

Any or all of the above measures could and should be accompanied by implementation of the price-wage review procedure—also described above—which would prevent abuse of administered pricing power to pervert rising demand into inflation rather than full employment.

The above suggestions are not offered as definitive proposals. There may be better ways to serve the intended purposes. The measures described above are advanced solely in order to illustrate the point that the present state of economic knowledge makes available a large arsenal of selective weapons which can be aimed with precision at the specific problems the Council envisions and at other problems that may arise as we press on toward full employment.

We call, in short, for a rifle shot rather than a blunderbuss approach to those problems. If the danger is that pursuit of maximum profits will cause excessive business spending, it would be inexcusable, to say the least, to meet that danger by a measure such as the surcharge, which would inflict hardship and unemployment upon the most disadvantaged among us—upon families that are in no way to blame for creating the danger.

Selective measures can be applied equitably to avoid needless hardship and unstabilizing distortions in the economy and to advance us toward our national goals. Gross fiscal and monetary measures are inequitable in their impact, victimize the innocent, do not prevent distortions, and allow for no distinction between high-priority national purposes and matters of lesser importance.

The proposed surcharge is afflicted with all the defects that apply in general to gross measures. In addition, its enactment now would create grave risks. On those grounds we oppose it and urge consideration of standby selective measures.

THE WAR ON POVERTY

The war on poverty is a casualty of failure to keep our national priorities in order. As we in the UAW have emphasized repeatedly, victory in that war requires:

- Jobs for all who can work;
- Decent wages for those at work; and
- Decent incomes for those unable or denied the opportunity to work.

Because we have failed to move with sufficient vigor on all of these three fronts, we are not winning but losing the war on poverty. When poverty is measured in relative terms, as it should be, *there were as of 1966 and probably are now actually more families who should be considered poor than when the Nation first committed itself to make war on poverty.*

On the job front, acceptance of the Council's goal of 3.8 percent unemployment for 1968 would mean to condemn to continued poverty those who are capable of earning their own way but for whom there are no jobs.

Yet there is no lack of work to be done in America. We can provide more jobs than there are able-bodied poor to fill by doing the work that most needs doing in our society—remodeling our cities, building the homes and schools and hospitals and other facilities we so desperately