

Representative CURTIS. Well, Tobin never talked as much about this. But I think he would agree that he was counting on cutting back on the cost element of the social worker. He may restructure him to do something else. But for me, I identify the social worker as the one engaged in this important task of identifying the need of the individual human being so that we direct attention to eliminating that need, spending money on that. The other is a sort of gross approach, that all people are the same and you do not have to tailor your expenditures to individuals. I think we do have to tailor our expenditures to individuals.

Senator PROXMIRE. One other question which has been brought up in the course of our hearings, and we are anxious to get your view on it. It has been argued that one definite advantage for the guaranteed income is that it or some variation of it would tend to dissuade these tremendous migrations from poor States, or particularly from southern States to northern States, the people coming into the cities. We have a situation in which an AFDC child in Mississippi gets \$9 a month, in New York he gets \$51 a month, in Wisconsin he gets about \$51 a month. These are enormous discrepancies.

In the first place, it is very unfair, very unjust. No matter what assumptions you make on the cost of living in the two places, it obviously is not a fivefold difference. The guaranteed annual income would say that all Americans have something close to a decent minimum. No. 1, and No. 2, it would tend to diminish one of the most unfortunate developments we have of a terrific congestion of people in our big cities.

How about that?

Representative CURTIS. First, I would say that an analysis of the problem lies in the fact that there has been a breakdown of residency requirements in certain of the States, which permits this kind of movement. People will actually look to see where they can get the most welfare, because they can go where they please.

I would put it on a more affirmative basis, the failure of the States to develop reciprocity agreements with each other as to how they handle welfare cases. Much could be done in this area. I have been urging it, and the administration undermines it, in my judgment, and does not encourage the development of these reciprocity agreements.

But this then gets back to the basic point which is made here, as I understand it, and it is always a difficult thing to argue against the imposition of Federal standards. There are certain areas where the standards are so low, that there is no question that you can, for the next 5 years, increase the standards of those areas by Federal standards.

My only point on whether we go to Federal standards is that we think in terms of what do we do to innovate for the future? As Justice Brandeis pointed out, the 48 States are 48 laboratories to test out ideas in the field of political science. I say 100,000 laboratories to test out ideas because there are that many taxing units if we include the school boards, the counties, and the municipalities and so forth.

There is a point at which you can say, "Well, we have tested these ideas out enough and we know what the standards should be and therefore, we can put them into force and on a federalized basis." When we do this, we have to at least understand what we are doing in the field of innovation.

Now, in this area, I think there is enough cause for alarm to say that at least to some degree, there should be some techniques used to