

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Yes, sir. In the meantime, they stay in the hollow, without work, on welfare, with no sense of hope.

Mr. ERLBORN. Supposing there was a proposition not to phase out the Job Corps, but to make it available to more disadvantaged youths under a different type of program that might involve the private sector as well as the public funds, how would you react to that sort of problem?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I think that is one of the most exciting things about the Job Corps.

Our Job Corps in Charleston is run by industry, by Packard Bell of California. Wherever you get industry running a job corps, I think you have a pretty well run job corps. This is exactly what we have now in Charleston. So I thoroughly approve of Government working with industry in this type of program. What we have down there, I think, is a good example of it. Packard-Bell is training girls to do the sort of things that Packard-Bell knows it needs to get done. They can do it better than a Government or a university.

Mr. ERLBORN. I would like to inquire of the witness, I noticed your comment earlier about the mixture of the disadvantaged with the advantaged, either boys or girls, with different problems and different backgrounds.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. ERLBORN. Your reaction was that those who were disadvantaged would sort of close up. You said you should not mix those who have different problems and different backgrounds. Did I understand you correctly?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Yes, sir; that is what I said.

Mr. ERLBORN. I wondered, with this feeling about the Job Corps, how you react to the educational proposals now that you say you can't get a good education unless you put the disadvantaged in with the advantaged.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. This is correct, if you start at an age where it is going to be meaningful. What we are dealing with here is 16-, 17-, 18-, 19-year-old boys and girls who have already missed their education. With them, it is a different matter. That part has already been dropped.

I am 100 percent for school consolidation, where you take a rural child with severe disadvantage and bring him together with a middle-class child with a good deal of sophistication. But I want to see it happen where it should be happening, and that is back from the elementary school life. The problem is that you can really see a physical change in a 16- or 17-year-old boy. When he gets to 18 he can legally drop out of school, he does. He tries to get a job, he can't. He tries to find something to do, he can't. Literally, a physical change will come over him. There is a depression. The clothes he begins to wear may revert suddenly to archaic type coalmining clothes to sort of seek out new identity. The boy feels he is losing grip. Since he is losing grip, he had better not pretend he can do something, because he knows he can't in this process.

It builds on itself. Within 2 or 3 years, you literally have a different physical boy or girl before you. Past 16, if you don't get to them then, it is going to be very, very hard. I have seen this happen in my own community time and time again. I am for the mixing, but it has to take place when it can do some good.