

Very frankly, the preference would be for not only the maintenance of weekly take-home pay, but for the increase in take-home pay, an increase in annual earnings. Organized labor generally would be willing on a short-term basis to sacrifice this goal of increased annual earnings, were it possible, through this action, to provide jobs for those currently unemployed.

Senator BUSH. They believe, then, that it would provide more jobs—this 35-hour workweek proposal. Is that right?

Mr. WISHART. This is the reason that proposal has been seriously advanced. And in the New York City area, in a number of construction industries, it has been applied at a level below the 35-hour level, as I am sure you know, Senator.

Senator BUSH. Twenty-five; yes.

Representative WIDNALL. Normally, when you talk about a 35-hour workweek, you are talking about mass employment in an industry. Are there not thousands of jobs, union jobs, that have been lost recently because of pricing out of the market individual home repair work, electrical work, plumbing work, building a gameroom, building an extra room? You have had this tremendous increase of do-it-yourself, because labor has priced itself out of the market with the individual homeowner.

Now, those are all jobs, but they are odd jobs, they are not the type of job people want, because there is not enough employment in them. And it is increasingly difficult to fill such jobs.

Mr. WISHART. I am not familiar enough with that, except from the view of the putative and injured do it yourselfer, to be able to say anything authoritative on this.

I would like, if I may be pardoned, to refer back to one earlier statement in regard to the educational approach on the problem of unemployment.

The Armour Automation Committee did a good deal of work in this general area in seeking jobs for displaced packinghouse workers. We found that there were in certain labor markets a number of unfilled jobs, jobs as computer programmers, jobs as missile designers, jobs as electronic engineers. But we found also that a worker who had had perhaps 4 or 5 years of primary education, and who spent 25 years cutting hides off steers, somehow could not qualify for these openings.

In regard to vocational training, our conclusion was one of some hesitation. Our feeling was that training in very specific skills in this period of automation, with very rapid shifts in skill requirements, was not necessarily the most desirable thing. Our feeling was that the concentration should be on basic education, in reading and writing and arithmetic, to provide workers who are then available for industry to go through the usual procedures of on-the-job training in the specific skills required in a given situation.

Senator BUSH. I would agree that is probably the case.

Senator DOUGLAS (presiding). Any further questions?

We want to thank you gentlemen very much.

(Whereupon, at 12:30 p.m., the committee was recessed, to reconvene at 10 a.m., Wednesday, August 8, 1962.)