

You must remember that this no-show study was done among people whose contact with the Job Corps may have been 12 months or more prior. You would have to compare the group that we surveyed 6 months after their "no-show"—in other words, you have to compare no-shows 6 months later with terminees 6 months later. When you do this, you find that the pay increase was almost half.

Mr. PUCINSKI. For the record, where is this information?

Mr. HARRIS. You can see it on page 56 of study 1706.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Erlenborn?

Mr. ERLNBORN. Well—

Mr. GOODELL. Would the gentleman yield?

I would say to my colleague that the quotation which I have used and Mr. Harris has clarified in his fourth study may refine this somewhat. It is on page 57 of the first study, in which they say that overall there is no reported change in the number currently employed compared with their pre-Job Corps experience, and the number in school has dropped slightly.

In terms of employment or being in school—

Mr. PUCINSKI. What page are you on?

Mr. GOODELL. Page 57. I don't want to take the time of the gentleman from Illinois, but just to clarify that, I think that in the testimony in respect to the second wave study he did, we could find figures on them.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ERLNBORN. The Chairman was giving figures for the Job Corps under the administration bill, I think \$295 million, and an alternative proposal of \$190 million. I think you very wisely did not draw a conclusion from that as to the quality of the effort under the two programs.

As a professional, I think you realize that there are other factors involved rather than just comparing dollars— isn't that right?

Mr. HARRIS. Let me put it this way, Congressman. I would be less than frank if I said I was an authority on congressional appropriations.

Mr. ERLNBORN. There is a tendency for people to equate the value of a program with dollars that are appropriated, and I think you would agree that you can't make those simple conclusions properly.

Mr. HARRIS. Congressman, let me say this. If we haven't seen by now the negative costs to society in terms of burning, destruction, these horrible negative costs that were incurred by lack of action, let's say, or by not doing enough, it seems to me that perhaps society in general ought to spend more in order to try to avoid this.

I think that proposition I can address myself to.

Mr. ERLNBORN. Let me expand on the question by putting some other factors in there.

If the Job Corps was spending \$13,000 per enrollee annually and appropriating \$295 million, or if the Job Corps was spending \$6,500 per enrollee with the same dollar amount appropriated, you could have—

Chairman PERKINS. Let me say to the gentleman that he ought to state his question fairly. The average cost per enrollee is down to \$6,500.

Mr. ERLNBORN. I don't know that that figure is correct, but if it is down to \$5,900, the end product is the same.