

they are not worth \$1.60 an hour economically; but once they have learned these kinds of habits, they could be. This is exactly what the bill provides, that you have the employer pay the \$0.90 or whatever they really are worth, because they are worth something, and that welfare make up the difference. Then, as they continue on that job, the employer picks up more and more of the cost because they surely will become worth \$1.60 eventually.

This only will hit at a portion of the problem but this will help a great deal.

Then I would have to know—and we have not studied it the way I wish we had—more about the profile of these people. Actually, what is the picture here? We do not have that data. We have not done our homework in this area.

I have been trying to get the Labor Department to come up with a profile of the unemployed.

Senator PROXMIRE. Right now I am talking about the employed whose incomes are inadequate.

Representative CURTIS. That is right. We are just recently getting a profile of the unemployed. Now, the underemployed is another highly significant group and we need to know what this profile is. I do not know.

Senator PROXMIRE. I would like to get Monsignor Corcoran and Mr. Hayes into this next point. You say, and I quote in part, guaranteed income has “a serious and disturbing effect” on private philanthropy.

Representative CURTIS. Yes.

Senator PROXMIRE. In other words, on charity.

Mr. Hayes, in his remarks—which the monsignor shares—says, “We favor abolition of the kind of power over other human beings which our present welfare system requires.”

You know our present welfare system is not a private philanthropy, but there is an element there which was brought out very well yesterday, in which Dr. Dumpson said how deeply people resent charity, and properly. They feel it should not be a matter of a person who gives it, whether he is a social worker working for a government or whether it is a private charitable institution, providing his own moral values, his own judgments, this own determination of whether people should have it or not.

Representative CURTIS. To this I would respond by saying let us study what we are talking about. What are the community chest agencies?

The picture that has been painted to smear—and I use the word advisedly—private charities is that of “Lady Bountiful” and charity in all the hardness that you have presented. I would argue, as you look into the community chest agencies in my community, or any, you will not find that kind of picture, and this is very unfair to the social workers and others who are engaged in it. They are probably even more aware of the harshness of that kind of charity.

Senator PROXMIRE. I do not want to be put in the position of criticizing the charitable institutions at all. I think they are marvelous and I am proud of the fact that I play a little part in them.

Representative CURTIS. I want them criticized, but I want them criticized objectively.