

Senator PROXMIRE. I would put the emphasis on the work. You notice how the people responded in that poll to work. In every category, people are for it. If you could work it out and develop it on that basis, it seems to me it would help.

I would like to ask Mrs. Winston, we now have a powerful tax incentive for people with high incomes, especially men with high incomes, to marry. Obviously, if you do, you tend to cut your income tax sharply. Could the negative income tax, in your view, be used to provide a similar incentive for people with more moderate incomes or with very little income, assuming that this is a happy and appropriate family policy?

Mrs. WINSTON. I think you would have to be sure in the first place that this really is an encouragement to marry, that these are the kinds of things people think of.

Senator PROXMIRE. Let me say it is discouragement for living in sin.

Mrs. WINSTON. It is a help if you legalize it; let's put it that way.

Senator PROXMIRE. That is right.

Mrs. WINSTON. We tend to give too simple answers to what are really very complex situations. I would like, if I might, to take up a little different point here and move to the actual incentive to work and to remain with one's family and to strengthen family life if we did something about the way in which we treat earnings in public assistance. Here we are really outside the tax structure, but we are getting to the same point. Now we say, "All right, we will give you assistance and then we will put a very heavy tax on anything that you earn." If we want to strengthen the institution of marriage, we need to reverse these and put the whole earnings in. Then approach the man or woman, for that matter, who is fully or partly employed, give the benefit of all earnings, and say, "If you cannot make it, we will supplement up to a given level."

Am I making myself clear on this point?

I think we have the whole thing reversed. Generally across the country, we take the position that if you have a full-time job or a relatively full-time job, you are supposed to earn enough to take care of your family. Only in a very few places do we supplement either partial or full-time earnings of people who cannot earn enough to provide a decent life for their families. This would be a real incentive toward some of these social objectives that you are getting at in your questioning.

I think again, to come back to the point that Mr. Miller has been making and that I made earlier about a family policy, that we need to clarify what the social goals are. Then some of these other approaches really begin to fall in place. Promoting the social goals, and the general emphasis here is that family life is a good thing, we had better have more intact families where there is adequate family income.

Senator PROXMIRE. As you pointed out so well, and Mrs. Griffiths did, too, we have had policies that tended to discourage family life of people with low incomes and who are on welfare.

I would like to ask Dr. Miller, you say at one point and call it a terrible circumstance that only one-quarter of the poor are receiving welfare aid in the United States. Mrs. Winston quoted a HEW study of June 1967, saying that 8½ million, or one-half of those eligible, are not receiving public assistance. So there is a difference. I take