

it your more comprehensive definition of the poor would include, for example, Wisconsin farmers who are making 80 cents an hour on the average, even though they are the most efficient dairy farmers in the world, and have incomes in many cases, I am sure, in the poverty class, receiving no public assistance. I am not sure whether it is a terrible circumstance they are not receiving it. I think it is a terrible circumstance their prices are so low. But do you feel it would be desirable that all the poor should be receiving welfare aid, necessarily?

Mr. MILLER. I think it is desirable that all the poor be nonpoor. I am more open on which method. I am also hesitant about agricultural policy, wondering what kind of reforms we need there. But I think the question really is to take a national responsibility to see that people have a decent level of living, whether we use the cash program or some other kind of effort to do it. Since we are so reluctant to move, and since I think it would be difficult to move effectively today on the job front, I think we have to move on the cash front.

Mrs. WINSTON. I do not think there is any real difference here. The point I was making is that we have this large number of people who are now eligible under the Social Security Act but who are being denied assistance because of the wide diversity and the many restrictive policies across the country. Then on top of that, we have the other millions who have income available to them which is below the poverty level but who are not yet covered for income supplementation under our existing social security legislation.

Senator PROXMIRE. Mr. Miller, you hit the point that the people are in favor of jobs, and you just said that you think we cannot move on the job front, we will have to move on the cash front. Politically, it is much easier to move on the job front, much easier for any Member of Congress to advocate a job program.

Mr. MILLER. That is just what you have been saying this morning.

Senator PROXMIRE. That is the trouble. Yet the job front from the economic standpoint ought to be a more—because the worker is a producer. He increases supply; he increases income but he is producing something, presumably of some value to somebody. So to the extent you can emphasize the work part of it, it is better economically as well as politically.

Mr. MILLER. I think I agree with you. I think one point has to be stressed, and that is not go away with the feeling that one program can solve all our problems. In Jim Tobin's analysis, he has made it clear that we would not want to encourage some groups to work. That is not a small group. You have to pay some attention to that one group.

I am for a job program. I think it is essential. I do not think it solves all our problems. But I feel somewhat along the same lines you do, that there have been some important shifts in this country beneath the surface in terms of what is politically acceptable. In other words, a full employment program has become more acceptable than ever before. I think there have been other important shifts taking place in this country. No one has mobilized these feelings into a political program of one kind or another. I think there are important things going on beneath the surface that requires pulling people together and making people aware that they believe in what they do believe. I think the country is more prepared to move than the country itself recognizes. I think that is a thing that is happening in the country today.