

Mr. SUITS. That is correct.

Chairman PROXMIRE. Do you want to comment, Mr. Bolton?

Mr. BOLTON. Yes. I just wanted to make sure my previous remarks weren't misunderstood. The taste one shows for a combination of public and private goods depends a lot on whether you are talking about four or five billion dollars or whether you are talking about \$20 billion. I didn't want to imply that I was in favor of spending all of it in either case on public goods. I simply was expressing the idea that the proportions might be increased somewhat in favor of public goods, but I certainly would support lower interest rates to stimulate private investment, private construction, and some tax decreases, if we are talking about a cutback, in order to stimulate private demand. I just want to make that clear.

Chairman PROXMIRE. Mr. Eisenmenger?

Mr. EISENMENGER. I want to make one comment. I would agree with Professor Suits that a reduction in spending for our space effort would make a great deal of sense when you have a national war effort going on, because these two activities do use the same resources. But, and I would also like to emphasize that I am an economist and not a political scientist, it is hard to visualize how you could cut the interstate highway program differentially in your fast-growing areas, say in the Middle West, the Far West, or the Northeast. I imagine it would be difficult to get political acceptance of that idea.

Chairman PROXMIRE. Yes. The roadbuilding program would be hard to cut unless you do it overall, as the President tried to do in December when he announced that he was shrinking the program, and did. There are other programs that aren't individually as big as that program, but are big, that you might conceivably be able to slow down, especially with regard to dam building, Federal buildings, and that kind of thing.

Mr. EISENMENGER. Yes.

Chairman PROXMIRE. I will yield to Mrs. Griffiths in just a minute. I would like to ask, and this is almost on behalf of the ranking Republican member, Mr. Curtis, who has been very diligent in questioning about this, and I think building up a good strong case.

Many of us feel we ought to have job vacancy statistics. The administration has recommended this, but the Congress has failed to provide it. We feel this would be a helpful element in providing for the kind of labor mobility we need. We don't have these job vacancy statistics on a national basis. There are some that we get in the area of, what is it, 15 or 16 labor markets, but we don't have it on a comprehensive basis.

What is the feeling of you gentlemen? Do you feel that this would be helpful in view of the fact that you have spoken at some length on the importance of mobility?

Mr. EISENMENGER. I would rather not talk too much about it, because I could soon run beyond my area of competence. I believe Sweden and the Netherlands do have a system of national registration and companies supply job vacancy data. I have a feeling it would take quite some time just to arrange the governmental machinery for data collection. The difficult question is: Do the benefits exceed the costs? [I just don't have any special competence. I would rather not comment.]

Chairman PROXMIRE. The cost is fairly modest as I recall, \$10 million, and we would get information, accurate information on unem-