

age children in these families, and also on the family stability and various other questions. We are going into fair detail, but I think the most important is the work habits.

Representative GRIFFITHS. Was it not discovered in the poverty programs that the first thing the poor wanted was a divorce?

Mr. LEVINE. That was in the legal services program. As a matter of fact, I believe it was in the Wisconsin legal service program, that they found the poor had in fact potential family instability built up without the money to get the divorce and in fact, once these services were made available, a good many of them did go to divorce.

Representative GRIFFITHS. I had a woman write me something about this and she had really quite a novel idea. She thought that the money should be sent in part to the wife and in part to the husband. You know, I thought it made some sense.

Mr. LEVINE. As a matter of fact, there are some arrangements in the experiment for how payments are made to families that have split up. Maybe Mr. Lampman can describe them. I do not remember.

Representative GRIFFITHS. Please do, Mr. Lampman.

Mr. LEVINE. Maybe we had better submit them for the record.

Mr. LAMPMAN. I would prefer to answer them later.

(The following was later submitted by Mr. Levine:)

1. So long as the family head and spouse are living together they must report their joint income monthly. Benefit payments are by check requiring joint endorsement.

2. Any family member, including either spouse who leaves the household and ceases to qualify as head, spouse of head, or dependent of the original unit causes the income guarantee to the remaining unit to be reduced by a scheduled amount (which varies according to status in family and guarantee level provided to the particular experimental unit).

3. Such a departing member(s) carries with him(her) (them) an income guarantee identical in size with the amount of reduction of the guarantee of the original unit. The tax rate of the original unit is applied to the income of the person(s) who left it, and to the total income of any persons who combine with him(her) (them) in forming a new unit.

Representative GRIFFITHS. All right, please answer them for the record. But why do you not consider, at least for some of the experiment, paying both the wife and the husband?

Mr. LAMPMAN. We initially proposed that we would write this as a joint check, as income taxes are filed jointly, and we would be proposing to require joint returns by all family units. So following that notion, the checks would have to be signed by both the husband and the wife in order to be cashed. You are suggesting that one constituent proposes that they be written 50-50, more or less, and sent to whatever addresses are named?

Representative GRIFFITHS. Yes. I did not think too much of them until I had three cases in 6 weeks of men who started drawing pensions and left for foreign countries. We are now supporting the wives on welfare, and of course, due to the fact that we are paying the pensions, I really do not understand why we do not do something about that. I have had the ambassadors of the foreign countries call in the men and we cannot get them to pay. And they are not reachable by process of law. It works out great.

Did you have some questions you wanted to ask, Mr. Laird?

We are delighted to have Mr. Laird present this morning. The first thing he wants to say is we should not call it a negative income tax.