

which we have given detailed company attention. I have a personal opinion perhaps growing more out of my experience as a member of a school board.

It would lead me not to particular notions with regard to the impact of the existing laws, school-age laws on this problem. It seems to me in general the combination of the environmental factors prior to school and the kinds of techniques that have been developed over the last 50 years in public education are such that the school just does not provide what these youngsters need. It is not just there.

I don't say this necessarily critically about the schools, but by and large, these youngsters have had it as far as school is concerned. This is why when we started out the program not to provide the kids with any more schooling because the kids don't want anything like school.

We learned then that the problem was more complicated. They needed school and they needed what school would provide but you had to provide it in a kind of setting with a kind of technique that was acceptable to these youngsters and that is when we looked around for somebody who had something like this.

That is when we founded the Board for Fundamental Education and thought if what they had done worked reasonably well with adult illiterates and people deficiently educated, particularly people in prison, maybe it would work with kids and they were interested in seeing if it would work with kids.

To go back to your original question, I don't see anything in the requirement that normally kids should stay in school to such and such an age and some of the other requirements that bears on this problem unless perhaps if a way could be found to surround the local school systems with less redtape with regard to what they do and encourage more experimentation with new techniques.

I think this would be very promising. As a member of a school board, I remember the oceans of redtape we had to go through with, I am sure over the years, well-intentioned controls, but many seemed to inhibit the types of experimentation we need for these youngsters.

I should add, I had contact with the most dedicated kind of educators and teachers in our school system, too, and I would not want what I am saying to say these people are all blind to the problem are not trying to do fine things because, of course, many of them are.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Hawkins?

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Robie, I would just like to commend you on your statement. You have a wonderful experiment there. There are several questions I would like to ask you concerning the administrative problems it seems to me may be involved in a substantive approach.

Are you suggesting under this approach that subsidy would equal the difference between the actual worth of the individual and the wages paid?

Mr. ROBIE. This would have to be an approximation. I think we are suggesting it makes economic sense to say that a youngster who conceivably is worth economically perhaps 75 cents an hour or \$1 an hour is difficult for a lot of employers to employ at minimum wage levels without some help, particularly if he has to give some additional training expense to these youngsters.

We don't see any sense at all in trying to repeal the wage laws as a way of getting at those youngsters. Not only does it not make economic sense, but it does not make political sense.