didn't like the way it was developed, but nonetheless it does seem to be a general feeling that strikes which affect the total national interest are beyond the reach of effective law.

Would it come within the compass of your activities to include in your prescription as to what we ought to do with any such ideas?

Dr. HELLER. As you know, Senator, we are primarily charged under the Employment Act of 1946 with problems and policy relating to economic stability, economic growth and price stability. We do not get as directly into problems of the kind you are raising.

We certainly do not have a policy position on the matter you refer to that I could very usefully comment on at the present time.

Senator JAVITS. Would the same be true as to how business ought to finance the worker in respect of the transition to automation?

Dr. HELLER. This gets into the basic question of how best to stimulate investment and modernization and to improve technology in the economy, and it is something on which the Council might naturally be consulted and concerned, although I would not say we have a specific program to lay before you.

Senator JAVITS. You did not hesitate to prescribe what you thought should be guidelines for labor-management wage negotiations.

Dr. HELLER. This is an area so directly related to wage and price levels in the economy, and to the whole question of the possible resumption of the wage-price spiral, that it is directly related to our responsibilities concerning maximum purchasing power which, as you know, we interpret to include concern with the maintenance of reasonable price stability.

Senator JAVITS. Would it be fair to say, therefore, and this is my last question because my time is up, that the policy actions which are specified are by no means an exclusive list as you see the needs of the economy to move it forward and avoid a recession?

Dr. HELLER. That is correct.

Senator JAVITS. Thank you. I thank my colleague.

Senator PROXMIRE. I will ask a few questions and then defer to Congressman Reuss.

I would like to go back to something we Democrats have been neglecting today, the monetary policy, and ask you a further question on it.

Most of our fire has been directed at the Federal Reserve Board. I think Senator Douglas and Congressman Reuss did a marvelous job of laying the groundwork for the question I want to ask. Senator Douglas pointed out that traditionally, monetary policy has been to ease the situation when the expansion slowed down. All the evidence is that we have not done so this time.

Congressman Reuss certainly documented it well. I am referring to a New York Times article on last Sunday which is headlined "Kennedy Revises His Fiscal Goals," and frankly, this is one of the most alarming articles I have read as a Democrat and one who is deeply interested in economic policy. It reads in part:

The interest of the Kennedy administration in a steady or even higher interest structure both short- and long-term was attested last week by the outcome of an $8,800 million financing operation, most of which was intended to refund maturing debt and the rest to raise about a billion dollars in new money. All of the money could have been raised readily at short term at a cost of 3½ percent. Still, the Treasury saw fit to borrow $1,695 million of the total on bonds due in