

These, then, are some of the possible approaches to guaranteeing opportunity. Obviously there are many others which time has prevented me from mentioning. One thing is clear, the magnitude of the task is immense and requires a continuing effort by the private sector and understanding by all levels of government so that their programs work in conformity with and not against the operation of the private sector.

Guaranteeing opportunity has many advantages. It is positive and assumes that every individual should, and will if the climate is right, make a contribution of his own. It challenges our ingenuity to find ways and means for maximum utilization of our human resources. It is consistent with our value system and what we think we know about human behavior. It would be supported with a greater public consensus. And it would tend to protect the balanced mechanism of freedom with responsibility, calling for less social control of the individual.

In his 1962 State of the Union message, President Kennedy proposed; that amendments to the public welfare program stress "services instead of support, rehabilitation instead of relief, and training for useful work rather than prolonged dependency."

We are far from the mark. Indeed programs going in the opposite direction have been sold under this fine label.

The guaranteed income, the negative income tax, child allowances, and other well meaning programs would take us further afield. We need to develop our society so we can truthfully guarantee opportunities to all who gain satisfaction from doing a meaningful job well; and in this development we will find that we probably have attained a society where all have ample incomes.

Representative GRIFFITHS. I would like to thank you, Mr. Curtis.

I would like to point out that you are one of the committee members who has continually urged me to hold these hearings. I appreciate your kindness, your assistance, and your help.

Senator PROXMIRE?

Senator PROXMIRE. I want to commend Congressman Curtis, too, on a very impressive statement. I have been trying to go through it. It is a detailed statement, 21½ legal-sized pages; but obviously a great deal of thought—discriminating, intelligent thought—has gone into this. I am very much impressed.

In your statement, you say the problem of America has always been labor shortages. This shortage has been more, not less acute, since World War II.

What do you mean by a labor shortage? You say labor shortage is endemic in our economy. This is shocking to most of us who recall so vividly the 1930's and periods before.

Representative CURTIS. We have had those periods of aberration, but even in the 1930's, we had this underlying shortage of labor. Let me illustrate in a broad way. We supplied that labor shortage historically through immigration. It was not until around 1920 that we suddenly decided to cut off this source. But that is where we were pulling in labor.

The other proof is almost begging the question when I mention it—but on the other hand, let's put it out—is the constant movement toward automation in our society. This indicates labor shortage. Any time industry could figure a way of doing an operation through a machine instead of manpower, it would do it because there was this essential shortage of labor causing prices to go up.

I must interject one other important point. I have always praised Henry Ford, who was an economic pragmatist, not a theorist. Lord Keynes quoted it in theory. Henry Ford said, "I want my people to be able to buy Fords." Lord Keynes was pointing out the importance of purchasing power in a society. The Bible points it out, perhaps, in