BOB DOLE
1ST DISTRICT, KANSAS

243 CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
AREA CODE 202
225-2715

COMMITTEES:
AGRICULTURE
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

DISTRICT OFFICE:
101 FEDERAL BUILDING
GREAT BEND, KANSAS 67530
AREA CODE 316
SW 3-5423

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

COUNTIES:

BARTON	HODGEMAN	RAWLINS
CHEYENNE	JEWELL	REPUBLIC
CLARK	KEARNY	ROOKS
CLOUD	KIOWA	RUSH
DECATUR	LANE	RUSSELL
EDWARDS	LINCOLN	SALINE
ELLIS	LOGAN	SCOTT
ELLSWORTH	MEADE	SEWARD
FINNEY	MITCHELL	SHERIDAN
FORD	MORTON	SHERMAN
GOVE	NESS	SMITH
GRAHAM	NORTON	STAFFORD
GRANT	OSBORNE	STANTON
GRAY	OTTAWA	STEVENS
GREELEY	PAWNEE	THOMAS
HAMILTON	PHILLIPS	TREGO
HASKELL	PRATT	WALLACE
		WICHITA

CONGRESSMAN DOLE REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON FOR RELEASE: WEEK OF MAY 29, 1967

THE GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME

More and more is being heard about The Guaranteed Annual Income. It is being touted by certain "economists" as the cure-all for poverty and low income in the United States. Despite the nation's prosperity--or perhaps more accurately because of it--Americans have in recent years become greatly concerned with poverty. Very few would not find themselves in sympathy with the objective of eradicating it.

What Does It Guarantee?

The Guaranteed Annual Income has gained the support of a surprising number of left-wing individuals and organizations--among them the ADA, various leaders of organized labor, and publicly-declared socialists. Generally speaking, the scheme involves establishing a level of family income roughly set at $3000 per year. Every family income below that figure would be classed as poor and would automatically receive a supplement from the government to raise it out of that category.

Advocates say this plan is a necessary consequence of forces at work in our society--elimination of jobs by automation in industry and other factors. They hold that society must adopt the concept that every citizen has the right to an income and it is the duty of the Federal Government to guarantee everyone an income sufficient to live in dignity.

Drawbacks of the Plan

Promoters seem inclined to ignore some of the drawbacks to the plan--which appear to be many. The guaranteed income would not differentiate between its recipients. The subsidy might be inadequate for some and excessive for others. More important is that it would discriminate between those who are unable to support themselves and consequently in need of welfare and those capable of self-support but preferring welfare to earning their own way.

It is my view that to be meaningful, freedom from want must also mean freedom to strive for a better and more fulfilling life. The most damaging effect of the proposal is the eroding effect it would certainly have on our nation's young people--particularly those from poor homes. Individual incentive would be dealt a body blow, and most surely America's decline as a world power will have received a great stimulant if the day arrives that the guaranteed annual income becomes a reality.

In any event it seems certain the tempo for adoption of this or a similar plan will increase as the months roll past, and it may be nearer to becoming a reality than most of us realize at the moment.