

Representative GRIFFITHS. You surely would be able to lay off some of the clerical workers?

Mr. WYMAN. If you divide the function, as Mr. Hursh has pointed out in his State has been done, between the income-maintenance aspects and the social service aspects—I do not suppose that Mr. Hursh was able to lay off anybody. But he was able to improve the services and the effective use of his staff.

Representative GRIFFITHS. How many could you lay off if we did away with the categorical aid?

Mr. HURSH. How many people would we lay off?

Representative GRIFFITHS. Yes.

Mr. HURSH. I would feel as Mr. Wyman does, that it would not quite work out in such a way that staff would be reduced. One of the things I feel about this pat answer of the guaranteed income is that people are going to have many needs for services that may never come to the attention of the agency until the need has erupted into a situation that is beyond repair. I think you have staff members down about as low as you can get them. With the use of these subprofessionals for all of the eligibility aspects, using only your caseworkers for service aspects, I do not know just what would happen. Because, you see, even if you have the guaranteed income, it will be just like social security in a sense: it is never going to be quite enough to meet everyone's needs. So for every emergency, they are going to have to go to the welfare department for supplementation.

Half of the people we have on old-age assistance are receiving both social security checks and old-age assistance checks. Social security never quite keeps up with the cost of living. I think this is what would happen to the guaranteed income. You would start out with \$3,300, or whatever the prevailing level is for a family of four. In a short time, that is behind the actual costs, the law is not changed and so you would always have people who are going to go to the welfare agency to get the supplementation.

Representative GRIFFITHS. In reality, you are saying to me that even if you had a guaranteed income, a negative income tax, or child allowances or what have you, whatever you do, you would build two duplicate empires. You are going to have the social workers plus the Internal Revenue or whatever else you are going to have working on this problem; you are not going to save anything in the administrative costs.

Mr. HURSH. You already have both setups. If you do it through the income tax device, maybe it takes some more clerks or better machines in the IRS, but this is merely a matter of more people filing a tax return. But in the welfare department we have never been notoriously overstaffed.

As I say, I still think there are going to be many requests for supplementation, as well as for services, that are not going to permit you to reduce, except possibly in the clerical staff.

Representative GRIFFITHS. Mr. Carter?

Mr. CARTER. I just want to say that I do not agree with Mr. Hursh's estimate, although I do think there is some justice in the points he is making. I think the implication of the scope and lack of change could be all wrong. That is for the reason that Mr. Hursh, I think, assumes a static situation. I am assuming that the more income people