

Mr. GRAHAM. No. 1, I would say that this is not either—or, that this kind of grant for the rural area does not remove the need for something in the area that you are talking about in the cities.

Mrs. GREEN. What would you put in the bill so that I could vote for a \$1,500 grant? For one thing, I should think there would be unlimited policing power to see that it was wisely used and the item kept and not later sold for some critical need at any given moment. For example, could the \$1,500 be used to buy a tractor?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, it can. I still am not sure that unless this tractor can be used efficiently and over a long enough period of time to justify this expenditure of money that this is the way to do it. I don't think the grant ought ever to be given to do the thing which is economically unjustifiable any other way. This is a hard thing to define. I am vague on this, I know that I am. But would you loan money to the same person if the money was available and his credit was good?

Mrs. GREEN. I must say it would make some sense to me to increase the social security payments for everybody over 60 than to give a \$1,500 grant to a 60- or 65-year-old person living on a farm to increase his income. I think there would be more justice in it if we could have a social security payment that recognizes the cost-of-living increase from the time when we set the present amount. Then we would have justice across the board for the city dweller and the rural family.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not prepared to argue with the Congresswoman's judgment at this point. I think that is pretty good judgment.

Mrs. GREEN. The gentleman said they would not all come under social security—then I think somehow we ought to find some way of bringing them in.

Mr. QUIE. Farmers are under social security. This provision is if their income is low they have other options to pay into the retirement.

Mr. GRAHAM. The problem is that if the income is low, the option is so hard to pick up.

Mrs. GREEN. Even if it is hard, would it not be a better alternative to devise some way to make it easier than to say we will give a 60- or 65-year-old farmer who is living in poverty a \$1,500 grant to supplement his income? You know the political facts of life. A situation like this would be politically impossible. How could a person go home to his city and say, "I voted for a \$1,500 grant for farmers for which you people are going to pay taxes and we don't pay you anything even though you also have barely enough to buy the necessities of life."

Mr. GRAHAM. You are bringing up some of the questions that were in our mind when we talked this over in executive committee for a couple of hours. There are real questions to be resolved here. We are not sufficiently enthusiastic about this approach to have resolved all the problems yet.

Mr. QUIE. Will the gentlelady yield?

Mrs. GREEN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield. I yield to you farmers.

Mr. QUIE. I want to remind you that your constituents are going to be paying a lot more of that to wealthy farmers under the cotton-wheat bill. I know you did not vote for it.

Mrs. GREEN. The gentleman who is a witness can close his ears, but the gentleman knows my vote on that.

Mr. GRAHAM. So does the witness.