

entitlements under the law; unfortunately, they have had to force administrators to meet that responsibility.

We did not do it for a variety of reasons. One reason is that many administrators and their staffs have felt that the poor, those who were recipients of service really did not have anything to contribute to the administration of welfare; that they knew what was best for them; and that we would give them what we thought the law said they should have. We have since been forced to change that mentality, happily, and entitlements, I think, are going to be published in the 50 States, or certainly will be if the welfare recipients have anything to do with it.

Representative GRIFFITHS. Frankly, I think if Congress has anything to do with it it will; I do not think that these people should not know what they are entitled to.

Do you think that if there were an income maintenance program, there would be any percentage of the recipients who would require no other services?

Mr. DUMPSON. Madam Chairman, my conviction is that a large number of people who are dependent on public funds for support, given adequate income maintenance, will be as self-directing as those of us who are not dependent. There will still be a number of people, however, who will need services. I think that number of people is not confined to the financially independent group. I think there are a lot of us who are financially more affluent than the financially dependent, who will need social services at one time or another in our experience. So by separating income maintenance of whatever form from social services or social support, we may even reduce the number of people whom we now think need social services of a variety of types. We will identify them, whether they are in the dependent or non-dependent groups. We will also, therefore, provide self-directing opportunities to those who are now financially dependent through an income maintenance scheme.

Representative GRIFFITHS. I am hunting for a way to save money, and you are the first person to suggest that there might be a chance to save some.

Mr. Ryan makes the point that a national system of income maintenance would stop the move to the cities. Do you agree, Mrs. Burns?

Mrs. BURNS. Well, I think it would help, but it is not that I believe so much that people move in order to get higher welfare benefits; we have very little hard evidence one way or the other about that fact. The general impression seems to be that this is not why people move. They have moved in order to get better opportunities somewhere, more jobs. Then they get to the cities or to the metropolitan communities and they find that in a number of cases, the jobs are not there; then they have to seek welfare.

However, I think an adequate universal guarantee would mean that more people would be able to stay in their own communities. They would not be, so to speak, compelled to move out for whatever reason, whether for jobs, or, as some people believe, allegedly for higher relief payments. But I do not think the second is the real reason why people come.

If people were assured of a minimum guarantee in their own communities, they might be more inclined to stay there, and, therefore,