

Putting it again, I don't believe the minimum wage law has ever been considered applicable to the payments for education in training.

Mr. QUIE. Not for education in training but in the Neighborhood Youth Corps the minimum wage does apply whether it is an in-school or out-of-school program.

Secretary WIRTZ. Taking that fact, that is right. I interpose no objection. In fact, to the contrary, as far as on-the-job training is concerned, where it is private employment, I think that is a good thing. My concern is not about picking up the tab. The public is picking up the tab as far as the training, the educational factor, is concerned. I think it should.

I am very much disturbed by the proposal that the public pick up that tab and also an additional 25 percent if I read that proposal correctly. I am not sure that I do.

Mr. QUIE. What is the difference if the Government picks up a portion of the tab of a private profitmaking organization or a private nonprofit.

Secretary WIRTZ. It would make no difference in support of the on-the-job training program. I feel it should be expanded and extended. It is when you go beyond that point that I raise the question.

I do suggest if you go beyond that point then it does present a problem of relationship to the minimum wage law.

Mr. QUIE. Haven't we already gone beyond that point in the Neighborhood Youth Corps in public and private nonprofit employment?

Secretary WIRTZ. Only with respect to payments for an educational or training element. On that it seems to me that we are over on the side where the case becomes clear it is not in the whole educational program.

I think this problem arises only when there are payments to employers for profit which are not identifiable with education or training.

Mr. QUIE. What about the youths I saw in a park in Chicago digging around some trees, raking some leaves and doing other work which I understand they do over and over again? Is all of that training a training component?

Secretary WIRTZ. No; the point is very well taken. In fact it would seem to me that your point requires an amendment of my statement. If we come to a conclusion in which there is a situation, in common terminology, there has to be an employer of last resort, particularly the Government, on a public works program then it seems to me we are in a third area.

In that area it has been recognized that full Government payment is appropriate. I dislike that area as much as I think all the members of the committee do and want to limit it as far as possible.

May I just add this. It has been very carefully provided in every one of those public works laws that money shall not be paid under any circumstances which results in private employment being reduced in what would otherwise be private employment.

Mr. QUIE. Do you feel that a public agency should be the only one that should be an employer of last resort, or do you think that private nonprofit agencies ought to be able to engage in this?

Secretary WIRTZ. I have such a complete lack of satisfaction with any public employment or not-for-profit kind of employment that I have to answer only having identified that position first and having