

census goes out and the forms come in and have to be processed. There are other things, however.

Chairman PROXMIRE. So it has limited value when you have a rapid buildup of the kind we have had, because the situation obviously 2 years ago was completely different than the situation right now.

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is quite right. I would think 1966 or 1967 would be necessary to have in order to estimate the situation at the time of the cease-fire.

Chairman PROXMIRE. I just had one other thought, and that is, this would be most helpful to us, of course, if we could somehow get data that was related to the Vietnam war, because obviously, it doesn't help very much to know, in my view it doesn't help very much to know, simply, that there might be a \$15 or \$20 billion reduction in the level of arms spending.

This is of some use, but unless we can pinpoint the kind of procurement and the kind of impact the Vietnam commitment involves, we are not in a very good position to judge what to do with regard to regions, with regard to industries, or, perhaps we can do quite a bit with regard to manpower, is that correct?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes, sir. I think we are not as well off as we hope to be by midsummer actually, because there is work going forward which I think either Mr. Anthony or Mr. Schultze spoke of yesterday, to bring together the contract on the one hand with the people and the places, and the firms specifically involved on the other hand.

Chairman PROXMIRE. So we know what effect a cease-fire would have in Vietnam. Obviously this has a direct effect on procurement and the question of the personnel involved would be more gradual as you and Senator Stennis have cautioned us, but I would assume that we would have to slow down our procurement, although there would be this period of replenishing inventories.

Nevertheless, it would involve a specific impact, not one that we can generalize on. Research obviously would be affected relatively little, where as the procurement of helicopters would be affected directly and very greatly.

Mr. ALEXANDER. You put your finger on the most difficult part of the problem. To say 10 percent doesn't tell you who is going to get hit by it, and that is what you need to know. We will never know precisely, of course, because of the competitive system of procurement, but we can tell much more approximately, and certain items are procured only from certain sources.

Chairman PROXMIRE. Thank you very much.

Congressman Curtis.

Representative CURTIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you for that fine presentation. Incidentally, just on that replenishment problem, I directed some questions to Senator Stennis. He very rightly said in replenishing pipelines and inventory, there is going to be a mixup of some sort.

Some things you won't want to replenish. This becomes quite important. First you have to try to estimate how much, and if it is billions, and I suspect it is, that would be involved, you also have to determine in what areas. Would it be textiles, drugs, or where would the replenishment come? This is the way you would relate it, as I would view it at any rate, to the impact on the economy.