1. It should be available as a matter of right, with need as the sole criterion of eligibility.

2. It should be sufficient to insure that recipients have a decent and dignified living.

3. It should be available to all families including those who are employed but do not receive adequate incomes.

4. It should provide for adjustments for differences and changes in the cost of living.

5. It should provide for freedom of the recipients to manage their own incomes and to participate in meeting their personal and employment needs.

6. It should be developed as part of a broader economic independence program which would also assure—

(*a*) Work for the employable, to the extent possible;

(*b*) The creation of as many jobs as possible by government and private enterprise;

(*c*) Training with marketable skills for all who can be trained and employed;

(*d*) Auxiliary services such as vocational counseling, educational programs for home budget management, et cetera, to assist in the further development of economic independence and individual initiative.

7. It should not discriminate against families because of marital status or size of family.

By way of example, some application of the criteria to some of the proposed methods of guaranteed annual income might be helpful.

One of the most publicized methods is the negative income tax. This would probably fit most of the criteria. No clear indication has been given, however, on how this would fit together with a guaranteed employment plan. This might not be sufficiently intelligible to low economic groups, and might not even reach some persons. It would demand strong supportive services to bring it to many persons who do not now submit an income tax form, and to assist many others in executing a form.

Another plan is that for children's allowances patterned after the Canadian plan. In Canada, these are not intended as to eliminate poverty but to equalize wages according to the size of the family. All families, rich and poor, receive the allowances. In addition, it is a questionable practice to predicate the income of a family on children, making the child the breadwinner, so to speak.

Some have suggested enlarging the public welfare program as the basic plan for guaranteed annual income. We have already spoken of the welfare program—it does not provide sufficient income, it is not sufficiently accepted as a right, does not provide freedom for the recipients to manage their own incomes, and does not enable recipients to manage their own lives.

Perhaps the most serious obstacle to the establishment of a comprehensive income maintenance system lies in the attitude of people. This must be given extensive consideration. Much study, explanation, and discussion will be necessary for a long time to come. We hope that these hearings will be a major contribution to this study and debate. We have the same hope for the President's Commission on Income Maintenance.