

Representative WIDNALL. The question was raised in my mind by Professor Hansen, I believe, who was testifying before us last week. He said that in Great Britain a 2-percent unemployment figure would be the same as a 3- to 4-percent figure here in the United States. This certainly is at variance with what you have just said.

Mr. REUTHER. But in this chart, the adjustment that he was referring to is already reflected.

Representative WIDNALL. Now, you had another chart which referred to the imbalance between the rise in wage and fringe benefits as against price increases and other increases within the economy. Do you have any figures for the years 1955 to 1960? It is my recollection that at that time the wage and fringe benefits were increasing by a greater percentage than the other components.

Do you have any figures on that?

Mr. REUTHER. I don't have them at hand, but this chart was chosen for this period, the second quarter of 1960 to the second quarter of 1966 because we thought we were starting at a point that was comparable to the point where we were ending up, from the peak of one cycle to the peak of another cycle. We think, therefore, that this is a valid comparison of the movement of the compensation of these groups.

Representative WIDNALL. Could you furnish for the record the prior 5 years?

Mr. REUTHER. Yes; we would be happy to provide the committee with any specific information that we may not have with us today.

(Information requested by Representative Widnall and later supplied by Mr. Reuther, appears below:)

In the course of my testimony, Congressman Widnall asked for data comparing changes in various forms of income from 1955 to 1960. The figures are presented below for whatever they may be worth; however, I do not believe they are worth very much. The period is a wholly inappropriate one for comparison because 1955 was a year of extraordinarily high profits and the second half of 1960 was a period of recession. Total corporate profits before taxes in 1955 had jumped 26.9 percent over the preceding year to a new all-time record and were 14.0 percent higher than the up-to-then record level of 1950 when profits were ballooned by the speculative, inflationary boom arising out of the Korean War. In consequence, use of 1955 as a base period for comparison of the movement of profits with that of wages obviously distorts the results—especially when the other end of the comparison is a year that was half recession. It would therefore be misleading to present the figures requested without first putting them into perspective. They follow:

	Percent change
Total employee compensation-----	31.0
Corporate profits before taxes-----	2.3
Corporate profits after taxes-----	1.1
Dividends -----	27.6
Interest -----	64.8

Representative WIDNALL. How would you evaluate the contribution of public training programs toward reducing unemployment?

Mr. REUTHER. I am very much in support of public training programs that are directed toward improving skills and upgrading workers, so that they cannot only qualify for a higher paying job, but can make a greater economic contribution to the overall community.

I do believe, however, that training programs in themselves will not create more employment. It will only determine who is unemployed and who is employed.