

ties of this era, unless we recognize that in this era, not everybody can work, that there must be an income floor, there is no way to bring in a guaranteed income. The guaranteed income is not primarily a fiscal question, it is a question of restructuring power.

Let me, for example, state that I am convinced that we are going to have to move in the not too distant future to seeing a job as a responsibility once somebody says, "I want to do a job," he is going to be required to do it. Strikes, for example, will not be a tolerable form of activity in the sort of world we are moving into. Our society has become so complex that strikes no longer do what they are said to do, which is to affect the relative rights of labor and management; rather they affect the consumer and the public. This world is too complicated to tolerate strikes. In a sense, I am convinced that the society has to say to a worker, if he decides to do a job, that he has to do it; if he decides to leave and not do the job, that is his privilege but he must do the job if he stays.

The guaranteed income implies long-run social change, as well as a short-run tidying up of the welfare system. It is a change in the total social system in which we are going to live.

Representative GRIFFITHS. Thank you. I think that is a very good statement and I hope I live to see the day when we can not have strikes.

Now, let me say I would like to return to your statement that you feel that a guaranteed income will make a more meaningful marriage or that we are moving anyhow toward that. I agree that I think this is very possibly true. I think one of the greatest criticisms of the present welfare system is that it has broken up families, and it certainly has. We are rearing 5 percent of the children in America today on aid to dependent children, largely without fathers. In the very briefly foreseeable future, it is going to be 10 percent of the children.

Now, I would like to turn, Mr. Thursz, to your statement that the first thing you are going to have to consider in a woman's going to work is the welfare of the children. I will agree with you on that. But why do you want to concern yourself with what it does to the employment cycle of the world? Why is this a problem? If you are going to consider whether or not it puts other people out of jobs, then are you not really relegating women here again to a second-class citizenship?

Mr. THURSZ. You are quite correct, Madam Chairman. I would not. I am perfectly willing to make a decision on the basis of the family and the needs of children. I was reacting to the many statements that are made that these women ought to make a contribution to the economy. I was raising certain questions as to, first, the viability of such a plan, whether this really does represent a contribution to the economy; and secondly, I was expressing my own awareness of the limited nature and number of jobs available for women who have to carry on the responsibility of raising families. Again, if I can use Baltimore as an example, we have jobs available in Baltimore for women that tend to be beyond the beltway. The transportation involved requires approximately an hour and a half to two hours to get to these jobs. Most of these women live in the inner city. If we are really to help these women to work while continuing to assume what is their responsibility, the responsibility in most cases of being