

other similar programs. We are undertaking to develop in the coming year (fiscal year 1968) an ongoing evaluation system, including cost-effectiveness analysis, of all the programs of the Bureau of Work programs.

Mr. SCHEUER. Of course, the second great advantage is that perhaps a year or 2 years hence we will look at the whole smorgasbord of programs and begin zeroing in on the programs which show a terrific return and drop some of the programs that have been marginal.

I think that is something the Members of Congress, from all points of view, would like to do. We need hard data in order to do that.

Secretary WIRTZ. I referred earlier in general terms, because the announcement does not come until Monday, to a series of 10 contracts that we are making with private organizations to do some of this training. We are starting right from the start on that, on a complete evaluation of the effects of these 10 different programs and we set them up on the basis of a different mix of various components largely so that we can find out what makes sense and what does not.

Mr. SCHEUER. That will be valuable to us a year hence.

Mr. GOODELL. Unfortunately, unless we in the Congress agree to do this, so long as the Secretary feels as he does at present, we won't be able to evaluate the idea of subsidizing wages in private employment with this kind of assessment very effectively.

The figure of \$9,000 I must say in all respects I regard as a scare figure in terms of the cost of this type of approach. But even if it turns out to be that, your second point was that, if you were sure it would pay off, you would say it was worth even that price.

When we tried to devise the language in our Industry Youth Corps proposal to accomplish it—

Secretary WIRTZ (interrupting). On an experimental basis?

Mr. GOODELL. Well, as far as we are concerned, when we talk about setting it up with 85,000 or so participants, it is not exactly an experimental program but posed in terms of a total need of a million drop-outs a year, it is a small group.

Perhaps we should start at a slower pace than that. But your existing programs for on-the-job training are now paying this kind of cost for the most difficult hard-core person. You would continue under our proposal exactly the same standards that you apply now in those areas. You just have the additional incentive of paying a quarter of the wage to the employer.

You say it would dilute the minimum wage. I don't think it serves much purpose for us to quarrel about whether it dilutes it or not. It certainly does not dilute it from the point of the individual who receives the wages.

In a sense, the Industry Youth Corps proposal is designed to help ease the transition to employment to the degree that the minimum wage makes it more difficult to get youngsters started in productive employment. We build a bridge for the transition here. They receive the minimum wage and I believe they should.

I believe the principle could well be extended beyond that. I did not mean by saying we did not want to belabor it to preclude your making any response, if you have one.