

lot of people who are employable. Certainly the high school dropouts who are over 16, 17, and 18, and so forth are. This is the thrust of what we were trying to do in the 1967 social security amendments which were falsely reported. We were not trying to force mothers with small children into the labor market; we were trying to provide opportunities for those who wanted to, when their kids were 8 and 9 years old and not have to wait until the kid was 18, when they would have to go out and learn a skill, but give them a chance earlier to learn a skill. So what did we do? We put more money in there for day care centers, because we found out there were not enough of these so that these mothers could work. This was based on the assumption that that profile you have read is in error, that there are a lot of these mothers who could and would want to work if we provided the proper machinery.

Senator PROXMIRE. It is very difficult, as you know, for a child under 16 to work. We have child labor laws. Most of these children are under 16 years of age. I would agree if a child is 18 years old, you have an entirely different situation. He is virtually an adult as far as work is concerned. But the great bulk of these are children under 16, plus those who fall in the other categories, parents responsible for children, the aged, a very large proportion, and the blind and disabled.

Representative CURTIS. What I am trying to say is that this is a starting-off point. This is an exaggerated figure. I want us to look at it closely. I do not want this to be accepted as if it were true, because I think so much of it is untrue. I think the thrust of my argument is that we should look and find out what this group really is. A lot of our older people are anxious to work, would like to work more, and there is every reason they should work more. Golly, we get it all the time, people wanting to change the social security retirement laws so that they can work more and not lose their social security benefits. I would argue that here is another underutilized economic resource in this whole group you have listed here—older people.

All I am pleading for is to hold hearings on this kind of statement and really find out what is truth and what is exaggeration and then we will begin to identify better where we need to direct our training and retraining and other things that need to be changed in the structure of our society.

Senator PROXMIRE. My time is up.

Representative GRIFFITHS. I might say, Mr. Califano did not count women at all and this is an error that the executive department of this Government has always made.

Mr. Rumsfeld?

Representative RUMSFELD. Mr. Curtis, I, too, want to say that what I have read of this statement indicates that it is a most significant contribution to these hearings.

You began by drawing a distinction between guaranteeing income and guaranteeing opportunity. You have made the statement, "Guaranteeing opportunity recognizes that a man grows with responsibility."

The thrust of your paper, as the thrust of papers taking exactly the opposite position, is directed to the goal of the growth of man as an individual. You draw a sharp distinction as to how best we arrive