

Representative CURTIS. First of all, in this area, I do not look at the Government versus the private sector so much in this category. I think I can identify, or try to, what we need to do. First identify the jobs going begging, and secondly, direct your training and retraining programs toward them. Here is where management has to do a lot. They have to restructure a lot of these jobs so that they can find a place for the deaf guy or the blind guy or the guy with a lower IQ, or any other limitation. It requires that.

I am afraid if you go to this other approach of the guaranteed income you create permanent wards. I know who is promoting this other idea, too. They are people, some of them who mean very well, but there are others who are dedicated to getting the Government into this area and make permanent wards of these people.

I think you hit the key when you read that guaranteeing opportunities recognizes that a man grows with responsibility. Now read the second clause, "Guaranteeing income denies his capacity for growth and self-sufficiency" if in this way you are not careful that the guarantee ends when you get over meeting his need.

A guy has a stroke. You meet his need. You guarantee his income while he gets over the stroke, but hope that as you meet the need that you take away that guarantee, because what is in its place is the opportunity. If you go on the assumption that whatever this guy does he is going to get a guaranteed income, I think this hits at the very heart of the motivation factor.

Again, I hope people will reread "Hull House" and the point there, the politician versus the social worker. Of course the politician—this is our business. If we can be administering to these needs of people, we can get votes from them. There is a tendency for us in politics to try to have a permanent clientele.

I remember when I first started out, every Republican and Democratic organization would have a Christmas basket and a Thanksgiving basket. We wanted to be able to minister to people. This is a factor. This is where the danger of Government getting into this game is so acute, and we are now beginning to see it even more.

We saw it brought out in the Green amendment, where the city hall crowd wanted to take over poverty and take it away from the social workers. Milton Friedman's idea that the social worker—and I may be overstating it and oversimplifying, to criticize him—is that the social worker really does not perform a service. I argue that the service they are performing is identifying a need and ministering to that need to eliminate the need so that people can come back off welfare, not be on it as a permanent way of life.

This guaranteed income sort of says, well, needs are not significant, we do not have to spell them out, and we should not be tying the income to getting rid of the need.

Representative RUMSFELD. My time is up. I congratulate you on your excellent presentation.

Representative GRIFFITHS. Thank you very much.

Mr. Curtis, what do you estimate it would cost in schooling to guarantee opportunity?

Representative CURTIS. We could take the money we are spending right now and have money left over. Let me give you a big area that we