

prestige, power, and social usefulness. Indeed, access to income may strengthen motivation and liberate creativity."

Despite its rather intensive studies of the issue of guaranteed income, the National Council of Churches does not feel that it possesses either the resources or the competence to undertake to spell out and defend any specific plan for implementing the concept. This is a task for experts in economics and political science. The National Council policy statement does set forth some criteria which it believes should be observed as guidelines in designing any concrete plan for guaranteed income. These are stated as follows:

"(1) It should be available as a matter of right, with need as the sole criterion of eligibility.

(2) It should be adequate to maintain health and human decency.

(3) It should be administered so as to adjust benefits to changes in cost of living.

(4) It should be developed in a manner which will respect the freedom of persons to manage their own lives, increase their power to choose their own careers, and enable them to participate in meeting personal and community needs.

(5) It should be designated to afford incentive to productive activity.

(6) It should be designed in such a way that existing socially desirable programs and values are conserved and enhanced."

In conclusion, the National Council of Churches expresses its intention to press for development and implementation of a feasible program of guaranteed income for the American people, its purpose to encourage and facilitate the widest possible public discussion of the concept of guaranteed income among the constituency of the churches across the nation, and its eagerness to be of any reasonable service to the Committee in furtherance of its assignment and to those who may follow up on its work through implementing legislation.

Representative GRIFFITHS. Thank you very much, Mr. Tyson.

All of this time, we have been worrying about whether or not, if you gave people some money, it would lessen the will to work. I would like now to change the question.

Supposing we did give everybody some money. Now, you can start off by assuming that it is not going to be a really bountiful sum of money. It is going to be as small as we can manage. But we give it to them. What would the effect be, in your judgment, upon our curtailing all other programs that would help those people into a meaningful stream of employment?

That is, we would say, well, you have some money; there is no need for us to do anything for you. Do we not really begin, then, to create a permanent welfare class, without any real concern about it? Or would you think that would be true?

Would you like to answer?

Mr. THEOBALD. This is where I have disagreed very strongly with Professor Friedman. He has seen the guaranteed income-negative income tax as a method of eliminating all kinds of social service. It seems to me that we should only talk about eliminating all other forms of financial payment. It seems to me this is a meaningful goal.

What happens then? Once the guaranteed income is available as a matter of right, one fundamentally reforms the relationship between the social worker and the client. Until the client can react humanly with the social worker and object to bad treatment without fear of losing his welfare rights, there is not much a social worker can do for a client.

Representative GRIFFITHS. Well now, for instance, in Detroit, I believe the auto manufacturers have picked up 17,000 of the hard-core unemployed and they have really worked with them, trying to give them jobs. And these are very good jobs.