

it flatly without further study—but I think it is something that looks on the surface like a very promising approach and ought to be very seriously examined by the Congress.

Representative RUMSFELD. I cosponsored that with Mr. Curtis and there must be 150 cosponsors in the House and Senate. There have not even been any hearings held on it. There are arguments on both sides. I happen to think it would be a way to get the private sector into the task of undertaking a greater portion of the training of the marginally unemployable. It is not going to solve the problem of the very hard-core unemployed, but it would leave the other Government programs freer to deal with the hardest of the hard core by taking more of the marginal, the ones that it is not currently economically feasible for corporations to train, and making it economically feasible to train them.

Mr. Tyson in his statement, Mr. Hazlitt, lists six guidelines.

Mr. HAZLITT. Yes.

Representative RUMSFELD. He calls them six guidelines. If it were possible to design something that met those guidelines, what would be your position with respect to it?

Mr. HAZLITT. Well, if you just take guideline No. 1: "It should be available as a matter of right, with need as the sole criterion of eligibility"—this seems to me the essence of the whole guaranteed income proposal, and I think this whole business of making an income available as a matter of right, whether somebody is making any effort to work or not, is something that should not be allowed as a criterion in the beginning.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Yes. This is what you get to in your last paragraph, where you say how can Government mitigate the penalties of failure and misfortune without undermining the incentives to effort and success? You are saying you do not wish to underrate the importance of the first, but you feel that the second half deserves much more earnest attention than it has?

Mr. HAZLITT. Yes.

Representative RUMSFELD. Mr. Theobald also said in his answer to Mrs. Griffiths that in this era, not everyone can work. I do not know what "can" means, but I do not think it means able in the sense you were saying. I got the feeling you were thinking in the broader sense. We had already dismissed and agreed on the people who are not able, meaning the ones who are physically handicapped or blind or mentally ill, and so forth.

It seems to me you were getting down to this issue that I think is basic to the question: Do you believe our society is developing in such a way that automation and technological changes are going to create a circumstance where a group of people will not be able to find jobs and that this underlies your feeling that, therefore, this society or any society should of necessity, to avoid having them just exist without any means of support, deal with them?

Now, I do not think Mr. Hazlitt believes that automation or technological changes are going to lead to a circumstance where we are going to, of necessity, have a group of people for whom there are just not jobs. From what I know of his feeling, he believes that automation and technology will lead to more jobs, and that the problem is not in fact providing for people for whom there are no jobs, but finding