formal report on it. And, so, I do not have it clearly enough in mind to know how broadly it raises a question to which we have given a good deal of attention; namely, the application, or the use of minimum wage rates in the training programs.

Representative CURTIS. It is hitting along that line. Let us leave the record open for your response.

(The information furnished for the record follows:)

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF LABOR WIRTZ IN REPLY TO QUESTIONS BY REPRESENTATIVE CURTIS

First, I will respond with regard to the tax credit for the expenses of employee training programs which would be provided under the Human Investment Act bills (H.R. 4574, 4578). Last year, at the request of Senator Percy, I submitted material for inclusion in the record of the hearings of this committee on this subject. (February 2, 1967, part 2 of the hearing record, p. 307). I indicated there that the Department of Labor was actively pursuing the subject independently and with representatives of the Treasury Department, but that all plans which had been considered had such serious defects that they could not be supported. Shortly thereafter in the Manpower Report of the President dated April, 1967, the President directed creation of a Task Force on Occupational Training with members drawn from business, labor, agriculture, and the general public. This Task Force now is engaged in a survey of training programs operated by private industry and will make recommendations as to how the Federal Government should promote and assist private training programs. The possible use of tax credits as one method of promotion and assistance is being considered by that Task Force. My own final conclusions on this subject will not be made before receipt of the Task Force report.

Second, with regard to the direct wage subsidy plan contained in H.R. 13777, the Employment Incentive Act bill, introduced last October. In principle this is the same as the direct wage subsidy proposal on which I testified last June in the hearings before the House Education and Labor Committee on the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967. (June 22, 1967, part 2 of the hearing record, pp. 1203–1208 and 1214–1215) A direct wage subsidy is not, in my opinion, the answer to our present problem. The views expressed there remain my views, and are reinforced by the strong support and response which private industry is giving to the Job Opportunities in the Business Sector (JOBS) Program announced by the President in his January 23, 1968 message to Congress, "To Earn a Living: the Right of Every American." This program will devote $350 million to a new partnership between government and private industry to train and hire the hard core unemployed.

Representative CURTIS. In essence, it recognizes that certain people, at some stage of their development, probably are not economically worth the full minimum wage. Therefore, the employer pays that which they are worth, and you make up the difference in minimum wage through, frankly, Government subsidy. But then it phases out.

This would be a comment on my part, rather than a question. During the development of the social security bill last year, I was very concerned that we gear this in with the minimum wage laws and other laws, like child labor and so on. The Health, Education, and Welfare Department officials, including Mr. Cohen, were the witnesses. I kept asking to have the Department of Labor people come in, because I thought you were most familiar with it. Mr. Cohen reported to us that he had had discussions with someone in the Department of Labor and reported back that they felt, as we did amend it in certain ways, that it was properly geared in.

For the record, later, would you comment on how well you think we did or did not do a job in the social security legislation?

Am I coming clear to you with what I am asking?