

Senator RIBICOFF. The only other comment I have is the question of how effective these programs are. So far, the Congress has no way of checking up. You are the only one that can really evaluate. We don't get the benefit of this.

Mr. SCHULTZE. It obviously takes time to get data and do evaluation. Many of these programs are only from 1 to 3 years old. But we are beginning to get a number of evaluations in.

For example, and this is reflected in the budget, on-the-job training probably pays off more than institutional training, not for everybody but for many. As a consequence, the Manpower Development and Training Act has been shifted around to give more emphasis to on-the-job training.

Second, we have also found that the hard-core unemployed need more than just training. They need a lot of followup. As a consequence, on the basis of that evaluation, which the Department of Labor made, the new adult work-training programs have a large component for very heavy followup of people, dealing both with the employers and with the individual himself.

So, we do these evaluations, and they do shape the nature of our programs. They are not dramatic, but the administration has turned the MDTA program in a different direction; adult job training programs have taken advantage of what we have learned over the last several years. We have, obviously, got a lot more to learn. But we are taking advantage of evaluation and more and more we are trying to build into the program specific requirements for evaluation.

Chairman PROXMIRE. Senator Percy?

Senator PERCY. Mr. Schultze, I would be less than honest if I didn't say I have enjoyed myself tremendously this morning. For 25 years I sat in your seat, defending budgets before boards of directors who would pick out almost any item on that budget and expect me to be an expert on it. So I feel sympathetic with you this morning. Your testimony has been exceedingly helpful.

I wonder if I could go back to a year ago, before we look at this budget. When I heard last year's message in a different position, and I saw a \$1.8 billion deficit, a lot of people were cynical. And it wasn't more than a few days after that that the \$1.8 billion mark was broken and we went over \$2 billion by congressional action on the GI bill for South Vietnamese war veterans. Certainly, the almost unanimous vote of that bill must have been apparent to the administration. But I understand you have to put in what you feel should be the program, not what you feel it might be.

But as these situations developed, and you saw the budget getting in more and more trouble—and there wasn't a day that new evidence wasn't presented that this budget of \$1.8 billion was absolutely impractical—as I see it you had two responsibilities. One, to call for increased revenue as spending went up, or two, to cut back other nonhumanitarian, nonessential spending.

Does the Budget Bureau have an initiative responsibility for pressing on the administration delays in programs or budget cuts as you see a condition unfolding which is unfavorable and unhealthy for the country?

Mr. SCHULTZE. Yes. I would say yes with one modification. I don't think I like the term "pressing on the administration" because some-