

Mrs. RIVLIN. I would really like to back that to Mr. Levine, because I think he has some strong views on it.

Representative GRIFFITHS. All right, good.

Mr. LEVINE. I am willing to try.

I think the basic answer is that it is very difficult to have the two put together without the feeling, whether justified or not, on the part of the recipient that something is being forced on him as a condition of getting this money. I think social services are, for very many cases, necessary and desirable. I think they are much more effective if they are accepted by the recipient purely voluntarily. Once you connect the two and the person knows that his check is coming in some sense through the social worker, I think both the income maintenance and the social services become less effective. That, I think, is the basic reason, Madam Chairman.

Mr. MORGAN. Well, the social workers themselves are very much opposed to the amount of time and energy they spend on regulatory work, eligibility requirements, paper work and so forth. Many of them were trained to provide counseling and real services to these people. If you go to their meetings, they are quite irritated at the time they have to spend enforcing rules, checking up on people, doing police work. They effectively find it very difficult to conduct the kind of services for which they were trained.

Representative GRIFFITHS. The testimony of the State of New York before this committee was that 95 percent of the time of their 35,000 social workers was spent on trying to decide in which category you fell in whether or not you were eligible for the money, and so on, and about 5 percent on doing any real assistance. In your judgment, if we had a negative income tax, would you be able to get rid of any of the 35,000 people employed in social service work in the State of New York?

Mr. LEVINE. I am willing to try that. I would not use the phrase getting rid of.

Representative GRIFFITHS. Well, that is a jocular phrase. We will be able to employ them elsewhere.

Mr. LEVINE. I want to make the point that there is a great need for people trained this way elsewhere. As we increase our employment program, the community action, education, things like this, we are beginning to feel shortages of trained people on the one side, at the same time as 95 percent of the social workers in New York are engaged in this checking activity. So I think, yes, we would be able to shift these social workers to much more needed jobs and jobs where we need people very badly.

Representative GRIFFITHS. And we would not have to pay them on the welfare rolls; that is, it would not be administration. At the present time, I think it is \$200 million of the money in New York is paid for administration. Surely, you could cut down on some of that administration in welfare.

Mr. LEVINE. Yes, and stop trained social workers from being administrators as such and putting them back into true social work.

Representative GRIFFITHS. From your work in the poverty institute on the design of the project, what do you anticipate to be the difficulties in administering a negative income tax?