

Mr. WERTS. In the neighborhood of \$13,000 to make these tests.

Mr. CORNISH. Mr. Secretary, does that include the cost of preparing the booklets, administering the tests, and then evaluating them? Is that the total cost of the personality test?

Mr. WERTS. The figure I used, which is actually \$12,997, has to do with the answer sheets—designers, Government Printing Office charges, 30 State and regional employment service personnel who evaluated the tests, the scoring template, reimbursement to States for overtime work in the scoring of tests, and that sort of thing.

Mr. CORNISH. Would that be available for insertion in the record?

Mr. WERTS. Yes.

The following is a breakdown of costs for the expense of testing nearly 22,000 Project CAUSE I applicants:

|                                                                         |         |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| Answer sheets-----                                                      | \$440   |
| Royalty to designers of California psychological inventory-----         | 750     |
| Government Printing Office-----                                         | 3, 813  |
| 30 State and regional employment service persons who evaluated tests--- | 6, 882  |
| Scoring template-----                                                   | 912     |
| Reimbursement to States for overtime work-----                          | 200     |
| Total-----                                                              | 12, 997 |

The cost of testing came to less than \$1 per applicant.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Reuss?

Mr. REUSS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My concern with this 1964 CAUSE personality test, as I have said before, is not simply because I want to rake up the past, but because if I may say so, Mr. Secretary, the Department of Labor's lack of repentance about it indicates you are going to keep on doing the same old thing. I note in your statement the following sentence.

Our experience with the assessment of trainees during last year's CAUSE program suggests this newly designed examination will prove to be an even more relevant and accurate gage of an individual's suitability for employment that requires constant contact with the disadvantaged.

Well, I agree with the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Macy, who said yesterday that this 1964 CAUSE personality test was not the least bit relevant or accurate, and it should not be used at all. But the Department seems to be saying, even at this late date, that it is relevant and accurate.

I question your ability, very frankly, to come up with a new test or new set of hiring standards that are accurate and fair. And the questions of the Chairman and my colleagues, Mr. Horton and Mr. Rosenthal, indicate that you still are not profiting by your unhappy experience. For example, I notice you described this year's program, and I am going to read what you said there—

Through the use of computerized information, we can compare each candidate with general statements about the entire group as well as with sample groups that have the characteristics in which we are interested. We thus expect, on the basis of our interview-type application, to place our candidates in two groups, first those who have many of the experiences and background characteristics we feel desirable, and secondly, those who have few of these characteristics.

Well, that is precisely the kind of test, from your description of it, which the Civil Service Commission says should be thrown into the ash can. Yet now you propose to do it again. There isn't time this morning to go into this year's test, and I have just been confronted with it, but from your description of it, you are again thumbing your nose at the Civil Service Commission's rules.