

The Full Employment Act of 1946 states, and I am going to skip some parts of it: "The Congress hereby declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

I was wondering why you would not have used that language rather than what you used, or if as you see it there is any basic difference between the two policies?

Secretary WIRTZ. Senator Miller, you refer to that as the "Full Employment Act of 1946."

There is irony in the history which is that there was introduced to the Congress a full employment bill which Congress enacted as the Employment Act—they struck "Full" from the title of the bill and I think the point has relevance only to the psychology which has attended the subsequent development of our thinking in this area.

We have been afraid—too many of us—to say "full employment" and mean it. And so my answer to your question is that I would not be content with the philosophy of the full employment bill.

Senator MILLER. Why would you not seek to have Congress amend that act? It seems to me, as just one member of this committee, that if we are trying to promote maximum employment, we are trying to promote full employment in the best sense of the word.

Secretary WIRTZ. I don't think there is a shortage of legislation on this point. I think the Congress has responded to this problem in the enactment of the Manpower Development and Training Act in 1962 and in its subsequent amendments on four different occasions. Each time we have come up with needed additions developing a program which is still surely not complete. So I think it is a relatively good legislative picture. I think that the largest thing we need to do now is to further develop and integrate the efforts of government and of the private employer in this area.

Senator MILLER. Then would you agree that the Employment Act of 1946 objectives which I have read coupled with the subsequent legislation would indicate that the Congress intended by maximum employment the concept of full employment in the best sense of the word?

Secretary WIRTZ. Yes, I think that is right.

Senator MILLER. In addition to that is this word "purchasing power." Would you not consider that stability of the purchasing power of the dollar is an inherent part of that policy, not only the policy as set forth in the Employment Act of 1946, but the policy that you have stated in your statement?

Secretary WIRTZ. Yes, I would.

Senator MILLER. Then to the extent that you have indicated real wages went down last year, we have fallen short of attaining that purpose and policy, have we not?

Secretary WIRTZ. I think that's right.

Senator MILLER. How many employees—if you have the figures, fine—if you do not, I would like to have you supply them for the record—by year—how many employees are covered by escalation clauses in the United States?

Secretary WIRTZ. We can supply that figure. My offhand estimate would be 3 to 5 million. We will supply the specific figures.