saying now for so many years—that we can afford to rescue and restore the public sector, and cannot dare to do less.

CEA position on poverty: talk versus action

The current CEA report sets forth succinctly a quite good outline of approach to the problem of poverty. It sets forth a strategy including sustained high employment and economic growth; education, training, medical assistance, and access to well-paying jobs; some form of income maintenance for those not within the employment stream; and attacks upon poverty pockets in the ghettos and certain rural areas. The CEA further states that "the number of poor in poverty pockets can be reduced by promoting public and private relocation assistance to those with employment opportunities elsewhere" (p. 155).

Elsewhere in the same chapter, the CEA points out that a small redistribution of the benefits of growth would greatly speed reduction of poverty (p. 160); that the tax system itself redistributes income away from the poor (p. 160); that minimum welfare benefits should be established, financed wholly by the Federal Government (p. 167); and that there should be guaranteed work programs (p. 171).

All this sounds fine, but where are the quantified and specific programs needed to carry forward along these lines? How can benefits of growth be redistributed in favor of the poor by the tax policies and interest-rate policies during recent years, advocated or approved by the CEA, which have redistributed income in a very regressive direction? How can guaranteed work, which implies full employment by direct Government action if that is the only way to achieve it, be squared with reluctant insistence that perhaps the current level of employment needs to be increased somewhat to fight inflation?

How can the degree of population relocation which may be required be undertaken, without penetrated quantitative analysis of what kind of relocation should take place, how people are going to get there, and who is going to finance the costs of such relocation, including not only the transportation costs and the housing costs, but also the needed shifts in industry? How can this new awakening to the problem of relocation be squared with farm policies and other policies which, during the past 8 years, have "relocated" millions of farm families to urban areas, where they have contributed so mightily to relief costs, unemployment, urban decay, and urban unrest?

The sad fact of the matter is that CEA has not come to realization that the achievement of social equilibrium through a full-scale war against poverty is not a side issue to be treated superficially in one chapter of a CEA report. It must instead interpenetrate with the whole process of the development of a long-range social and economic budget for the Nation, and the adjustment of *all* basic economic policies thereto, something which the CEA has never attempted.

The inclusion within the current document of the report to the President from the Cabinet Coordinating Committee on Economic Planning for the End of Vietnam Hostilities (pp. 181–220) underscores two shortcomings. The first is failure to recognize that planning must be a continuing process, and that the work and the responsibility of the CEA with respect to so vast an issue cannot be done separately and apart from the work of a Cabinet Coordinating Committee. The