

Senator PROXMIRE. They would not.

Mr. ROLPH. I think if you went through the whole program and asked, "Is this program justified on the basis of income distribution?"

Representative GRIFFITHS. Why would not veterans' benefits be cut back?

Mr. ROLPH. It would be a question of how you are going to coordinate it.

Senator PROXMIRE. I do not want to be in the position of being one of those who has to lead the fight for cutting veterans' benefits, under any circumstances.

Representative GRIFFITHS. It would be simply incidental. You would be taxing back more of the money, would you not? You would not have a problem with that, would you?

Senator PROXMIRE. Maybe not, but I think the veterans might consider that the benefits they are getting are something they have earned by service in the Armed Forces and are for something they have been deprived of, and something they should get under any circumstances.

Mr. ROLPH. If you want to buy this type of plan, you can always put on a supplementary credit to any class you want to define—veterans, people who are blind, disabled, whatever.

Mr. WATTS. There is another candidate that you did not mention for possible reduction. This is in the area of housing. It seems to me that if people are provided incomes with which they can reasonably afford quality housing, and if we realistically face what the cost of quality housing is, I have a fair amount of confidence in the private sector's ability to meet the demand for this housing.

Senator PROXMIRE. There is no question in terms of the future thrust of our housing. But our housing in the past has been so limited in this area. Two and a half years ago, we passed a rent supplement program. As of the end of last year, 400 families in the whole United States had used rent supplements.

These things are so slow that as of the budget before us now, the savings here would not be very great. Prospectively, it might be very helpful, because I think we are moving into an antipoverty area and into a more constructive housing area than we have in the past.

I think you might make some case for Mr. Rolph's position in 1975, but not in 1968.

Let me ask Mr. Watts—I think none of you gentlemen put as much emphasis as I would like to see, and as I think most Members of Congress and the public would like to see, on jobs.

There is no reason why there should be a conflict between these two things. In fact, if the Federal Government acted as residual employer, or employer of last resort, you would solve a lot of the problem. What is left would be politically practical and possible and capable of being handled. Very few able-bodied people do not want to work, in my view.

Give them the proper amount of training, maybe a little motivation, and so on, and I have not, in my experience, found anybody who really did not want to work. I think if people could rely more on jobs, the Government doing all it can to find and create jobs, this might help you get what your objective is much more effectively and at a far lower cost.

Mr. WATTS. Let me say that I also feel there is no necessary conflict between those two. I think in terms of many points of view, simply