

1969, to 13.32 percent in calendar 1977; that expenditures for the economic opportunity program or its equivalent should rise from 0.23 percent to 0.39 percent of GNP and from \$9.86 on a nationwide per capita basis to \$24.04 (measured in fiscal year 1969 dollars); that outlays for housing and community development should rise from 0.32 percent to 0.64 percent of GNP and from \$13.72 to \$39.34 on a per capita basis; that outlays for education should rise from 0.53 percent to 2.36 percent of GNP, and from \$23.16 to \$143.79 on a per capita basis; that outlays for health services and research should rise from 1.21 percent to 1.43 percent of GNP, and from \$52.51 to \$87.41 on a per capita basis; that outlays for public assistance and labor manpower and other welfare services should rise from 0.69 percent to 1.08 percent of GNP and from \$30.95 to \$66.00 on a per capita basis; and that outlays for agriculture and natural resources should rise from 0.91 percent to 1.11 percent of GNP, and from \$39.91 to \$67.75 on a per capita basis. These goals include Federal contributions of \$1 billion in 1970 and more than \$2 billion in 1977 to the OASDHI to help increase benefit payments to the aged. This tableau provides, if it should be needed, an increase from \$89.5 billion to \$94 billion for national defense, space technology, and all international, but this would involve a decrease from 10.11 percent to 6.73 percent of GNP, and from \$441.18 to \$410.84 on a per capita basis. Yet, in an adequately expanding economy, all Federal budget outlays, while increasing from \$917.01 to \$1,223.77 on a per capita basis, would actually decline from 21.02 percent to 20.06 percent of GNP.¹³

With this feasible degree of dedication to do what we ought to do and cannot afford to do without, we could by 1977 virtually liquidate poverty in the United States;¹⁴ provide a decent home for every American family (which we have promised since 1939); achieve minimum standards of uniform excellence in our public schools throughout the Nation; and bring adequate health services, at costs within their means, to all of our people. The projections for all domestic programs cover also our transportation needs. The projections for agriculture and natural resources contemplate that we reverse the trend—a trend against which I have been protesting for 16 years or longer—toward the impoverishment of our farm population and the abysmal neglect of rural life and living standards, toward malnutrition and hunger among millions of our people despite indescribably abundant agricultural production, and toward the forced movement of millions of farm families toward our great urban areas, where they have contributed, and contributed disproportionately, to unemployment, relief costs, overcrowded housing, urban decay, and urban unrest.

In fact, the failure of the CEA, in its preoccupation with fiscal policy, and erroneous fiscal policy at that, to give adequate attention as mandated by the Employment Act of 1946 to the other great areas of major economic policy, such as farm policy, social security policy, housing policy, and internationally economic policies, has been a signal aspect of the CEA failure to view our economy in a sufficiently broad and long-range perspective, and to develop an integrated policy and program in lieu of a spawning proliferation of policies and programs

¹³ See chart 14, following text.

¹⁴ See again chart 8, following text.