

Mr. DUMPSON. If we are doing that as a strategy for interpreting to the American people why this is necessary, I will buy it.

Senator PROXMIRE. I think that is an honest way to do it, because I think that is what this is.

Mr. DUMPSON. I do not use "strategy" there as an invidious thing. But I would like to point out two things: You said you felt that the overemphasis on the employment route as a way of eliminating poverty has not been effective. The opportunity for full employment in the real sense of those terms, I think, is a pipedream.

Second, there are large groups of people, to wit, children, millions of children, for whom a work incentive program as a basis for support is absolutely meaningless. I think the time has come for the American public to face up to its responsibility to children.

Senator PROXMIRE. There is no question in my mind, no question I am sure in the mind of most Members of Congress, that those who cannot work, whether they are children or have some handicap—

Mr. DUMPSON. They are the overwhelming majority, sir.

Senator PROXMIRE. In that case, you can make a very strong case. I do not know of any responsible group that would oppose a program of assistance for people we know cannot work. I think a children's allowance, a program for children, is irresistibly appealing. I wonder if we could use this to slow down the other approach?

Mr. DUMPSON. My own knowledge of the development of programs or categorical programs in the country has been that we have almost gone the demogrant route. We have aided populations of the Nation by aid to physical disability, or what have you. I think I am really saying, or what Dr. Burns is saying, is let us start with that top priority group in our population, namely, children. If you can achieve a universal guaranteed income—maybe I part ways with Dr. Burns here this morning—if we can achieve that tomorrow morning, let us do it. I think we cannot. But until we can, let us go the way that recognizes the rights of children to decency.

Senator PROXMIRE. Mrs. Burns, before you go, did you have something you wanted to say?

Mrs. BURNS. Unfortunately, I have to leave at 11:30. I do not think it would put an obstacle in the way of achieving a more adequate guarantee. For one thing, if you look at what is happening to our social security system, which has now been in force over 30 years, you have to agree that in 1935, it would have been quite impossible for a hearing like this to have taken place in Congress. That responsible people would have been sitting around talking about guaranteeing income to everybody or guaranteeing income to children—it was just incomprehensible and inconceivable. What has happened is that as the social security system has been in force all this time, as we have come to realize more about the magnitude, the nature or the causes of loss of income and the inadequacy of present approaches, more and more we are moving toward some kind of a guaranteed income. It is because we have seen that whereas before 1935, we felt the American enterprise system was going to be destroyed if we gave rights to benefits through the social insurance system, we have lived with it since then. We have discovered it is all right. It works. People get used to the idea and see it is all right.