

our local public advisory committee. Every Upward Bound college has a local public advisory committee on which sit representatives of the CAA, usually of the local school districts with which the program is related, and in every case one-third of the membership of that committee are people who are OEO poor.

This committee has related a great many colleges to their own poverty neighbors for the very first time. The poor, I think, have much to say to higher education because higher education—and I want to confess this as a member of it—has historically maintained its reputation by rejecting people, and the poor have much to learn from the college about the long-range value of continued education.

Lastly, frequently Upward Bound is the poverty family's first contact with the war on poverty. They have a teenager; they are intensely interested in his problems and success. When they get him into Upward Bound, the CAA then has this family surfaced and can look at some of its other problems for which they may have and frequently do have a number of resources with which they can respond.

Mr. Chairman, I don't want to take any more of your time in open presentation. We think so far the program has been a success. We will be glad to answer questions about it.

Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. First, let me compliment you on an outstanding presentation. I am personally most deeply impressed with your testimony, especially when you state that three-fourths of the students who come from the 10th grade are disadvantaged because they are "C" students or less.

You did further state that it was crucial that this program be in the Office of Economic Opportunity. My question is: Can you now reach this type of youngster that you have described, 1,400,000 poverty high school students in the United States, of which only about 8 percent go to college, if this program were transferred to the Office of Education?

I would like to hear your views on that. Why will it work better where it presently is rather than in the Office of Education?

Mr. Frost. Mr. Chairman, I believe at this time it is in the right place for the reasons I have stated: that the community action agency has particular and, in our judgment, indispensable resources to bring to the program, and community action is in OEO.

Second, the classic reason of OEO's single-minded concern for the poor. The U.S. Office of Education is a great agency with a variety of mandates, only one of which is to do something about poor youngsters. This program in the agency is exclusively concerned with poor youngsters.

Our own opinion is that when you mix this kind of non-performing, at present poor youngster, with a lot of other programs, he is the one that is going to be forgotten the soonest.

Lastly, because it is in community action the program has had flexibility in financing. I recall that in 1966 the agency estimated the demand at \$20 million. That was the budget, in quotes, that we worked with. It turned out a vast number of applications came in from colleges and Mr. Shriver could flexibly get another \$5 million into it and it became \$25 million.