

also get structural shifts, because we used different kinds of plants and different skills for the peacetime expenditures than we do for military, of course.

Mr. SCHULTZE. I quite agree. And one part of my paper was attempting to try, and very crudely, I admit, some measure of concentration by area of these.

Representative CURTIS. I am trying to do the breakdown, which I think is even more significant, by skills and for what purpose are they used, and which is for a certain period.

This was the problem after the Korean War to a large degree, the fact that we had to find jobs for a little less than a million people coming back. Certainly if you include the munitions industry, this number was well in the area of a couple of million.

Mr. SCHULTZE. As you indicated, Mr. Curtis—and I fully agree—the correlation between military and civilian skills is probably higher than most people think. And secondly, maintaining an overall level of economic demand is the most important requisite. A large number of problems are taken care of because both the plant and the manpower particularly is flexible.

Representative CURTIS. I read a statement by Secretary Fowler in which he assumed that the revenue, or the revenue estimates of the Treasury Department, would remain at the same level even if there were a deescalation of the war in Vietnam. If this is an accurate statement, he was making no allowance for the problems involved in this structural shift. I am talking about revenues now. And certainly one should allow for some loss of revenue as a result of this shifting. Don't you agree?

Mr. SCHULTZE. I would say very little loss, Mr. Curtis. I think that policies can be pursued which will get the transition done both quickly and without an economic pause.

Representative CURTIS. Let me suggest that if the administration has not done its homework yet in the area of what skills are under pressure, and what plant capacity is under pressure because of Vietnam, they are not going to be in a position of alleviating the problems in the structural shift area. Maybe you will do it geographically. But I am talking about the relation of skills and plant utilization.

Mr. SCHULTZE. As a matter of fact, the Department of Labor does have on the way a look at occupational requirements, occupational skills. That is one thing that Mr. Ackley will look into it.

Representative CURTIS. I see my time is up. I might add at this time that in spite of the testimony produced at our Subcommittee on Statistics last year, in which all witnesses said that we needed the job vacancy statistics and that they were feasible, the representatives of AFL-CIO and the Department of Labor are the ones who wouldn't move forward into developing this. I would regard this as a very essential statistic if we are going to do the job of shifting, whether it is an economy based on war or major shift in the economy itself.

Mr. SCHULTZE. I recall that in the last two budgets before this committee the Labor Department asked funds for this job vacancy survey. After two failures it was not included the third time, but we did ask for it twice.

Representative CURTIS. Yes, but if this administration would be really energetic in trying to get these statistics, and pointed it out to