

in a public school. The very circumstances in which many of these people live would, in many cases, make that almost an impossible provision to apply.

Mr. LANDRUM. I interpret your remarks to mean that you are not concerned here with the law providing any particular assistance to an organization of a religious nature or to an institution of a religious nature, but you are concerned about the section as directed at the child?

Monsignor HIGGINS. At the child. We have no interest in getting additional funds which would accrue to the benefit of sectarian education or anything of that sort, but our concern, as I have tried to indicate in my entire testimony, is with helping to carry out the provisions or the spirit of the bill; which is, to help any child, or any adult for that matter, who is in need of the kind of special educational training or other training that is offered or provided for in this bill. And there are many, in our judgment, who cannot be reached in practice unless, in some way, this training provision is provided under proper safeguards in the schools which they actually attend. That would be true; for example, in many of the areas where the Spanish-speaking children go to school, most of whom, or many of whom, are very poor and are in need of special training. It would be true of many Negro children in Catholic schools in some of the large cities, both in the North and in the South. It would be true of the migrants.

Our concern is only with finding whatever way is feasible under law to help those children pull themselves up; which is, of course, the aim of the bill for all children who need this kind of help.

Mr. LANDRUM. You do not mean to convey the impression that your organization; for example, or any parochial institution, or religious organization, seeks to have written in here provisions that would allow that institution or that organization to receive funds—public funds. What you are driving at is that you want the child to have the benefit of it.

Monsignor HIGGINS. Yes. But our difficulty with the bill, as it is now written, Congressman, is that while there is the provision which I have alluded to in section (b) which elaborates upon section (a), which says that nothing shall preclude the participation of children even though they are not enrolled in public schools full time, our difficulty is that we do not see how, in practice, that is going to accomplish the purpose of the bill. In other words, if you have very deprived and very poor children in a neighborhood in which they normally would tend to go to a parochial school and you want to help them with remedial reading types of programs (which are already being offered in many Catholic schools), it seems to us that at least it is worthy of consideration by the committee to find some way in which that type of remedial reading—which would have nothing to do with sectarian education but would be within the spirit of this bill, the purposes of this bill—might be provided in the school which they attend. We fear that, otherwise, section (b) in many cases will simply not work; they will not go to the public school. They normally will get this kind of education in the institution to which they are accustomed to go. For the very reason that the Governor stated so forcefully earlier in trying to explain why some