

A good deal of our questioning of you has been in terms of cost effectiveness and I think that is the way it should be. We do have to assure responsible spending of public money and I for one feel we must do more in evaluating effectiveness of this program and other programs rather than less.

At the same time, it seems to me it would be unfortunate if we couched all of our judgment in pure cost effectiveness terms, because, especially with respect to the Job Corps as the point has been made repeatedly in these hearings, we are not talking simply about the question of providing vocational training but in most instances of rebuilding almost from the ground up entire human beings.

Do you have any further comment on that?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, Congressman, I feel this very strongly. If I may indulge myself personally for a moment; I was trained as an economist and I did not particularly study political science or sociology. Some people may feel strongly about that, as I have ended up in the field of political science and sociology; but I don't know of any particular way in which one trains himself to become a Member of Congress. There are many areas of our society where I don't think people would look with scorn on occupations where it is really your training as a generalist. That is academically speaking. That is more important than the specific trade that you learn.

I think in the end the degree to which you learn to use your mind, the degree to which you learn to concentrate on a job at hand, the degree to which you have character as a human being and the degree to which you have consideration, a sense of decency and knowing how to get along with people on the job, these things are apart from what I gather sometimes has been made of whether a fellow brushed his teeth, combed his hair, shaved his whiskers, and so on.

These things can be just as vital, a whole gamut of them, as whether he has learned to be a good machine tool operator. I don't say that we, therefore, don't seek—you see the problem you get into, people say therefore, you don't have to train people. Quite clearly you want to train people as best you humanly can. The more skill they have the better off they will be; but to say simply the development of this skill on a one-to-one basis is a measurement of what they are and what they will be for all time is vastly an oversimplification, it seems to me, as to what people are and how they get ahead in the world.

What you are as a person, in the long pull, will make the difference in how well you do in your work and not particularly whether you have been given the enormous advantage of specialized knowledge.

I find that specialized knowledge tends to be dated or even evaporate in time unless you constantly update it by use. You can train someone today in a skill, but unless he has used it 6, 9, 12 months later, and in fact has learned to apply the skill better, that training does not mean a great deal.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Let me touch on one other point, Mr. Chairman, and ask for Mr. Harris' comment and then I will yield.

I was back in my district this weekend where we had some troubles in my hometown in Indiana and some of the troubles involved young people there, just as has been the pattern in other cities in our country. I was very much struck by the profiles that you set forth here of success and failure in the Job Corps, even before I came to page 11 of