

have the rate of unemployment on a national aggregate level, the more specific efforts we will have to take to place unemployed workers who are in the category of poverty and who are unskilled, untrained, less well educated. More specific efforts will be needed because less of that job will be done by the natural forces of the labor market. That does not mean it cannot be done. I think it can be done, but we will have to make more effort and spend more money to do it if we have 3.5-percent unemployment than if we have three.

Representative GRIFFITHS. Mr. Rumsfeld?

Representative RUMSFELD. As we have proceeded through these hearings, I think everyone has been aware that what we have is not perfect. We are seeking something better. But we are also aware that to those who would change what we have fails the responsibility to substitute something better. I keep coming back to one thing, and I would like to pose it to the three of you. There is no question that there is some appeals to much of what has been said during these hearings, and regarding the concept discussed this morning. It seems to me that we would agree that in all economic levels of our society, there are going to be people who are not usefully employed because of physical health. One of the problems is alcoholism—if an alcoholic is at the lower end of the economic spectrum, he is called a wino; if he is at the top end, say he is a member of the country club, we say it is someone who has not found himself. But the problem is not terribly dissimilar. Also involved are mental retardation, mental illness, personality irregularities. On the one end, such a person is a social misfit, on the other, he is someone who is a bit eccentric. Then there are people in transition plus the very old, and the very young. I think we can set all of these aside and say they have to be provided for and dealt with by our society. These people are not really what we are talking about here, in my view. We are talking, of course, about everyone else who is not usefully employed, gainfully employed.

Now, we have discussed this question of what the changes in our society bring. What does automation do to our society? Does automation provide more jobs; do the technical advancements that are taking place provide more jobs or do they in fact provide fewer jobs and therefore, over a period of time, are we going to be having more troubles? Practically every person that is asked indicates that automation in fact does provide more jobs, contrary to what some have thought over a period of time. There is no question but that it changes the jobs and provides matching difficulties. But if automation does in fact, and what is going on in our society as far as technical advancement do in fact create more jobs, then is the problem in providing income or dollars, or is the basic problem and thrust providing jobs?

Now, I am not going to try to say we should walk down one road, but I am thinking more of focus, and I am particularly addressing this to Mr. Tobin. If jobs plus social services and those things that Mrs. Winston was referring to are the answer, then there is a matching problem—a training problem. It seems to me that is the basic problem and it is a problem of not just of a job, but a job that is purposeful and meaningful, because I think this is very important to an individual's attitude; also, it must be a position or a job that has some potential for advancement.