minorities and the poor. We will be pleased to hear from you, Mr. Mitchell, as soon as we get back.

Mr. MITCHELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SHORT RECESS

The CHAIRMAN. The others, I assume, will be along shortly, Mr. Mitchell, but we will proceed. If you will be so kind as to proceed with your testimony, we will call on the others when they get here.

STATEMENT OF CLARENCE MITCHELL, DIRECTOR OF THE WASHINGTON BUREAU OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE

Mr. MITCHELL. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I always appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and have frank exchange of views. You have always been very helpful in that respect, and I am sure today will be no exception.

I would like to file my statement for the record and make a brief comment.

The CHAIRMAN. Fine. We will print your statement exactly as you prepared it and then we will have any additions you want to add to it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the important thing that we have got to face on this welfare problem in the United States is we are not going to get the kind of public support for any kind of bill that we need until we can somehow or other change the image that people have of welfare recipients.

I think that Senator Ribicoff made an important contribution today when he engaged in an analysis which showed that the concept of welfare recipients as chiselers is greatly overrated, when he showed that the concept of them being lazy and wasteful is also not typical of welfare recipients.

I think also that the concept of fathers dodging their responsibilities is a problem but I do not think it has the importance in this total program that many people assume it has.

I would say on the basis of my personal experience—because I live in a slum area over in the city of Baltimore, and I would say on the

basis of my personal experience—that most people who are poor would like to work; most people who are poor would like to raise their children under good circumstances, and most parents would like to take both paternal and maternal responsibility for their children.

Until we recognize that that is a fact, and say it again and again, there will be many people who would want to have a rational program, who will be afraid to come out and vote for it because they think it will get them into trouble with their constituents.

We would like to see a unified system under Federal control in this country because if it is a fact that there are people who move back and forth across States lines in search of opportunities to work, as we know it is, it is inevitable at some point those people are going to need assistance.

So if we have got a unified system, it would seem to me, it would be much easier for us to handle that problem.

At the same time, I do not see any great barrier to arranging the system so that it can take into consideration regional differences. We do that in the construction industry under the Bacon-Davis Act, and it would seem to me it would be just as easy to establish regional standards which would enable us to take into consideration economic structures of, say, your State of Louisiana as opposed to the economic structure in the State of New York.

I think the same thing could apply to wage standards. In my judgment, if we are going to undermine the economy in this country, a good way to do it would be to try to get a whole lot of people doing jobs at substandard wages. So I think that we would be defeating our own purposes if we opened the door for the employment of welfare recipients by people who will be unscrupulous enough to try to pay them a wage below what is a decent standard of living.

Another thing I would like to stress is the role of mothers when dealing with young children. I must say, Mr. Chairman, both respectfully and being mindful of our long knowledge of what each other would be doing in this country, that I disagree with your formulation about mothers being so fat they cannot get through the door, their requirement that they ought to sweep off the pavement in front of the house, and when you open an icebox there may be beer in there.

Well, I, as I said, live in a poor neighborhood and I could take you through my routine in the morning, I get up at 6 o'clock in the morning—

The CHAIRMAN. You understand, now, Mr. Mitchell, I am not saying that is typical, but that goes on, what happens; and there are altogether too many cases of that type of thing where people take the money that was intended to feed the child and spent that on beer rather than on milk, and it happens, and I am sure that you know it happens.

Mr. MITCHELL. Oh, it may happen, but I would say this is one of the points I am trying to investigate; that if we take that, which perhaps would represent one-tenth of 1 percent, if it exists at all, this is the image of the welfare recipient that antagonizes the public, and it seems to me if we could somehow or other softpedal that and discuss it in maybe executive sessions of the committee, after finding out just how much of it is factual, we would do a lot to reduce the opposition to

welfare reform, and the opposition to people who are entitled to receive it because they are really in need.

Now, I felt, too, when the discussion was had about the welfare recipients going to the employment office to pick up their checks, it all depends on how you look at it. I can imagine some of my neighbors being physically unable to get to the employment office to pick up their checks. I can also know, because I have seen this happen, if there is no other transportation available and they get a taxicab down there then they are attacked for going down to the welfare office to pick up the checks in a taxicab. I feel, unless we face up to these realities, unless we start a new approach in which we talk about the great majority of people who are just unfortunate enough to be in need of assistance we will never get the country with us to do what I am sure you are trying to do, which is to get a sensible system of welfare reform.

With respect to day care centers I mentioned, the last time I was here, an experience I had on that. The bill, as originally conceived by the White House, provided that you could give Federal money for the purpose of establishing day care centers, and I said that was a very important thing because I had participated as a trustee in a group which was trying to help the poor under one of these programs.

One of the ministers, who had a program of day care at his church, was asked by the Health Department to put in lavatory facilities for little children, to put in electric wiring, and also to put in kitchen facilities, all of which he did. But then the local government wanted to prosecute him for spending money for these things which they said were not authorized by law, and I think that if we are going to say, as a condition of employing mothers, you have got to have adequate day care facilities, it must in fact be adequate and we ought not penalize people who try to provide that kind of facility. But I cannot emphasize too strongly my belief that it is unwise and will generate many other collateral problems if we make it mandatory that mothers of young children work.

I have enough faith in the women who bear children in this country to believe that if we give them bona fide opportunities to work at decent wages, opportunities also to have their children cared for, that they will work without any compulsion.

The CHAIRMAN. Some things about this bill that I think deserve recognition are not being discussed sufficiently.

For one thing, there are some of us who favor having at least this \$130 minimum that the House bill provides for the aged.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And some of us would like to go every bit as strong, and maybe stronger, than the \$200 for the two, for a man and his wife if they are both over 65 and have no other income.

Now, that one thing alone could have the effect of taking all the aged people out of poverty by the present definition, should it not?

Mr. MITCHELL. It should, I would think.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, that is a nice stride forward in itself, is it not, Mr. Mitchell?

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is anyone who quarrels with the things that are accomplished for the aged and the blind, there may be differences here and there.

The great criticism of H.R. 1 centers on the treatment of welfare recipients who are mothers of children, and that is really where the vulnerable point exists in this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, that is a sticky point from the point of view of some of us. Seventy percent of those families have a working father somewhere, a father who is able-bodied, capable of working and certainly available for work, and, presumably, out of that 70 percent I would think it fair to assume that at least 40 of the 70 percent actually have a job, actually are employed, making income adequate to make a substantial contribution to the support of their children.

Now, is it fair to the workers who are paying taxes to support those who are on welfare that those fathers who are employed with income adequate to make a major contribution for the support of their family should be able to shift that burden of supporting their children off onto the backs of other workers who are already supporting their own families.

Mr. MITCHELL. I followed that discussion with great interest this morning because I happen to be one of those who is strongly in favor of all States adopting the Uniform Nonsupport Act so that you can get at the fathers who tried to dodge their responsibility. But as I listened to the discussion there were two things that I thought were important. First, if we got all the fathers who are dodging their responsibilities would we be able to get enough money from them to make an appreciable dent in our welfare problem, and I am afraid the answer to that is no.

The second thing is, in the illustration which I believe you gave, in which you said that someone had mentioned in his testimony fathers who lived physically with the mother, who acknowledged in response to a question that they are the fathers, and the mother acknowledges in response to a question that she is the mother, yet nothing can be done about it. Well, this is not correct. I do not know what's happened to the prosecution in those States, but actually, even under the common law a person who acknowledges responsibility for paternity has an obligation to support children. So it seems to me there are two solutions in that situation. First, we must establish as a legal fact that the man who says he is the father is indeed, as a matter of law, the father, and then move under our existing legal machinery to force him to pay.

Now, that is something you do not have to have an act of Congress to do and I cannot understand why, whoever has got that problem has not made use of existing legal machinery, and I must say I would be a hundred percent in favor of doing that, and in any way, if Congress can strengthen it, sir, I would like to see it done.

But I hasten to add that I do not think even if you got every single one of them that it would make a measurable dent in the need of welfare in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. I differ with you in that, Mr. Mitchell. I am convinced from everything I can learn that particularly when he leaves the State and crosses a State boundary if you try to use the authority of the reciprocal State action program the district attorneys in the State to which the father has gone seem to take the view that they do not want to be bothered with it. Presumably the man by now has a

new set of associates, and he might be in the process of having new family relationships, and so if you take money from him in the State to which he has fled, it might deny his dependents in that state of support, and there seems to be an attitude on the part of the district attorneys who would have the responsibility just not to bother with it.

MR. MITCHELL. I have not checked this particular part of the bill, because it has gone through so many revisions but to my best recollection, when the bill was first proposed by the administration, there was a price in it which would simplify the process of getting at these fathers who cross State lines under a Federal operation.

I think that is still in there but if it is not, it seems to me that could easily be put back in.

But again, as I said, even if you put it back in I think we ought to know just what we are going to get if we do it. It is entirely possible we may spend more, as Senator Ribicoff pointed out this morning, about that New York operation, they spend more in trying to get those who are violating the law than it is actually worth in returns.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, thank you, and we will do the best we can to try to help take care of the same people for whom you have spoken here today.

We may have something of a difference of approach but, as I said before, if the administration wants to spend \$4 billion to help poor people, it is perfectly all right with me provided—and I am willing to vote for it provided—they are doing it in a way that I think would be most beneficial to those people, I mean so far as encouraging doing what is in their own best interests as well as using the money where it would get the most effective results.

MR. MITCHELL. I certainly believe that that is your objective, Mr. Chairman, and I think you know from our mutual friend, Paul Douglas, that if we were called up here to testify as to whether that is what you have in mind, I am sure he would say "Yes."

But I do earnestly ask that you try to avoid the colorful descriptions of the welfare recipients which themselves arouse prejudices in this country, and make it difficult for us to pass these programs, because, for example, in that illustration this morning about the mother, about the sweeping of the pavement, what I did, I turned to Mr. Jordan of the Urban League and I said, "You know, I would like to take Senator Long over to my house." As I said, I live in a slum area, on a high traffic concentration street. I get up at 6 o'clock in the morning and brush off the pavement, hose it down, and by 10 o'clock there is a bundle of trash there again. We even now have, after the trash men, regular trash men come through and collect the trash, even now have something under one of these antipoverty programs where people come through and take up whatever the trashmen drop and they usually drop something, but even that does not keep it clean.

Now, you cannot blame the people who live in those neighborhoods for those conditions because if you do, you would have to blame me, too, and I like cleanliness, but it is a kind of a losing battle, I will tell you, against modern conditions under which people live, and unfortunately, the people who are against what you are trying to do, and what I am trying to do, and what some of the members of this committee are trying to do, namely, help those who are in need, grab that illustration and say, "Well, you see, they are no good, they are lazy and they won't even sweep the pavement."

The CHAIRMAN. Well, now, you oppose the idea of requiring any work from a mother who has small children. Now, would you extend that argument and that philosophy to the extent of not even requiring as a condition of welfare payments from the Government that she at least keep clean the area immediately in front of or immediately behind her own home.

MR. MITCHELL. Well, I would certainly think it would be unfair to put that as a requirement because, as I said, even those who are disposed to do it, and who have money, as I had, to buy a broom and to buy a hose, get somebody to clean the front, still cannot keep it clean. So it seems to me it would be grossly unfair to require a mother to do an impossible job.

Now, my solution would be that we do, as we are trying to do in my church, I am chairman of the board of trustees in my church, and we have a program under which we are trying to train mothers in household responsibilities and all the things that will make a home attractive; things that will help them to save money when they make purchases in stores, and I think that is really the solution.

I think if we can train people to do the best they can in the face of existing circumstances, they will do it, and I think we would get more done, really, that is constructive than if we said as a matter of law, "If you don't sweep off the pavement and keep your place clean, you cannot get assistance."

The CHAIRMAN. Well, of course, that is just the difference between our approaches. My thought is that it is a basic difference between paying a person to do something and paying them to do nothing.

MR. MITCHELL. I think you should pay it.

The CHAIRMAN. Little though that may be, it is more than zero.

MR. MITCHELL. I think the most precious possession any country has is the future generation of children and it seems to me the first consideration should be how can we administer this in a way that is going to give the children opportunities that maybe their parents did not have and after we have done that, it seems to me it is quite likely that one of the ways of helping to get those children opportunities would be to provide a training program for mothers which would enable them to work, and a program under which you would have day care centers and that kind of thing.

But it seems to me the very first and primary consideration is the children, and I don't think you can reconcile that with compulsory employment because what happens now is if a mother is required to work, she is going to have to leave those children unattended at home or send them to a substandard nursing place, so that we are going to wind up with a whole pile of juvenile delinquents and people going to jail simply because mothers did not give the care that a mother can give, and I feel that, as I say, if we start with the welfare of the children because they are wards of the State, and if we can work out something that does not do harm to them, then I think we are on the right track.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, thank you very much.

Senator Ribicoff. Just one question, Mr. Mitchell. I, too, appreciate your testimony, and I have the highest respect for your knowledge and dedication to many cases full of heartbreak.

As I gather from your colloquy with our chairman you, too, are anxious to close any loophole that would lead to fraud or cheating.

You do not approve of fraud or cheating and you want the committee to do whatever it can do to close it up and make the father responsible for the children. But what you are saying is that represents a small percentage of the overall amount of people on welfare and while we try to close up the loopholes you want us to take into account that basically we should design a program for the overwhelming number of people who are trying to do their best and cannot make it, is that what you are driving at?

Mr. MITCHELL. It is exactly, and I say that I was inspired to depart from my testimony to make that point because of the very eloquent and moving way in which you developed that point at the morning hearing. I was saying to the chairman that we can never get support for welfare reform on the scale that we need it if we continue to depict the welfare recipients as lazy, irresponsible, cheaters, and errant fathers.

We have got to isolate the facts, as you so ably did, we have got to say "All right, we are going to spend \$300,000 or \$400,000 to catch up with the chislers," as they are doing in New York. "How many did you catch?" And I did think that the answer wasn't entirely responsive to your question because the answer was 21 or 26. I made an observation to somebody during the recess that with one-eighth of that money we could catch a whole lot more dope users and numbers writers and other kinds of lawbreakers so that really it seemed to me the program was set up as so many of these investigative programs are set up, to appease the public clamor about chislers.

Well, I do not quarrel with that, but it seems to me once we find out what the facts are, then we ought to say, "Here, as New York has got a million people on relief and 21 of them they find were supposed to be chislers," it seems to me then that lets the public know we are not dealing with chislers and fakers and others who are trying just to get a free handout.

Senator RIBICOFF. You know, you say that you live in a slum area. One of the things that has always impressed me whenever you go through a slum area, whether blacks or Puerto Ricans or whites, you come across a school right in the heart of the ghetto, and I wish that every Member of Congress would do that sometime, just go and pass when school is in session or playground how clean the children are, bright, and the dresses are starched, they look neat, the girls, the boys have got their hair combed. When I often go through the slum areas and I see how those children are dressed and look in the middle class suburbs it comes as quite a shock to many Members, which indicates that somewhere in that slum area with most people on welfare must be a mother who loves those kids and trying to do the best with them. I wonder if you find that in Baltimore where you live.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do, indeed, and I will say to you when I was a boy I had two suits. My mother washed those alternately so that I could go to school with a clean suit on. We did not have central heat in our house, and very often I would get warm in school, and I can remember sometimes when they would give out the Graham crackers and the milk, how embarrassing it was to me because I didn't have a nickel with which to purchase that, and they always looked so much better than they taste now that I can afford to buy them. But that was

not unusual. That is typical. It has been what I have observed all of my life.

I wish I could have had the members of this committee with me the day we had that big snowfall. The newspaper boy came to collect for his money. His mother was with him, and she didn't have a hat on, she didn't have galoshes on. She didn't even have a coat and I wanted to do something. I offered some attire and she was too proud to accept it. They weren't looking for any handout. They were out there collecting money under their newspaper route, mother and son.

I say to you, and I am sure you know this, Senator Ribicoff, that these are the people who are typical of the poor in this country, and when we get our fellow Americans to see that these are the people we are trying to help, I think we can move a lot of these programs much faster.

Senator RIBICOFF. You see, I think one of the things that bothers Senator Long and that bothers me is when Mayor Lindsay was here and we had a discussion a few years ago about the people on welfare doing something, and what Senator Long is talking about cleaning up their own backyard, I was deeply disturbed when I went to Bedford-Stuyvesant, I would say it is probably one of the most tragic sights in the world. I do imagine, I never have been in India, but it probably compares with the slums of India, but you would go right in the neighborhood, forgetting the filth in the streets, but you would see a playground that their children and they used, full of debris and glass and, of course, it is unfortunate because it is the neighbors and people throwing it out but I think what Senator Long is driving at if at least some of the people who lived there on welfare part of the day would get a trash can and a broom and clean up their playground so their own children could play in them and, as I was listening to him, he is not asking that they do onerous work, he says they have a mother and the kids are in school, certainly is it too much to ask for 2 or 3 hours a day while the children are in school she goes into the playground and sweeps up the broken glass and the cans so her children can play in that playground? I think that is what you are driving at, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MITCHELL. My answer to that is, of course, but I think you will find if you ask for volunteers, and I know this it true because I have seen it work, you ask for volunteers you get a whole lot further with those people rather than if you say as a condition of getting your money you must do this work.

Now, I think if we train people to try to cope with these problems, I would like to hazard a guess, if you suspended the street-cleaning operation and the watering of the streets up here in the Capital for a couple of days it would look worse than Bedford-Stuyvesant or most of those other areas where you have slums because of the heavy traffic people throwing debris around. The reason it looks good is because we spend a whole lot of money keeping it clean.

I don't say we can afford to spend money keeping that kind of playground clean, but I certainly do not think you can keep it clean by making it mandatory that mothers go out there as a condition of receiving relief.

Senator RIBICOFF. That is all.

Senator CURTIS. I am sorry I did not get in on all of your testimony, but I have no questions.

Mr. MITCHELL. Thank you, Senator Curtis.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Fannin?

Senator FANNIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am sorry, too, I have not heard all of your statement. But I looked at your statement, and the end of your statement says many of the important programs designed to help the poor are not reaching those in need. I think this is true and a very necessary part of the work that we are doing is to correct that, but if we could take care of those in need, if we could, I think, much better and with the funds that could be made available, if those who are able bodied and could take care of themselves would put forth a better effort and we would have more control over what is happening so far as the family is just growing and growing beyond the ability of the parents to support the children.

Now, I think we have to be very frank about some of these matters and I think it is one of the most serious that I have witnessed since I have been on this committee and in these hearings and that is here we cannot be fair and there is no way that I can see that the family can be fair where they have 11 children, and they have been in need for many, many years, but they still continue to have additional children.

What do you think, what would you recommend to help overcome that problem so that we can take better care of those who are not able to take care of themselves?

Mr. MITCHELL. I think that there are many people who are interested in programs of voluntary birth control, and I think that really is the answer. But, as I said earlier, I happen to be a member of the Methodist Church and I do take my religion seriously, I do not believe any human has the right to say as a matter of law to a fellow human, that "You may not reproduce." And for that reason I would not favor any mandatory participation in a birth control program as a condition of receiving assistance. But I do think realistically we can do things to educate people to make use of what knowledge we have on birth control.

Senator FANNIN. Well, in some way we must bring about self-discipline. I do not have an answer for it. I wish that we could find an answer. I know it isn't simple, but I do think that there is a point at which we cannot go beyond, and welfare is costing us more and more and more, there are more people going on welfare, and if we followed the philosophy that you have, that "The NAACP stresses the need for strengthening regulations that would prohibit the forcing of welfare recipients to accept employment that does not pay fair wages or to work under conditions that would be hazardous to health and safety." No one wants people to work under conditions that would be hazardous to health and safety, but I certainly cannot agree that we do not need, you say forcing, but requiring, and forcing is just like, the same, as a person cannot graduate from school unless they have certain requirements. Well, you are not necessarily forcing them to take that, but it is a requirement, and I think there is a great difference there, and I think requiring people to accept work that is available to them, that would take care of their needs is certainly a requirement that we should insist upon.

Mr. MITCHELL. Just before you came in, Senator Fannin, I had said to the chairman that it is my opinion, based on experience, that most mothers would like to work but I think we, as people who have the future of our country in mind and the responsibility for caring for the children of this Nation, have an obligation to see to it that if they work there must be adequate day care facilities and they must get a wage that is commensurate with the duties performed, because if we do not do that, we are going to generate worse problems in the form of juvenile delinquency and things of that sort, stemming from parental neglect caused by nothing more than the absence of the mother from the home.

Senator FANNIN. Of course, that could be argued both ways. Many times it would not be a great advantage, other times it would be an absolute necessity. We would not want to just get into that as that simple. I don't think, but what I am concerned about is we have a problem, we must find a solution, we just cannot keep adding and adding people on the welfare rolls without hurting those people. We are worrying because their attitude then in many cases that carries down through with the children and the children think, "Well, dad and mom, they were on welfare. What difference does it make, we can go on welfare." That is something you don't want and I don't want. We want that self-discipline, that encouragement along with self-discipline, to help these people so they can help themselves and I do not think we are going to do it the way you are recommending.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, that is true, what you said, Senator Fannin, but before you came in I made the point that in all of these things we say about what is causing the increase in welfare rolls we have to be sure that we can prove it statistically, and if we prove it statistically, then determine how much of this is causing an increase in the welfare rolls. For example, who could say that the fact that a person has 11 children instead of seven is a reason why the welfare roll costs jumped \$5 million? That may be true but we have not as yet, to my knowledge, developed any statistics which support, which would support that point. And I said, too, that it seems to me it makes it far more difficult to do what you and I want to do, which is put people on their feet, if we identify these recipients as so profligate, and so unrestrained that they wind up with children on a kind of a pro-duction line, because that makes them get the kind of image which causes people to say, "Well, why spend money for them?"

Senator FANNIN. I do not want to say why spend money for them, but I do want to know why we almost encourage that to happen.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not know that it is done. So far as I know the welfare agencies dispense information about birth control. I was a little, I am a little old-fashioned, and I was a little bit shocked to go into an institution that I have some connection with which was the last place I would expect to see this, to see advertisements about birth control and abortions and things of that sort, which had been put there by welfare and city agencies. Well, I say that merely to indicate I am sure that kind of information is being disseminated, and in my judgment that is the only way we are going to come to grips with the problem of excessive birth, if you call it that, although I hasten to say I would not consider the birth of any child excessive.

Senator FANNIN. No, but sometimes it is regrettable at times. We know that.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, only God knows that, really.

Senator FANNIN. Well, of course, I do not mean it from the sense you are talking about. I am talking about the child suffers by being brought into a family of 10 or 11 where the family cannot support the child and not take proper care of it, including welfare, and it is still a problem of taking care of 11 children.

I am not one who should judge who should have a family.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, you see, I think you cannot have it both ways in this country. We cannot say we want children to take, to read the Bible in schools or take an oath of allegiance to the flag, and things of that sort without carrying through to its ultimate conclusion the principles for which those things stand, and the Bible stands for the right of man to be born, and the Constitution and the flag stand for the right of people to determine how many children they are going to have.

While I heartily agree that we ought to make information available which will enable those who want to use it to control the size of their family, I do not think we ought to make it as a condition of receiving assistance.

Senator FANNIN. I do not think there is any document that stresses more the attitude of work and the requirement for work more so than the Bible.

Mr. MITCHELL. You are so right, and I think, Senator Fannin, that we underestimate the potential of people who want to work.

Now it just happens when the Atomic Energy Commission was building the plant down at Aiken and Augusta in South Carolina some years ago, I was down there and we were talking with the companies about who would work in that plant. This is atomic energy. We thought this had to be some high-powered workers of one kind or another. The people who were building that plant said, "All we need to have are people who know how to operate a tractor. If they know anything about machinery we can train them to work in this plant."

I think we just do not understand how many people really would love to be able to work but cannot find a job. I do not know how we can get that breakdown between the people looking for work and jobs that are available, but I do not think we have scratched the surface.

Senator FANNIN. Of course, there are many jobs. I have neighbors, friends, I know my own wife has problems getting domestic help, it has been a continuous problem. It is here in Washington, it is in my State, so I just feel that we are not, somewhere or other we are not getting the two together.

I thank you very much.

Mr. MITCHELL. One thing, I think we are not paying people what they ought to be paid for work, and then where you have the really good jobs, as I am sure you must have, that shows that word does not get to people who would be worthy of it.

I am rapidly reaching the point, Senator Fannin, where I think in this country, unfortunately, there are some people who just do not want poor people to have a decent wage. It happens my youngest brother is a Member of the other body, and a member of the Banking

and Currency Committee. He got, with the help of Republicans and Democrats, an amendment to the wage legislation which said that the wage control would not apply to those people who were working below the poverty level because obviously, if we could raise them, that would be a good thing. But that amendment is not being carried out at this time though it is the law, and apparently the reason is, there are some people who just do not want to pay the poorer folks the wage that even the law says they should get.

Senator FANNIN. Well, of course, naturally there are people who want to hire at the lowest wages, I grant you that, but I think most businessmen, they are wise to take a person on the basis of production, and I think that is the basis on which successful operations are brought forward.

Well, thank you.

Mr. MITCHELL. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any questions, Senator Hansen?

Senator HANSEN. Mr. Mitchell, would you think it would be helpful to have a better means of identifying all welfare recipients than we presently have?

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, I think if you have adequate safeguards of privacy, I think Senator Ribicoff or Governor Rockefeller mentioned that in one of these programs there is a social security number which goes on the welfare recipient's record, and I do not know what the purpose was, but I think it was for the purpose of, for example, looking for a father who might not be taking care of his children; well, that seems to me a rational and reasonable request. It is just like asking somebody for his address or where he was born.

Where I would draw the line is in the case which was mentioned today where some official of the State of Arkansas said that if he could just get access to the information that was available to the welfare people, he would be able to cut down the relief rolls.

Well, that, in my judgment, would be a horrible development in our country because there are plenty of people who would be delighted to get that kind of information for the purpose of driving people off of welfare, not for the purpose of unearthing chiselers.

Also, I think—

Senator HANSEN. I do not know that I understand exactly what you mean by this.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not think you were here when that came up this morning.

Senator HANSEN. No; I heard some of it—as a matter of fact, I think I may have referred to the county attorney from Arkansas who was speaking about—

Mr. MITCHELL. Was it you?

Senator HANSEN (continuing). Who was speaking about the lack of cooperation on the part of the Federal agency, HEW specifically, as I recall. He said that, as a matter of fact I think what he testified to was that by virtue of regulations long ago adopted, HEW just adamantly refused to make any information available, and I think his interest was in trying to trace fathers who deserted families.

Now, when I said I did not understand what you meant, I am not clear in which way you think that such information made available

to appropriate officials would be used to keep people from applying for welfare. Maybe I misunderstood you.

Mr. MITCHELL. I said it would be used to drive people off welfare rolls. Unhappily, when a man is elected to public office, sometimes the lure of a headline gets him to act in a way that is really not in keeping with his oath of office or public need, and I would predict that if people like that, the gentleman that you mentioned, had access to welfare rolls, quite likely they would use it in such a fashion as to embarrass recipients so that they would be glad to get off welfare even though they were in fact in need and that is why I would say I do not think you should make that kind of information available.

Senator HANSEN. Well, I guess if I understand you correctly, we may not see eye to eye every bit of that problem. I would take the view that a father who deserts his family ought to have to share the responsibility. I do not think it is fair at all for a husband, simply because it seems to be easier for him, to pack up and leave to go off and abandon his wife and leave her with the responsibility of seeing they get welfare and that they are taken care of. I happen to think that they ought to be traced down, and in Wyoming we have been trying to do this.

Mr. MITCHELL. I agree.

Senator HANSEN. I might add, about 99 percent of them are all white people, because I think we have fewer than one-half of 1 percent blacks in Wyoming, so I am not injecting any racial bias in this at all. It is just a case of—

Mr. MITCHELL. Unfortunately, no racial group has any monopoly on philandering.

Senator HANSEN. I agree.

Mr. MITCHELL. But I would say, I think, I am in agreement with you because before you came in this time, I did say that anything which would enable us to catch the fathers who escape their responsibility, would be useful, but I also said that I could not for the life of me understand why the prosecutors and other officials cannot do that now, because the law certainly requires fathers to support their children.

Senator HANSEN. I think the law is clear enough, but, unfortunately, I gather from what their Mr. Weems, I believe it was, testified, indicated, that he could not get any help from HEW at all in order to help trace down through whatever means, I suspect that most of these people would have some social security numbers, and I would gather that that information would be helpful if a father were to go across a State line, as oftentimes happens in my State, if the appropriate officials—and I do not mean to make this information indiscriminately available at all, but if appropriate officials might be able to find out from social security people if this person were employed outside of the State, it would be quite helpful in getting some finger on him so you could see that part of his salary goes to the support of his family. Would that disturb you?

Mr. MITCHELL. It does only for this reason. I have not read that legislation recently, but I seem to recall that the agency would be prohibited from giving out that information as a matter of law, and one of the things I mentioned before you came in was, I think that in the

administration's bill, originally at least, there was a provision which would try to meet that problem. It does seem to me that would be the way to do it, and not violate the secrecy of the social security records, which we have imposed for the protection of people for other reasons.

Senator HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am aware that there is a vote going on. Perhaps we should all go vote.

Mr. MITCHELL. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you finished interrogating the witness?

Senator HANSEN. I would just like to say your testimony has been very helpful.

Mr. MITCHELL. Thank you.

Senator HANSEN. And I must say you are a very excellent witness.

Mr. MITCHELL. Thank you, Senator Hansen.

The CHAIRMAN. We will recess for 10 minutes while we vote, and then we will reassemble here.

Mr. MITCHELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(Short recess.)

(The prepared statement of Mr. Mitchell follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF CLARENCE MITCHELL, DIRECTOR OF THE WASHINGTON BUREAU OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am Clarence Mitchell, director of the Washington bureau of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Thank you for this opportunity to present testimony on H.R. 1, proposed welfare reform legislation.

The following four points are the major thrust of the NAACP's resolution on welfare reform.

1. Elimination of categories and establishment of a unified federally administered and federally financed system based solely on need (the job rights of state and city employees should be fully protected during the transition from State to Federal administration).

2. Benefit levels:

a. Minimum benefits for individuals and families beginning at the government-defined poverty level, with appropriate adjustments to meet variations in the cost of living;

b. Federal supplements to assure that benefits are maintained at least up to present assistance levels.

3. Protections as to both suitability and wage standards on all job or training programs. Wage rates should equal the federal or state minimum or the prevailing rate, whichever is higher.

4. Exemption of mothers of pre-school and school-age children from all job or training requirements; establishment of day care centers with adequate standards and other supplementary services to enable mothers who choose to accept employment to do so.

We are also concerned about the need to give adequate safeguards to the job rights of individuals who are currently employed in welfare programs.

At present, large unemployment is one of the principal reasons why training of welfare recipients, without at the same time creating new job opportunities, would be meaningless. On the other hand, even during periods of full employment there are some persons who would have great difficulty in obtaining or holding jobs in private industry. A careful program of matching individuals to jobs in the public sector or in non-profit organizations would have untold value in our country. In this respect, we could receive very valuable guidance from our experience in the anti-poverty program and other types of job creating efforts that we have made in recent years.

[The NAACP stresses the need for strengthening regulations that would prohibit the forcing of welfare recipients to accept employment that does not pay fair wages or to work under conditions that would be hazardous to health and safety.] We are also opposed to any requirement that mothers be required to work as a condition of receiving aid.