

Mr. HICKS. In the House barbershop, for example, I went the other day and asked about getting a shoeshine and was told that they had not had a shoeshine man there for a period of 3 weeks; since the riots, in fact.

There was nothing wrong with shining shoes. I cannot get my shoes shined except in one place on Capitol Hill—one barbershop. All the other barbershops do not have any shoeshine men. Why? Because there is no reason for a person to shine shoes for a living.

I have shined shoes myself in the past. I do not see what is wrong with it, if it is the only thing you can do and it is a service which people need. But somehow, our governmental schemes for solving these problems always end up costing the taxpayers more and producing nothing.

Representative RUMSFELD. Mr. Dumpson, in your statement, you say that something has to be done to break the cycle of dependency and poverty. I think most can agree that that is important. I think we can also agree that the present system is not working very well.

Then you say we cannot achieve this aim with demeaning and inadequate financial grants.

You say that we will never achieve it if the manner of giving, and the nature of what is given, separates one group of children from another.

You also say we will never achieve this aim if the help which is given is seen as a matter of charity. That is a statement which keeps popping up in these hearings. Could you expend on it a bit? You are pretty positive about it, obviously. You use the word "never." I would like to be convinced. I would like to hear what you have to demonstrate that that is an accurate statement.

Mr. DUMPSON. You see, as Commissioner of Welfare, with a staff a large number of whom perceived their function as dispensing charity, I was aware that staff frequently made decisions to give or withhold on the basis of individual personal judgments. Charity became a personal experience; it denied the concept of right; it was demeaning to the recipient. Let me give you an illustration of what I mean.

In New York City, we had no limit on rents, no limit as to what a family would pay for rent. It was a rent allowance as required by the market. We had a number of families who were evicted because of nonpayment of rent, because the rent allowance was inadequate in the grant. When I would go to the staff and remind them that we had no policy that required imposition of a ceiling as long as it was determined to be reasonable by a trained housing consultant the staff member would say to me, Commissioner, I only pay \$85 a month rent and I refuse to authorize a request for \$120 or \$150 a month rent to a "relief family."

That is the personal judgment, the intrusion of an individual's personal value, that comes as part of the "charity concept" of giving to people. If it is a matter of right with an objective criterion, in which personal judgment, personal prejudices, if you will, about what the poor should or should not receive at a given moment, are removed, as in a guaranteed income program, and as in children's allowance scheme where no one can say, "this kind of child, born out of wedlock is somebody that I object to"; or "my personal values are against illegitimacy and I will withhold"—"I do not care what the law says or what the policy says"—it is the personal criterion that I believe is implicit in