

many more children if the opportunity is afforded. The intent of this bill is to mobilize all financial and human resources in eradicating poverty. Surely, then, it should be possible to devise some way of utilizing the facilities and personnel of parochial schools, not for the sake of the school—these programs are actually a burden to the schools—but for the sake of the children.

We note that H.R. 10440 does make a partial attempt to assure the participation of all schoolchildren in whatever special educational programs are provided at elementary and secondary levels. Section 204 states:

No child shall be denied the benefit of such a program because he is not regularly enrolled in the public schools.

The objective of this provision, we commend, for the basic criterion should be need, and this I think is the spirit of the bill, and that need, as already observed, is just as evident among the children in parochial schools as among those in public schools. We question, however, whether this provision, paragraph (b), section 204, will in practice be effective in assuring the special educational opportunities necessary for these disadvantaged children.

As previously indicated, we recognize that H.R. 10440 is only one step in the direction of aiding the poor, but a very important step. It concerns itself about certain segments of the population, segments which need special attention. There are other groups of citizens, however, who demand consideration. The needs of these groups are utilized in a special policy statement approved recently by the Catholic charities directors of the United States, representing all sections of the country. This statement, which pledges support to the Government in fighting poverty, I would like to submit as part of the record of this testimony when it becomes available next week.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF RT. REV. MSGR. RAYMOND J. GALLAGHER, SECRETARY, NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC CHARITIES

The average citizen of the United States may well test his knowledge of the actual dimensions of poverty existing in his nation. It is probably true that each of us has read broad and generalized statements that have conveyed the fact that a large number of people are living below a minimum standard. It remains to be seen whether or not the average citizen has been moved to seek a great deal more factual material, and inspired to relate it to the poor around him. Forty million people, we are told, live below the poverty line. This alarming fact is followed by a long list of statistical citations, all of which underscores the degree of need being experienced by children, youth, the aging, families, and individuals. Indeed, even in their own income maintenance programs, public welfare services have provided for the needy at a less than sufficient material level. The average assistance grant received by those who are dependent upon the Government for their daily bread is well below the same Government's poverty line.

Upon hearing the statistical analysis of poverty, most of us have a practice of relating these facts to Harlem or to Appalachia, but rarely to this city in which we live. It has not as yet become a personal thing with us, the result being that we are not truly involved in enunciating and defending the rights of the poor. These basic rights remain, regardless of the ability of the poor to pass an affluence test which our present-day society has set forth. Their rights remain, whether or not the poor are able to earn the status necessary to defend these rights against their critics. The poor retain an equal right with that of any other citizen to an adequate and regular means of livelihood. They retain their God-given right to the means necessary to make their lives secure, productive, satisfying, and fulfilled. They retain the right to make a contribution to society,