

Mr. HAYES. I am not sure I have your question, but, if your question is what is the relevancy of that argument being put in here as an issue, we were trying to suggest that one of the major objections to a guaranteed annual income is based on that premise and that we do not believe that is necessarily so.

In other words, if the work-ethic attitude is going to be the basis for our society arguing this case, then we believe that it ought to be brought to the attention of the public and recognized that this comes out of our culture and that it has to be modified in order to meet the needs that exist.

Representative RUMSFELD. Then would it be fair to say that you were really not quite saying what you meant when you said this was a premise underlying your program; rather you injected this into it in order to overcome an objection to the guaranteed annual income program, not that this solves it but it is a valid objection.

Mr. HAYES. I did not mean a premise that underlies our proposal, but I meant that one of the premises that underlies our proposal here means that it is not necessary for everyone to labor in a sense that a lot of people are taught, but that it will be necessary for us to recognize that there are many ways for people to contribute to society and that those new kinds of labor will be in the development. In that sense, I thought we had no disagreement.

Representative RUMSFELD. Thank you very much.

My time is up.

Representative GRIFFITHS. The point that bothers me very greatly is the assumption that everybody is owed a living. Supposing everybody chooses to collect. What do you do then? Who pays?

Mr. HAYES. Well, the paper presumes that we will be committed to a solution to the problem and that we have the resources with which to solve this problem. Those are big presumptions. Of course, we come here with some convictions out of our own value systems and we just offer them as our opinions.

Representative GRIFFITHS. In my judgment, everybody is owed a job. Society should be so set up that everybody has a chance to work. Once you fail that, then I will agree that the rest of us may owe you a living. But I just cannot buy the idea that you begin with the premise that everybody is owed a living.

Mr. HAYES. I would agree with your statement, too, but I would include that in the idea, the premise that they are owed a living. In other words, they are owed a way to make a living. It may be that they are given an opportunity to work for it. But if they cannot have employment, if no opportunity is available to them to work—I think we make that fairly clear in the paper—then I believe we do owe them a maintenance.

Representative GRIFFITHS. Then I find great difficulty with the suitability of work. I frankly cannot follow this. I think this is one of the largest problems in the whole welfare program and I cannot understand somebody who comes in before this committee and says to me, I am not going to work at that job. Well, my answer is, if you had a chance to work at that job and you did not, as far as I am concerned, you can go hungry. Why not work?

Now, one of the things that has impressed me in the whole welfare program is, for instance, women who do not want to do housework.