

In fact, it was only said to be, but it of course turns out not to be temporary.

Let me ask a couple of more questions on this job situation. What was the employment in 1948 in this particular segment of industry you are representing?

Mr. STEWART. I would have to submit that for the record.

Mr. CURTIS. Do you have any figures? The reason I picked 1948 was because in your testimony you referred to the industry 20 years ago, but any figure, for instance 1950, would be adequate.

Mr. STEWART. I can go back to 1959, Mr. Curtis.

Mr. CURTIS. At least give me that. That will give me something.

Mr. STEWART. The electronic components industry, standard industrial classification 367, in the year 1959 had 213,300 employees.

Mr. CURTIS. You just gave us a figure in your other testimony that they are now employing 500,000 in 1968.

Mr. STEWART. I believe that that was a combined total for that industry and consumer electronic products.

Mr. CURTIS. Can you give me the comparable figure which relates to the same industry for 1968?

Mr. STEWART. I can give it to you for April of 1968, Mr. Curtis. That figure is 350,400.

Mr. CURTIS. I am going to quarrel with you a little bit, as I have with other witnesses when you put so much emphasis on loss of jobs. Of course what you are really talking about isn't real jobs where people are or were employed. You are talking about potentials. Here your industry has gone in 1959 from a 213,000 employment figure to 350,000 in 1968, not a loss of jobs at all. That doesn't mean you haven't got problems though.

I have been misquoted so often on the issue of jobs that I am sick of it. I am concerned about jobs, but here we are trying to look at jobs in the context of a very dynamic society.

We have an unemployment rate right now which is well below 4 percent. We have more jobs going begging than there are unemployed. We have a very serious problem of utilizing these unemployed in jobs or hopefully in this economic system which we could do with adequate training and retraining. We just haven't been doing that, but we have, as we always have had in the United States, a shortage of labor. This is one reason these labor-intensive industries become less labor-intensive as we automate by necessity for lack of workers.

Some workers are displaced from a particular job by automation but it doesn't mean that human beings are not being employed. It may mean they are not being employed in your particular industry and that the labor unions that are in that industry are not getting dues, but this doesn't mean these men and women aren't being gainfully employed. If in fact it is a labor-intensive industry the workers are now probably being employed in an industry that is not so labor intensive and therefore their wages are higher.

I just want this issue of jobs in context. If anyone can complain about loss of jobs look at American agriculture where employment now is about 6 percent of our society from a much higher level, and coal, which was three times the employment which it is, and yet our coal industry has in effect driven out the coal industry of Western Europe by its efficiency.