

for guaranteed income, it would effectively remove social workers from a decisionmaking task vis-a-vis the person who is getting a check, because the check would not come through a social work establishment, it would come directly to them in a dignified manner. Our goal is to give self-determination to these people, not social work determination, so that we are not in disagreement on this question. This is one reason why we support a guaranteed income scheme. Our hope would be that then social workers would be able—I think Mr. Theobald put it very well—to be involved in a relationship with a person not as one who is holding a stick or a carrot, but a relationship of confidence, where there would be the ability to come freely to a social worker and say, we do not want to take your advice. From the very beginning of the social work profession, we have said we are not in the business of making decisions for other people. But we have been forced, and perhaps we are guilty, too, as part of this system that developed in the thirties which matched income as well as counseling, we have been forced to take on the role of a parent or an authority which is not the role that the social workers are to play today vis-a-vis people who need income support from society and are entitled to it.

Representative GRIFFITHS. Thank you.

Mr. Rumsfeld?

Representative RUMSFELD. I know Mr. Hazlitt can defend himself much more eloquently than I, and certainly to a great many more people through his writings, but it is my understanding of his response to my question that he did not quite say what Mr. Theobald suggested he said. It is my impression that Mr. Hazlitt indicated that certainly he was not opposed to some changes in the present tax system, but that changes should be made only after careful thought, attention, and analysis as to what would be the effect on the "power," to use your word, Mr. Theobald.

For example, I have supported tax exemptions, and credits, I supported President Kennedy's proposal for a tax credit to encourage the expansion of plant and facility. I have recommended tax credits for pollution equipment to try to bring the private sector into this problem area. I have done this knowing all along that I basically disagree with the concept and do not like this patchwork tax system, but because we were not getting any basic reform, and therefore you have to try to recommend changes so that we can meet the needs of the society today.

As I recall, you favored the tax credit for plant expansion.

Mr. HAZLITT. Yes. Well, first of all, Mr. Congressman, I wanted to thank you for setting the record straight on what I said about the present exemptions and deductions. I did not say that they should be there forever because they were already in there. Congress has the right to reexamine these each year and should reexamine them each year and may make some changes. But I suggest these changes should be based on the merits of each particular exemption.

Now, I favored the tax credit, or at least a more rapid depreciation of plant and machinery. But I also would like to take this opportunity to say that I think that a very promising approach is made in Congressman Curtis' bill, who is a member of your committee, on what he calls the Human Investment Act, which is the granting of a 10-percent tax credit to employers who take part in a training program or retraining program for workers. I think this is—I would not want to endorse