

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

REGIONAL AMERICAN PUBLIC WELFARE ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE

Minneapolis, Minnesota

September 12, 1976

One of the greatest challenges facing the next President, the Congress, and all of you gathered here tonight is welfare reform. The need for a comprehensive examination of our income support programs is dramatized by the fact that these programs, excluding social security, will cost Federal, State, and local governments almost \$50 billion in FY 1977.

Despite the sincere efforts of the past to devise a fair, efficient and compassionate system of support for the poor and the needy, we have not done so. And well-known deficiencies in our current patchwork of Federal and State income support programs have been severely worsened by poor management of the economy in the last 5 years.

In the last 5 years inflation has averaged 6.8 percent and we have suffered two devastating recessions.

The 1974-75 recession pushed many Americans on to the jobless rolls for an extended period of time. At the worst point in the recession 9 percent of the labor force was "officially" unemployed. But when those too discouraged to look for work and those involuntarily working part time were included, the "real" unemployment rate was close to 12 percent.

During 1975 more than 21 million Americans suffered a spell of unemployment during the year. This meant that more than 60 million men, women, and children who were either unemployed or living in a household with an unemployed worker were directly touched by the crippling impact of the recession.

This disastrous economic performance sharply increased the number of families requiring welfare. It raised the cost of providing families with welfare. And, it drastically reduced the ability of State and local governments to meet these increased demands.

In 1975, welfare costs rose by more than 20 percent, with the largest increases occurring in the number of AFDC families with an unemployed father present. In New York City, in Massachusetts, and elsewhere, rising income support payments, directly attributable to the recession, were a key factor in bringing on State and city budget crises.

By focusing on the impact of the general economy, however, I do not want to ignore some of the basic shortcomings of our current programs. These include:

-- The wide disparities among income support levels in various States which have encouraged the movement of the welfare population, often to areas where future job prospects are no better or are actually worse than they were at home.

-- Intact families are penalized, compared to those where one parent has abandoned the family. This encourages the break-up of low-income families and leads to an increase in female-headed households -- which traditionally make up a large part of those families living in poverty.

-- In some parts of the country, the combination of cash and in-kind benefits to some families exceeds the after-tax income of working families. This, combined with the sharp benefit reduction generally for any earned income, creates severe disincentives for welfare recipients to return to work.

-- Some programs fail to target our limited resources on those most in need and, at the same time, create a bureaucratic nightmare for those who need help.

-- High unemployment over a prolonged period has increased the number of individuals and families in need of income support. As a result, we have had to lengthen and broaden the coverage of Unemployment Insurance, making the U.I. system as much a welfare program as an insurance system against short spells of unemployment.

In addition to outlining these overall inequities in the system, I would like to speak for a moment about the unique problems of those who live in the rural areas -- a problem that has received too little attention.

Large proportions of poor and elderly citizens place significant demands on rural counties for welfare and social services. The problem of accessibility to services in rural areas greatly multiplies the costs and reduces the level of services available.

About half of all children 6-17 years old in families with incomes below the poverty level, reside in rural areas. However, only 24 percent of aid to families with dependent children (AFDC) and 20 percent of all child welfare service funds go to rural counties.

One half of our Nation's poor live in rural areas. More than 2.5 million rural families have incomes below the poverty line and an additional 1 million live in near poverty.

So, when we talk about welfare reform, and changing the inequities in the system, we must pay special attention to the unique social service needs of rural America.

Action can be taken now at the State and local level to ensure that rural people are included in the State Title XX Social Service Planning process. The States must pay particular attention to making sure that State Social Service plans address rural needs.

There is clearly no easy, simple solution to these shortcomings in current programs. But I believe that we can make our welfare programs more workable and restore dignity to low-income individuals and families.

But first, I think we must all realize that true welfare reform and full employment are closely dependent on each other. As most of you know, I have authored, with Congressman Augustus Hawkins and many other cosponsors in the House and Senate, the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1976, more commonly known as the Humphrey-Hawkins Bill. While the achievement of full employment, defined in S. 50 as 3 percent of the adult labor force, will not eliminate the problems I mentioned earlier, it will reduce them to more manageable proportions.

One tragic effect of our most recent recession is that it has so magnified many social and economic problems that it has left many people believing that the situation is hopeless.

We can make the reform of income support manageable by undertaking it in a climate of full employment. The Joint Economic Committee staff has estimated that each one percent reduction in the unemployment rate would reduce welfare costs at the Federal level by \$1.5 to 2 billion. It would also save \$2.5 to \$3 billion in unemployment compensation benefits.

This means that moving from an average unemployment level of 7.5 percent, the current rate, to even 4 percent, would reduce these expenditures by as much as \$17 billion at the Federal level alone. Additional substantial savings, which are difficult to estimate precisely, would be achieved at the State and local level.

It is no mere coincidence that the number of Americans living in poverty was reduced by 14 million in the 1960's while the unemployment rate dropped from an average of 6.7 percent in 1961 to 3.6 percent in 1968.

In 1974 the number of individuals living in poverty increased by 1.3 million, and when figures are available for 1975, they will show a continued worsening of the situation as unemployment approached 9 percent.

The goals of full employment as expressed in S. 50 would be achieved, first, by better management of fiscal and monetary policy, and then, if necessary through a variety of programs to attack specific stubborn pockets of unemployment. These would include a youth training and employment program, a regional economic development program, expanded adult job training, and counter-cyclical grants to State and local governments. For those who are unable to find employment through any of these means, there would be a job reservoir, administered by the Department of Labor, which would create a limited number of Federal jobs.

Moving to full employment, however, will not be enough. The income support disparities between cities and rural areas, between regions, between working and non-working families and between one-parent and two-parent families, would remain.

The recent fiscal crisis of State and municipal governments has highlighted the urgent need for greater Federal financial support of our welfare programs.

One of the most creative and comprehensive proposals for welfare reform, developed by a Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee, calls for federal assumption of welfare costs. A recent letter to the President from a group of distinguished economists, including James Tobin, Herbert Stein, Joe Pechman and others, endorses the principles of this approach.

While I am impressed with this proposal and the growing and diverse sources of support for it, I do have some concerns.

I believe we must focus very carefully on the reduction in benefits that some families would be forced to endure in some States under this proposal. Yet I realize the dilemma and sympathize with the authors. If benefit levels were adjusted to support income at the highest level prevailing in any State or municipality, the increased costs to the federal government would be enormous, particularly at today's unemployment level. As this proposal is considered in Congress, I believe that we must develop, in consultation with State and local governments, an equitable way for maintaining income standards in all States at least during a transitional period.

We must correct the disincentives to work and to family unity wherever they exist in present programs. At the present time, most programs have a two-for-one reduction in benefits for any earned income above a certain level. We can reduce this income loss by cutting benefits as little as 50 percent for any wages earned over a certain amount; changing this provision is, I think, the key to integrating full employment and welfare reform.

Finally, we can and must restore the dignity of those, who through no fault of their own, are unable to support themselves.

These are broad outlines of what I would like to see us accomplish as we restructure our welfare system. It is in this spirit that the Democratic Platform recommends that we "move toward replacement of our existing inadequate and wasteful system with a simplified system of income maintenance, substantially financed by the federal government, which includes a requirement that those able to work be provided with appropriate available jobs or job training opportunities..."

There are other problems I haven't dealt with, such as inefficient administration of programs and the abuses that exist. But I see here in the audience today many of you who have more expertise to recommend how we should go about this -- obviously it deserves high priority.

Many people have expressed grave doubts about our nation's ability to finance a broad income maintenance program and comprehensive health insurance.

If we continue to pursue policies that leave us with unemployment at 6, 7 or 8 percent, these critics are correct.

If we continue to place the leadership of our nation in the hands of the tired, tepid and timid, the critics are right.

But, if we aggressively pursue a full employment economy and elect a new generation of competent, compassionate and energetic leaders, we can and we will meet these most basic needs of the American people.

#

② Barry Morrisroe ^{HEW}

③ Bob Sullivan Program Director

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

REGIONAL AMERICAN PUBLIC WELFARE ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE

MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

Mayor Leo Satorn

SEPTEMBER 12, 1976

✓ Vera Lakin - Minn Commissioner
Public Welfare

✓ Edward Weaver - Asst Director

✓ Stan Green - Asst Officer

ONE OF THE GREATEST CHALLENGES FACING THE NEXT PRESIDENT,
THE CONGRESS, AND ALL OF YOU GATHERED HERE TONIGHT IS WELFARE

REFORM THE NEED FOR A COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION OF OUR INCOME

SUPPORT PROGRAMS IS DRAMATIZED BY THE FACT THAT THESE PROGRAMS,

"EXCLUDING SOCIAL SECURITY," WILL COST FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL

GOVERNMENTS ALMOST \$50 BILLION IN FY 1977.

and yet great needs

DESPITE THE SINCERE EFFORTS OF THE PAST TO DEVISE A FAIR,

EFFICIENT AND COMPASSIONATE SYSTEM OF SUPPORT FOR THE POOR

AND THE NEEDY, WE HAVE NOT DONE SO AND WELL-KNOWN DEFICIENCIES

IN OUR CURRENT PATCHWORK OF FEDERAL AND STATE INCOME SUPPORT

PROGRAMS HAVE BEEN SEVERELY WORSENERED BY POOR MANAGEMENT OF THE

ECONOMY IN THE LAST 5 YEARS.

(Recession inflation)

L IN THE LAST 6 YEARS INFLATION HAS AVERAGED 6.8 PERCENT AND
WE HAVE SUFFERED TWO DEVASTATING RECESSIONS.

L THE 1974-75 RECESSION PUSHED MANY AMERICANS ON TO THE JOBLESS
ROLLS FOR AN EXTENDED PERIOD OF TIME. AT THE WORST POINT IN

THE RECESSION ^{over} 9 PERCENT OF THE LABOR FORCE WAS "OFFICIALLY"

UNEMPLOYED. BUT WHEN THOSE TOO DISCOURAGED TO LOOK FOR WORK

AND THOSE INVOLUNTARILY WORKING PART TIME WERE INCLUDED, THE

"REAL" UNEMPLOYMENT RATE WAS CLOSE TO 12 PERCENT.

*Some cities
worse.*

L DURING 1975 MORE THAN 21 MILLION AMERICANS SUFFERED A

SPELL OF UNEMPLOYMENT DURING THE YEAR. THIS MEANT THAT MORE

60 MILLION MEN, WOMEN, AND CHILDREN WHO WERE EITHER

UNEMPLOYED OR LIVING IN A HOUSEHOLD WITH AN UNEMPLOYED WORKER

WERE DIRECTLY TOUCHED BY THE CRIPPLING IMPACT OF THE RECESSION.

over 57 million unemployed.

THIS DISASTROUS ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE SHARPLY INCREASED THE
NUMBER OF FAMILIES REQUIRING WELFARE. IT RAISED THE COST OF
PROVIDING FAMILIES WITH WELFARE. AND, IT DRASTICALLY REDUCED
THE ABILITY OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO MEET THESE
INCREASED DEMANDS.

IN 1975, WELFARE COSTS ROSE BY MORE THAN 20 PERCENT,
WITH THE LARGEST INCREASES OCCURRING IN THE NUMBER OF AFDC
FAMILIES WITH AN UNEMPLOYED FATHER PRESENT. IN NEW YORK CITY,
IN MASSACHUSETTS, AND ELSEWHERE, RISING INCOME SUPPORT
PAYMENTS, DIRECTLY ATTRIBUTABLE TO THE RECESSION, WERE A KEY
FACTOR IN BRINGING ON STATE AND CITY BUDGET CRISES.

BY FOCUSING ON THE IMPACT OF THE GENERAL ECONOMY, HOWEVER,
I DO NOT WANT TO IGNORE SOME OF THE BASIC SHORTCOMINGS OF OUR
CURRENT PROGRAMS. THESE INCLUDE:

L-- THE WIDE DISPARITIES AMONG INCOME SUPPORT LEVELS IN VARIOUS
STATES WHICH HAVE ENCOURAGED THE MOVEMENT OF THE WELFARE
POPULATION, OFTEN TO AREAS WHERE FUTURE JOB PROSPECTS ARE NO
BETTER OR ARE ACTUALLY WORSE THAN THEY WERE AT HOME.

L-- INTACT FAMILIES ARE PENALIZED, COMPARED TO THOSE WHERE ONE
PARENT HAS ABANDONED THE FAMILY. THIS ENCOURAGES THE BREAK-UP
OF LOW-INCOME FAMILIES AND LEADS TO AN INCREASE IN FEMALE-HEADED
HOUSEHOLDS -- WHICH TRADITIONALLY MAKE UP A LARGE PART OF THOSE
FAMILIES LIVING IN POVERTY.

L-- IN SOME PARTS OF THE COUNTRY, THE COMBINATION OF CASH
AND IN-KIND BENEFITS TO SOME FAMILIES EXCEEDS THE AFTER-TAX
INCOME OF WORKING FAMILIES. THIS, COMBINED WITH THE SHARP
BENEFIT REDUCTION GENERALLY FOR ANY EARNED INCOME, CREATES
SEVERE DISINCENTIVES FOR WELFARE RECIPIENTS TO RETURN TO WORK.

L -- SOME PROGRAMS FAIL TO TARGET OUR LIMITED RESOURCES ON
THOSE MOST IN NEED AND, AT THE SAME TIME, CREATE A BUREAUCRATIC
NIGHTMARE FOR THOSE WHO NEED HELP.

L -- HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT OVER A PROLONGED PERIOD HAS INCREASED
THE NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES IN NEED OF INCOME SUPPORT.

L AS A RESULT, WE HAVE HAD TO LENGTHEN AND BROADEN THE COVERAGE OF
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE, MAKING THE U.I. SYSTEM AS MUCH A WELFARE
PROGRAM AS AN INSURANCE SYSTEM AGAINST SHORT SPELLS OF UNEMPLOYMENT.

L IN ADDITION TO OUTLINING THESE OVERALL INEQUITIES IN THE
SYSTEM, I WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK FOR A MOMENT ABOUT THE UNIQUE
PROBLEMS OF THOSE WHO LIVE IN THE RURAL AREAS -- A PROBLEM
THAT HAS RECEIVED TOO LITTLE ATTENTION.

rural areas

LARGE PROPORTIONS OF POOR AND ELDERLY CITIZENS PLACE
SIGNIFICANT DEMANDS ON RURAL COUNTIES FOR WELFARE AND SOCIAL
SERVICES. THE PROBLEM OF ACCESSIBILITY TO SERVICES IN RURAL
AREAS GREATLY MULTIPLIES THE COSTS AND REDUCES THE LEVEL OF
SERVICES AVAILABLE.

set this -

ABOUT HALF OF ALL CHILDREN 6-17 YEARS OLD IN FAMILIES WITH
INCOMES BELOW THE POVERTY LEVEL, RESIDE IN RURAL AREAS.

HOWEVER, ONLY 24 PERCENT OF AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT
CHILDREN (AFDC) AND 20 PERCENT OF ALL CHILD WELFARE SERVICE
FUNDS GO TO RURAL COUNTIES.

(Rural Poverty)

ONE HALF OF OUR NATION'S POOR LIVE IN RURAL AREAS. MORE
THAN 2.5 MILLION RURAL FAMILIES HAVE INCOMES BELOW THE POVERTY
LINE AND AN ADDITIONAL 1 MILLION LIVE IN NEAR POVERTY.

L So, WHEN WE TALK ABOUT WELFARE REFORM, AND CHANGING THE
INEQUITIES IN THE SYSTEM, WE MUST PAY SPECIAL ATTENTION TO THE
UNIQUE SOCIAL SERVICE NEEDS OF RURAL AMERICA.

L ACTION CAN BE TAKEN NOW AT THE STATE AND LOCAL LEVEL TO
ENSURE THAT RURAL PEOPLE ARE INCLUDED IN THE STATE TITLE XX

SOCIAL SERVICE PLANNING PROCESS / THE STATES MUST PAY
PARTICULAR ATTENTION TO MAKING SURE THAT STATE "SOCIAL SERVICE
PLANS ADDRESS RURAL NEEDS.

L THERE IS CLEARLY NO EASY, SIMPLE SOLUTION TO THESE SHORT-
COMINGS IN CURRENT PROGRAMS. BUT I BELIEVE THAT WE CAN MAKE

OUR WELFARE PROGRAMS MORE WORKABLE AND RESTORE DIGNITY TO
LOW-INCOME INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES.

② Food Stamps
② Medicaid

X
X
L BUT FIRST, I THINK WE MUST ALL REALIZE THAT TRUE WELFARE
REFORM AND FULL EMPLOYMENT ARE CLOSELY DEPENDENT ON EACH OTHER.

L AS MOST OF YOU KNOW, I HAVE AUTHORED, WITH CONGRESSMAN AUGUSTUS
HAWKINS AND MANY OTHER COSPONSORS IN THE HOUSE AND SENATE, THE
FULL EMPLOYMENT AND BALANCED GROWTH ACT OF 1976, MORE COMMONLY

KNOWN AS THE HUMPHREY-HAWKINS BILL. WHILE THE ACHIEVEMENT OF

FULL EMPLOYMENT, DEFINED IN S. 50 AS 3 PERCENT OF THE ADULT

LABOR FORCE, WILL NOT ELIMINATE THE PROBLEMS I MENTIONED

EARLIER, IT WILL REDUCE THEM TO MORE MANAGEABLE PROPORTIONS.

L ONE TRAGIC EFFECT OF OUR MOST RECENT RECESSION IS THAT IT
HAS SO MAGNIFIED MANY SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC PROBLEMS THAT IT
HAS LEFT MANY PEOPLE BELIEVING THAT THE SITUATION IS HOPELESS.

L WE CAN MAKE THE REFORM OF INCOME SUPPORT MANAGEABLE BY
UNDERTAKING IT IN A CLIMATE OF FULL EMPLOYMENT. L THE JOINT
ECONOMIC COMMITTEE STAFF HAS ESTIMATED THAT EACH ONE PERCENT
REDUCTION IN THE UNEMPLOYMENT RATE WOULD REDUCE WELFARE COSTS
AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL BY \$1.5 TO 2 BILLION. L IT WOULD ALSO
SAVE \$2.5 TO \$3 BILLION IN UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION BENEFITS.

L THIS MEANS THAT MOVING FROM AN AVERAGE UNEMPLOYMENT LEVEL
OF 7.5 PERCENT, THE CURRENT RATE, TO EVEN 4 PERCENT, WOULD
REDUCE THESE EXPENDITURES BY AS MUCH AS \$17 BILLION AT THE
FEDERAL LEVEL ALONE. L ADDITIONAL SUBSTANTIAL SAVINGS, WHICH
ARE DIFFICULT TO ESTIMATE PRECISELY, WOULD BE ACHIEVED AT THE
STATE AND LOCAL LEVEL.

It is no mere coincidence that the number of Americans living in poverty was reduced by 14 million in the 1960's while the unemployment rate dropped from an average of 6.7 percent in 1961 to 3.6 percent in 1968.

In 1974 the number of individuals living in poverty increased by 1.3 million, and when figures are available for 1975, they will show a continued worsening of the situation as unemployment approached 9 percent.

The goals of full employment as expressed in S. 50 would be achieved, first, by better management of fiscal and monetary policy, and then, if necessary through a variety of programs to attack specific stubborn pockets of unemployment.

THESE WOULD INCLUDE A YOUTH TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM,

A REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM, EXPANDED ADULT JOB

TRAINING, AND COUNTER-CYCLICAL GRANTS TO STATE AND LOCAL

GOVERNMENTS *and,* FOR THOSE WHO ARE UNABLE TO FIND EMPLOYMENT

THROUGH ANY OF THESE MEANS, THERE WOULD BE A JOB RESERVOIR,

ADMINISTERED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, WHICH WOULD CREATE

A LIMITED NUMBER OF FEDERAL JOBS.

(Problems)

MOVING TO FULL EMPLOYMENT, HOWEVER, WILL NOT BE ENOUGH.

THE INCOME SUPPORT DISPARITIES BETWEEN CITIES AND RURAL AREAS,

BETWEEN REGIONS, BETWEEN WORKING AND NON-WORKING FAMILIES AND

BETWEEN ONE-PARENT AND TWO-PARENT FAMILIES, WOULD REMAIN.

THE RECENT FISCAL CRISIS OF STATE AND MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS

HAS HIGHLIGHTED THE URGENT NEED FOR GREATER FEDERAL FINANCIAL

SUPPORT OF OUR WELFARE PROGRAMS.

h ONE OF THE MOST CREATIVE AND COMPREHENSIVE PROPOSALS FOR
WELFARE REFORM, DEVELOPED BY A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE JOINT

ECONOMIC COMMITTEE, CALLS FOR FEDERAL ASSUMPTION OF WELFARE
COSTS. h A RECENT LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT FROM A GROUP OF

DISTINGUISHED ECONOMISTS, INCLUDING JAMES TOBIN, HERBERT STEIN,

JOE PECHMAN AND OTHERS, ENDORSES THE PRINCIPLES OF THIS APPROACH.

h WHILE I AM IMPRESSED WITH THIS PROPOSAL AND THE GROWING
AND DIVERSE SOURCES OF SUPPORT FOR IT, I DO HAVE SOME CONCERNS!

h I BELIEVE WE MUST FOCUS VERY CAREFULLY ON THE REDUCTION IN
BENEFITS THAT SOME FAMILIES WOULD BE FORCED TO ENDURE IN SOME

STATES UNDER THIS PROPOSAL. h YET I REALIZE THE DILEMMA AND
SYMPATHIZE WITH THE AUTHORS.

L IF BENEFIT LEVELS WERE ADJUSTED TO SUPPORT INCOME AT THE HIGHEST

LEVEL PREVAILING IN ANY STATE OR MUNICIPALITY, THE INCREASED

COSTS TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WOULD BE ENORMOUS, PARTICULARLY

AT TODAY'S UNEMPLOYMENT LEVEL. As THIS PROPOSAL IS CONSIDERED

IN CONGRESS, I BELIEVE THAT WE MUST DEVELOP, IN CONSULTATION WITH

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, AN EQUITABLE WAY FOR MAINTAINING *current*

INCOME STANDARDS IN ALL STATES AT LEAST DURING A TRANSITIONAL

PERIOD. o

L WE MUST CORRECT THE DISINCENTIVES TO WORK AND TO FAMILY

UNITY WHEREVER THEY EXIST IN PRESENT PROGRAMS / AT THE PRESENT

TIME, MOST PROGRAMS HAVE A TWO-FOR-ONE REDUCTION IN BENEFITS

FOR ANY EARNED INCOME ABOVE A CERTAIN LEVEL.

h WE CAN REDUCE THIS INCOME LOSS BY CUTTING BENEFITS AS LITTLE AS

50 PERCENT FOR ANY WAGES EARNED OVER A CERTAIN AMOUNT; CHANGING

THIS PROVISION IS, I THINK, THE KEY TO INTEGRATING FULL EMPLOYMENT

AND WELFARE REFORM.

⑧ SSI Benefits
Passed through.

L FINALLY, WE CAN AND MUST RESTORE THE DIGNITY OF THOSE, WHO

THROUGH NO FAULT OF THEIR OWN, ARE UNABLE TO SUPPORT THEMSELVES.

h THESE ARE BROAD OUTLINES OF WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO SEE US

ACCOMPLISH AS WE RESTRUCTURE OUR WELFARE SYSTEM. It IS IN THIS

SPIRIT THAT THE DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM RECOMMENDS THAT WE "MOVE TOWARD

REPLACEMENT OF OUR EXISTING INADEQUATE AND WASTEFUL SYSTEM WITH A

SIMPLIFIED SYSTEM OF INCOME MAINTENANCE, SUBSTANTIALLY FINANCED

BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, WHICH INCLUDES A REQUIREMENT THAT THOSE

ABLE TO WORK BE PROVIDED WITH APPROPRIATE AVAILABLE JOBS OR JOB

TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES..."

✓ THERE ARE OTHER PROBLEMS I HAVEN'T DEALT WITH, SUCH AS
INEFFICIENT ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAMS AND THE ABUSES THAT
EXIST. ✓ BUT, I SEE HERE IN THE AUDIENCE TODAY MANY OF YOU WHO
HAVE MORE EXPERTISE TO RECOMMEND HOW WE SHOULD GO ABOUT THIS --
OBVIOUSLY IT DESERVES HIGH PRIORITY.

✓ MANY PEOPLE HAVE EXPRESSED GRAVE DOUBTS ABOUT OUR NATION'S
ABILITY TO FINANCE A BROAD INCOME MAINTENANCE PROGRAM AND
COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH INSURANCE.

Health Insurance!!
Medicaid

✓ IF WE CONTINUE TO PURSUE POLICIES THAT LEAVE US WITH
UNEMPLOYMENT AT 6, 7 OR 8 PERCENT, THESE CRITICS ARE CORRECT.

✓ IF WE CONTINUE TO PLACE THE LEADERSHIP OF OUR NATION IN
THE HANDS OF THE TIRED, TEPID AND TIMID, THE CRITICS ARE RIGHT.

L BUT, IF WE AGGRESSIVELY PURSUE A FULL EMPLOYMENT ECONOMY
AND ELECT A NEW GENERATION OF COMPETENT, COMPASSIONATE AND
ENERGETIC LEADERS, WE CAN AND WE WILL MEET THESE MOST BASIC
NEEDS OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

#####



Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org