

not intensify this terrible problem we are having in the cities at the present time of being the place to which people come, because the idea is somehow or other that this is the place where more jobs are available.

Representative GRIFFITHS. I would think that if this would be one reason for voting for a national income maintenance program, a very good reason. But since I have had experience with this, I have learned that the moment you say that it would stop the immigration to cities, I feel sure that it will actually lose votes for the whole program.

Mrs. BURNS. I would not say it stops it, you see. I say it may hold it down to more manageable proportions.

Representative GRIFFITHS. Because the real truth is that a lot of communities are now solving their problems by making it impossible for people to live in their areas so that they go into the cities and get more money. This unhappily is not looked upon by this Congress as a national problem. So I think we are back about where we were 125 years ago, and we are building up to the same sort of explosion.

Mrs. BURNS. Do you not think, Madam Chairman, it is also partly a question of one's belief about incentives? Some programs will reduce—I stress the word reduce—the flow to the city, not cut it off entirely. I think this is tied up with a question of incentive. I would very much disagree with Mr. Hicks, or at least I would not share his fears so much. I think I have more faith in the American society and its social system than he has. I am inclined to feel that at any level we are talking about in regard to a minimum guarantee, it is low enough to leave a very sizable margin, thanks to our level of productivity, between what you can get on a guarantee and what you can get from participating in production. In other words, we can realistically say to people, if you can participate in production, you can indeed enjoy a higher standard of living.

Second, Mr. Hicks, I have the greatest faith in the American advertising industry, which from this point of view is our major safeguard. It exists to keep people absolutely dissatisfied with what they have and always wanting more. I think we have not reformulated our concerns about incentive and our thinking of it in regard to contemporary American society. I suspect there will be, indeed, a relatively small number of people who will be happy to live on \$2,000 or \$3,000. I am quite sure that number is going to be very small because of these features that I refer to about our economy.

Now, if this is so, then to the extent that the cities can indeed get over the idea that these are places where, if you go there, you can get jobs better yourself, some people are indeed going to move.

Representative GRIFFITHS. My time is up.

Mr. Rumsfeld?

Representative RUMSFELD. Mr. Ryan, I would be curious to know if you have discussed or if you would discuss for us, the problem of the differences in cost of living in various parts of the country. You know well the difficulties we have in the postal system today. The Federal Government pays postal workers the same across the country. They are standing in line for these jobs in areas with a low cost of living, and in areas of high cost of living, the turnover is tremendous and there is a great waste in training. So it is a real problem. Does your program account for that?