

Data on job openings would also give a better picture of current opportunities in the labor market and where they exist. Even when unemployment is high, many jobs go begging. A survey taken in 1966 by the Manpower Research Council indicated that roughly 4 percent of all jobs in the country were vacant. The 3 million estimated vacant jobs was about the same as the number of people unemployed at that time. In Rochester, New York, the National Industrial Conference Board determined in its study in 1965 that there were actually more vacancies than unemployed persons.

Vacancy statistics could also serve as a leading indicator of the level of general economic activity. It would provide an indication of the ability of the economy to undergo the stress of structural change that might occur, for example, in a rapid defense build-up or in layoffs in employment stemming from shifts in demand or technological developments. They would also be helpful in determining the extent to which demand in the economy could be increased without running into wage and price inflation.

The precise cost of a reasonably satisfactory job vacancy program has been estimated as between \$5 and \$8 million a year. To undertake the collection on a quarterly basis for approximately 80 major labor areas would cost about \$2½ million a year. In terms of the more efficient use that would result from the billions now appropriated for manpower development, the investment would pay handsomely. I hope that all of you here today will lend your support to this important project with the objective of getting the Administration to move forward with the collection of these vital job vacancy statistics.

More information is also required on new skills that are developing in our rapidly changing economy. One of the most important economic questions today is whether automation creates more jobs than it destroys. I think it does. But these jobs are frequently geographically apart from where the jobs destroyed existed. And they are frequently in different skills.

As rapid technological change continues, skills change and become obsolete. No longer can a skill learned in the formative years assure lifetime employment. Training and retraining on or off the job are increasingly part of the work pattern.

The hard realities of training the unemployables are that they will not be capable of learning the higher skills demanded in the jobs newly created by automation. Those with jobs must be trained and willing to do so. They must take the new jobs, thus leaving their old jobs available to those below them in the ladder of skills, if they too will train. The unskilled and semi-skilled with training will fit into the jobs left vacant by those upgrading their skills.

A job destroyed is easier to identify than the new jobs which are created. A job destroyed has nomenclature; it has a human being attached to it. The newly-created job frequently does not have nomenclature and does not have an individual human being attached to it.

There are those who argue that automation destroys more jobs than it creates. I think our disagreement lies in the fact that they use a narrower definition and possibly a more correct one than mine. I use the term in its broadest sense. But whatever the definitional differences, we have got to do a great deal more in developing an early warning system on the new jobs that are being created, apply nomenclature to them, find out where they are located, and train men and women to fill them.

A related problem is the relationship of our military establishment to the civilian sector. I have seen articles over a period of years in Labor Department publications which point out that about 80 percent of the skills needed by the military have their counterparts in the civilian sector.

I have been distressed to find that in the military itself there seems to have been very little development of nomenclature for these skills or coordination between the military and agencies which are in the training field. Yet we are spending over a billion dollars a year, at least, in the military sector training people in skills which exist in the civilian sector.

These observations point up the crucial importance of identifying and applying nomenclature to newly developing skills and occupational categories. The Dictionary of Occupational Titles must be constantly kept up-to-date and, in my opinion, this could best be accomplished by putting it into looseleaf form. In this way, additions to or changes in occupational nomenclature could be periodically added to the Dictionary without waiting years for the publication of a new edition.

The final reason for the need for better economic statistics is the many changes occurring within the economy, such as one shift to services and the decline in