What they gave you today was an attempt, I think, to show you what the situation is as of now. I hope and believe that there is no attempt to withhold information about how it was in December 1966 or how it was in 1965. There were a lot of things, for example, in 1965 that were wrong.

As we said, they were wrong. We changed them and they are no longer there now, but we don't normally, so to speak, give you that information. I think what they were trying to do was give you up-to-date information. There was one study made, this Caine report that Congressman Steiger asked for a few minutes ago, which according to Dr. Levine, whose business this is—I am not certain about this, but he told me that he thought it was the most—say it, will you?

Mr. LEVINE. I think it is far away the best course of any study made of any training program yet. Not just ours, any training program.

Mr. GOODELL. Are we going to have copies of that now?

Mr. LEVINE. I gave one to Mr. Steiger this morning. I can supply a couple more now and enough for the whole committee pretty soon. It shows essentially that the Job Corps on a benefit-cost basis is just very highly successful.

Summarizing all the data it shows this.

Mr. GOODELL. I am interested in that because on page 74—this is the one you are referring to I guess, benefit-cost ratio—on page 74 of your presentation you say that for every dollar spent in the Job Corps there is a $1.37 return.

Mr. LEVINE. That is the study.

Mr. GOODELL. I have here your war on poverty news summary, Office of Economic Opportunity, for June 12, 1967. It has a little paragraph which indicates that for every dollar invested it is $1.18. So we hear $1.37 in your presentation and see $1.18 in your publication.

Mr. LEVINE. I can explain that fairly easily, I think, Congressman. There is a range I think from $1.05 to $1.69 if I remember, depending on assumptions. We think that $1.18 based on all the factors when we put this out, that that looked like sort of the best likelihood, the best number; $1.37 was just splitting the difference.

In fact, if I might just continue on this line, this figure, whether it is $1.18 or $1.37 just depends on assumptions. This is a very conservative figure. It is conservative in the sense it bases these benefits entirely on the educational gains, shown by the Job Corps data, the kids they get in camps, and this is not to contradict what Mr. Kelly said that is not just education. It is just that the educational gains are the most measurable and there is a lot more data on the future earnings stemming from educational gains.

Mr. GOODELL. You use the word assumptions.

Mr. LEVINE. If we add to the educational gains other things which we didn't put in because it was conservative in this original calculation that came out, this $1.18–$1.37 range, if we add to these the things we just simply didn't count because they were tougher to measure, the vocational training gains, the gains in reducing crime rates, and so forth, we think that the true benefit-cost ratio of all the benefits of the country from the Job Corps is something like 2 to 1, which means that the benefits now from each dollar spent are worth about twice the dollar itself.