stays in, the closer that number will get to 2.8. It is still within the 1.7 to 2.8 range, whatever the Upward Bound experience of keeping the kids in college to graduation.

Mrs. GREEN. You are figuring on $3,300 cost as part of this.

Mr. LEVINE. Actually, we are figuring somewhat more. In order to do this kind of calculation, we figure the cost to the economy and the college as well. The Upward Bound cost is $3,300.

Mrs. GREEN. I was interested in the logic. If I understand it correctly, the benefit-to-cost ratio for youngsters who have never gone to Upward Bound and who go to college will be higher than the benefit-to-cost ratio for Upward Bound students.

Mr. LEVINE. That is right, because they would not include the cost of Upward Bound, so, therefore, would be divided by the lower number. Therefore, the ratio would be higher.

Mrs. GREEN. The cost-benefit ratio is so good for Upward Bound, that when you take any kid who does not get to Upward Bound, the cost-benefit ratio would be very high.

Mr. LEVINE. The point is that the benefit for these kids, these youngsters, they would not have gone to college at all. Therefore, the benefit for——

Mrs. GREEN. How do you know that?

Mr. LEVINE. By the data. I am sorry. Well, 8 percent of the kids in this general income age group go to college. In fact, this 8 percent is primarily the really top achievers among the high school youth; whereas, Upward Bound takes, as Mr. Frost testified, much lower achievers. I won't say none of these kids would have gone to college, but a very small number would have gone to college.

You take a youngster in this program, of the huge preponderance that would not have gone to college and otherwise, the benefit to the economy of his lifetime production, given that he went to Upward Bound, is roughly this much higher than his production would be had he not gone to Upward Bound.

Mrs. GREEN. This would be true among the five other million that do not go to college. I am not quarreling with the objective of the program. I think we ought to identify these poverty kids and I think we ought to make college available to them.

Mr. LEVINE. Mrs. Green, I am not trying to put a benefit-cost analysis as a "snow job," or as being the be-all or "end-all of evaluation." What it is is an indication to us that in fact in economic terms the program is a good investment. This is not the only justification for a program. I don't think I would say this, therefore, proves the case for all time.

Mr. SCHEUER. If there is any burden of guilt there, I ought to bear it because I have been perhaps the one member who has been insistently pressing and urging OEO to develop these cost-benefit figures.

May I ask a question as to why you say the benefit to society is equal as between the low high school achiever whom you are helping with Upward Bound and the normal high school kid that goes to college?

It seems to me if none of them went to college the high school chap would have an earning experience far superior to the low achiever, and you are not lifting them from an equal level to an