

Business does engage in the training of workers at present, and for the most part, this is the way our work force has been trained on the job. That is the whole traditional pattern of training in the American economy. I see nothing wrong with this and I think this is fine.

Representative GRIFFITHS. I just feel that the real proof is you and I are both giving support to the idea of the most helpless of all in our economy really being used as a subsidy to management. Now it seems to me that there is something to be said for training additional people and perhaps giving some sort of tax break, because in some areas there is just no point in management hiring those people if they have to pay all those outside taxes on it.

Mr. GOLDFINGER. In the first place, I think that the strongest incentive for business to train unskilled workers is tight labor markets—high and rising demand for labor.

Secondly, we do have in this country, largely as a result of very rapid technological change, particularly in agriculture, a number of people, a half million or it may be a million adults who either are in the labor market or should be in the labor market, who probably cannot compete very well if at all in the private labor market at present.

Now the Government's training programs are getting at this problem. The antipoverty program is getting at this problem. Furthermore, we have supported—strongly supported—the idea of moving ahead in the area of public service employment, of Government employment as a last resort, as proposed in the Nelsen-Scheuer amendment to the poverty program of last year. This would provide some type of regular employment for unskilled people with very low levels of education.

Furthermore, this is not simply a problem of training, and I think here is where we are making the mistake. We are talking about the real hard core group of several hundred thousand people, where the problem is not only that they are unskilled. It is that they have been discriminated against for decades, because they are essentially Negroes.

Representative GRIFFITHS. Ah, and essentially women.

Mr. GOLDFINGER. It's also because they have had very low levels of education and poor opportunities for education.

Representative GRIFFITHS. I would like to ask Dr. Madden what in your judgment would it cost business if they complied with the equal pay for equal work clause?

Mr. MADDEN. I have no notion that they are not complying in particular, nor do I know how much it would cost if they were to comply, assuming they are not complying.

Representative GRIFFITHS. Then I would like to ask Mr. Goldfinger why does the AFL-CIO continue to negotiate contracts identifying one job for women and another for men, and paying the women less?

Mr. GOLDFINGER. To my knowledge, Mrs. Griffiths—

Representative GRIFFITHS. Don't tell me you don't know it

Mr. GOLDFINGER. To my knowledge, Mrs. Griffiths, this does not occur as such. Now you know as well or better than I do that there are jobs which traditionally have been described in terms of job titles as women's jobs, and these are related to lifting weights and so forth. The distinctions in collective bargaining agreements, overwhelmingly to my knowledge, are related to the job and not to the sex of the person performing the job.