

essentially a residual program, and designed to supplement an income provision system based upon rights.

As further background for this presentation, we are offering for the files of this Committee reprints of two articles that have been published in our Association's magazine *Social Work*, and a paper prepared for our 1967 Delegate Assembly by Dr. Alan D. Wade, who is now Dean of the School of Social Work at the Sacramento, California State College, entitled "Lifting the Poor Out of Poverty".

One of the articles which we are filing "A Way to End the Means Test" by Dr. Edward E. Schwartz, George Herbert Jones professor at the School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago, develops what Dr. Schwartz calls a family security program which utilizes the Federal income tax system to provide a federally guaranteed minimum income which would be set at any one of three levels, varying from a minimum maintenance of \$3,000 a year to a modest, but adequate level of \$5,000 per year.

Another article entitled "Alternatives in Income Maintenance" by Arvin L. Schorr, Editor of our publication *Social Work* and HEW Deputy Assistant Secretary for Individual and Family Services, presents six distinctive approaches to income maintenance identifying their basic assumptions and controlling issues, and rejects or locates each approach within the system that will take shape over time.

We have not attempted to determine the cost of this four-part program we are suggesting, but are certain that during these hearings you have received from various witnesses, particularly the economists, the cost of instituting some kind of income assurance program. Such estimates may well have varied from a low of \$11 billion to a possible high of over \$30 billion. However, we do want to note that if significant and affirmative action is taken with respect to job guarantees, including a minimum wage of no less than \$2.00 an hour, if the social insurance system is extended and improved in its old age, survivors' disability and health phases, and if unemployment compensation is extended and improved, the cost to be carried by income supplementation devices such as the negative income tax or children's allowances and a reorganized public assistance system would be proportionately reduced.

There is an enormous cost to our society of a permanent poverty-stricken segment of our population. The cost is not only the degradation and alienation of millions of citizens and the violence and destruction that inevitably result from hopelessness amidst affluence. It also includes the wasted lives, the loss of productive and contributing tax payers and consumers, the new, yet unborn generations of alienated youth and the possible loss of the most fundamental objectives of our American Society. There are enormous negative social consequences to inaction on the matter of income maintenance. There are equally positive social consequences to action now to give to all Americans the income support and/or opportunity.

We welcome this opportunity to participate in this dialogue on guaranteed annual income and pledge the efforts and resources of our organization in the further extension of public discussion on the need for assuring all Americans a decent level of income.

Representative GRIFFITHS. Thank you. Without objection, we will be glad to receive them.

(The documents referred to are included in vol. II as appendix 18.)

Representative GRIFFITHS. Mr. Tyson?

STATEMENT OF LUTHER TYSON, DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC LIFE, BOARD OF CHRISTIAN SOCIAL CONCERNS, METHODIST CHURCH, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. TYSON. Madam Chairman, members of the subcommittee, my name is Luther Tyson, I am the director of the Department of Economic Life of the Board of Christian Social Concerns of the United Methodist Church. My area of specialization in graduate studies has been the fields of the sociology of religion and social ethics. I am testifying on behalf of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in