

nue system and the entire welfare apparatus to remedy this situation. Amendment of the public assistance laws has already started.

Another cogent argument is that not all of those entitled to public assistance are now receiving it. Certainly here, again, some system could be devised for reaching these people without instituting an entirely new form of assistance. One must consider the probability that those who are too isolated to know about 30-year old public assistance programs would not be aware of their eligibility for guaranteed incomes either.

If it is your intention to look beyond reform of the present system to some new type of program, we urge consideration of the following criteria for a new plan:

1. It should increase work incentives for the low-skilled and the young but avoid lowering work incentives of the present labor force—particularly those just above the poverty level.
2. It should be designed to phase out dependency, as well as poverty, in a manner that will not create, or increase, antagonism against the recipient of aid.
3. It should avoid increases in cost that would add to the “overkill” of existing tax burdens.
4. It should not lead to the disemployment of marginal workers because of increases in labor costs.
5. The needs of different groups of welfare recipients should be recognized and some should not be left worse off than before.
6. The giving of assistance should be related in some way to the cause of poverty, as well as to its fact.
7. The present tax system, with its remarkable record of compliance on a self-assessment basis, should not be interfered with as a means of improving the welfare system, nor should welfare legislation preclude changes in tax legislation.