

marriage to that woman with eight children more attractive to him. In some of these plans, you are going to have to make it better to be married than it is not to be married if you are going to have children raised in a legal family.

Mrs. WINSTON. Yes, up to a point.

Representative GRIFFITHS. I have been sitting waiting now for 2 weeks for somebody to tell me that if any of these plans went into effect, we were going to get rid of some other laws or some other costs or something. I would really like to settle the point.

One person has suggested that we repeal the minimum wage. Under your plan, Mr. Tobin, do you think it would be possible that you do away with workmen's compensation, unemployment compensation, social security and old age assistance, or any other thing under your plan? If your plan went into effect, would it be possible to get rid of any of these plans?

Mr. TOBIN. The ones you mention you would not want to get rid of, and I do not think you could get rid of—workmen's compensation, unemployment compensation, old age and survivors insurance. These are examples of plans which are designed to give income payments to people not just on the basis of need but largely on the basis of previous employment and previous contributions. Eligibility has been earned by the individual by previous work or by contributions to the system. You know, social security is not a welfare program, it is a national insurance system, including a national retirement system. We certainly could not get rid of that, because it serves a very important function, different from public assistance. We could, with a sufficiently generous negative income tax plan, supplant public assistance.

Representative GRIFFITHS. I agree with you that social security should be a pension system, at least. But I get voted down all the time. Everybody else is trying to make it into a welfare system.

Mr. TOBIN. I think we should move in the direction of making social security more a purely contributory, actuarially computed retirement system, putting income assistance based on need into other programs, such as the one I am suggesting. It would take a long time to do that kind of disentangling, but I think if you adopted that as the spirit you wanted in social security, we could move in that direction.

Representative GRIFFITHS. I could not agree with you more. It is being paid for by the great industrial States but being made into a welfare system for the poorer States.

Mr. TOBIN. But we do not want to move in that direction without doing something which takes the place of the welfare which is now being given under the aegis of social security. So I would not throw it out without something to put in its place in that respect.

Representative GRIFFITHS. My time is up.

Senator Proxmire?

Senator PROXMIRE. Dr. Miller, you say in your prepared statement that the programs needed to produce a full employment program for the poor require the kinds of efforts on a national scale which are not politically or economically acceptable today. Then you go on to describe what you mean, and you say a very low general unemployment rate, a considerable subsidy to business, and the expansion of public employment in order to guarantee employment.