along the line outlined above." Then you gradually move into your somewhat higher schedule, which is still quite modest.

You start out with a schedule that would permit $400 per year per person. Last year, the average level of assistance was $850 for an adult, so you are less than half of that. That is really modest. The District of Columbia, for instance, was substantially higher. So if you put this into effect, this L schedule that you propose, it would not be an answer to the problem of the person with a low income? You would still have to have a welfare program?

Mr. TOBIN. You would still have to have a welfare program for many people.

Senator PROXMIRE. For almost everybody. You cannot live on $400 a year.

Mr. TOBIN. But this would help a lot of people who have earnings of their own and this would supplement them.

But I certainly do not favor that schedule except as just a door opener, to get a program established and then get the levels brought up to at least poverty line standards. That is what I would want. That is what I would really recommend.

Senator PROXMIRE. I am very happy that you limit your negative income tax to a work supplement. I think it is absolutely essential. The Gallup poll indicated how dramatically important that is when it reported that everybody in every income category, even the very low, is against the guaranteed income tax, or a negative income tax. I am sure they do not all understand it. But they are overwhelmingly in favor of an opportunity for people to work. I think if you explained this to all the people in the country, they would recognize that what this is, fundamentally is, is an opportunity for a modest income to those who cannot work or are not eligible, because of, you know, for some reason for employment, but that you put very heavy emphasis, especially in your presentation here this morning, on training people and getting them motivated and so forth so they will want work. You put emphasis here on your 40-percent tax rate so they would have a real incentive to get a job, which they do not have now if they are on welfare. So this is really a work incentive kind of proposal rather than a simple payment for people to do nothing.

Mr. TOBIN. That is absolutely right.

Senator PROXMIRE. For that reason, I think you need a new name. I think the reason the rent subsidy has suffered so badly for so long, although it is an excellent program, is because we have the wrong name for it. People all over the country are saying "you are subsidizing people's rents; I do not have much of an income and you do not subsidize my rent." If you could modify this or change it. It has a nice, pure, clean arithmetic appeal—I can understand how 1,200 economists are for it, but it would be hard to find 1,200 other people for it. You emphasize that it is a kind of study scholarship program, some catchy word that emphasizes the constructive and creative force that you have behind this. I do not say this in a trivial or facetious way. I mean it very seriously. These programs depend greatly on the label that is attached to them.

Mr. TOBIN. I am very much aware of that problem and am open to suggestion. The best we have been able to think of is something like incentive income supplements, something like that.