

Senator PROXMIRE. So they would not have the kind of cost push.

Mr. TYSON. Their wages have been under greater control there than they have been here.

Senator PROXMIRE. On page 4, you have a very, very incisive indictment of our present welfare system. At the same time, it seems to me that Dr. Thursz' suggestion that we should try to reform it and build on it rather than throw it out and replace it seems very practical to me. Do you think it is hopeful? Do you think we just have to be pretty radical about this?

Mr. TYSON. There are certain aspects of it. If you mean, are we going to get rid of some sort of supportive social service institution, my response to that is no.

Senator PROXMIRE. Should we even want to? Does not the social worker perform a tremendously useful service?

Mr. TYSON. Right.

Senator PROXMIRE. Should we not have more and better trained social workers?

Mr. TYSON. Correct.

Senator PROXMIRE. If we follow a strictly guaranteed income payment or income maintenance payment, are we not likely to lose the value of social workers?

Mr. TYSON. I do not think this will affect the value of the social worker. It will simply give him a new job definition that perhaps he has been seeking instead of budget making.

Senator PROXMIRE. How do you keep him from just being a busy-body? If people get their income, why should somebody stick his nose in telling them what to do with it?

Mr. TYSON. These are supportive mechanisms of counseling which we always need. They may turn into outpatient clinics for mental health. I can see psychiatric social workers doing this particular kind of function, instead of being primarily policemen in a system to be sure only people are on it who need to be on it.

Senator PROXMIRE. If you are a mayor in a city today or on the city council, you have a tough problem of trying to raise enough money to meet your budget and it gets to be one of the toughest problems in the world. If you have an income maintenance system, it seems to me one of the first areas you think of cutting would be your welfare worker. After all, the welfare worker now is necessary in part to justify in part at least holding welfare costs down.

Mr. TYSON. I think you have indicated some pressures that would develop in the welfare system if this occurred, but I think the welfare workers themselves are redefining roles and job definition to take this into account. Certainly we would no longer see the kind of detective work that has been associated with this man in the house business. But you would redefine your functions. They would be supportive functions for supporting the kind of internal organization of family where it on longer would be within the income maintenance brackets. It would be vertically mobile; this would be one of the strong societal inputs into the system, so people would not be locked into a minimum income bracket but move vertically through it. We might see it as one of the primary resources for vertical mobility.