

Mr. HARRIS. Well, it is fairly feasible that you can cut the amount spent and do a better job; yes. I imagine you also reach the point of no return, though, at some point. In other words, that can't go to infinity.

The logical conclusion would be that you spend nothing and do the best job possible, if you go on with that.

Mr. ERLNBORN. I would agree with you on that.

The figure we are talking about is seed money that mobilizes private resources, a total more than the \$295 million. That \$190 million may have a more valuable contribution. Wouldn't you agree?

Mr. HARRIS. Congressman, I have no way of judging it. I have to admit that I am ignorant about the appropriation side of this. I have no idea what the \$295 million really is made up of. I have not seen what the \$190 million proposal consists of.

Mr. ERLNBORN. Let me—

Mr. HARRIS. If I might—I am not ducking at all, but I just feel that it is not in my area of competence to be a judge of, you know, what the budgetary mix should be.

Mr. ERLNBORN. I am not asking you to do that. I am saying you cannot compare \$295 million of a program that is totally funded with \$190 million that is only partially funded with Federal funds and those Federal funds are used as seed money for the private sector.

You cannot make a comparison just by the dollar amount, can you? You have to take into consideration the other factors?

Mr. HARRIS. It seems to me, Congressman, you must look at the substance of any program in terms of not only what it is set up to do, but what it is doing, and determine—I think as a citizen I can say as a taxpayer, I would feel a lot better if there were more evaluations done—not necessarily of the kind we have done—but what happens to Federal programs.

We do a great deal of work in the private sector for many large corporations, and while I know some corporations that perhaps aren't too good at this, they generally do a better job than the Government in evaluating what they are spending, not only their money but the programs they are in.

I would say in general one of the areas of criticism. I would have of the Federal Government is that far too little has been done on finding the impact of what these programs are engaged in.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Daniels.

Mr. DANIELS. Having made four studies over the past 7 months, have you noticed any basic differences between the successes and failures between the women's Job Corps and the men's Job Corps?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, we do analyze women. One of the problems we have, Congressman, with the women is that they tend to get married more than men. That in itself is not perhaps encumbrance in terms of job, but it is the women, not the men, who create the children. As soon as they have the children it tends to put them off the job market.

So, in other words, I am suggesting it is not fair to take just the women's performance in jobs and so on and compare them pro rata across the board with men.

They are also trained as you know for a great many different kinds of occupations and even more than that, as a matter of fact, one of the salutary things that did seem to come out here was that the women