

This is like taking a single frame of a moving picture and saying that is the whole picture when in truth it is the sweep and the movement especially over time that makes the difference.

Mr. GOODELL. I could not agree with you more but you must apply that same standard to those who did not have Job Corps experience.

It is a mistake to say that 47 percent of those who had no job when they went into the Job Corps would have remained unemployed without Job Corps experience.

They are becoming older, and a certain number of them might have gotten a job when they got into the older range and you have to compare this again with the general statistics of population moving from that age group.

Mr. HARRIS. If we knew a way to do this, the way to do it would be to have interviewed these Job Corps people before they went into the Job Corps, while they are in the Job Corps and after they have left the Job Corps.

This is rather difficult and very expensive because you would obviously have to interview—I think somebody estimated a million two hundred thousand eligible for the Job Corps potentially and they get, what, all of 75,000. So you would have to interview about 15 times the number who actually went to the Job Corps.

It would be a very difficult task. I don't mean to make it sound impossible but I would say it is very costly to get this on an accurate basis.

Mr. GOODELL. The best evidence we have, and maybe you have evidence to the contrary, is that at any level of skill, education, you will find an increase in the percentage of jobs when you move from the 17- to 18-year-old group, from the 18- to the 19-year-old group, from the 19- to 20-year-old group.

The older they get the larger percentage you have who get jobs.

There may be some year variations in there but that is the trend. What I am saying to you is that if we take 17-year-olds who go into the Job Corps and compare them to 19-year-olds who get out of the Job Corps, you must adjust in here for the number of employed which would have increased because they gained 2 years in age.

Mr. HARRIS. The exciting part of the research we are engaged in is that we will be able to take 17-year-olds and not compare them with 19-year-olds but we will be able to take 17-year-olds who have been dropouts, meaning they left in say 1 or 2 months in the Job Corps, 17-year-olds who were discharged, the kick-outs and 17-year-olds who were in the Job Corps for say 6 months or more.

Mr. GOODELL. This will be valuable.

Mr. HARRIS. We can then compare the 17-year-olds when they get to be 18 and when they get to be 19.

For the Job Corps to really have done an effective job, and what I think the Job Corps should say is they are willing to bet their life on if they have the capability of doing this job, by the time these 17-year-olds who have been in the Job Corps 6 months or more reach the age of 18 or 19, they should be appreciably ahead of those who dropped out and certainly ahead of those who never showed up at all.

It seems to me that is a fairer measure.

Mr. GOODELL. Sure, but it is not a measure of success in comparing