

youngsters have to be led by the hand (and these are older youngsters than we are talking about at the elementary and secondary level) will have to be led by the hand in a new world even to apply for a job and for training. If that is true of older youngsters who have graduated from high school or who are of high school age, it is even more, I should think it would be even more true in many cases of younger children.

Our concern is to think through or ask the committee to think through perhaps a little more carefully the question of whether or not this provision will really meet the full purpose of the act which is to reach all of the children who need this kind of help.

Mr. LANDRUM. We are going to give serious consideration and thought to that in the hope that we can devise some means of satisfying your concern; at the same time, I am sure, you can appreciate the position we find ourselves in that we must protect the constitutional provisions under which we have to work.

Monsignor HIGGINS. I certainly do. Anybody who has been at the National Catholic Welfare Conference as long as I have been, some 20 years, is quite conscious of the constitutional problem and all of the emotion that surrounds that issue. But it seems to us that this is not a general education bill. This is a bill designed for a very important purpose and to fill a very urgent need, and that is to help us lift these poor children up and give them an opportunity in the world.

We feel that some consideration should be given to the possibility of enabling them to get the kind of training they need where they are most likely to succeed.

Mr. LANDRUM. Thank you, Monsignor.

Mr. Bell of California.

Mr. BELL. Monsignor, relative to the Federal funds as you spoke on page 5 of your statement, you made very clear your position of Federal aid to parochial schools as well as public schools.

Monsignor HIGGINS. That is at the top of page 5?

Mr. BELL. Yes. If this permits the use of Federal funds in the great charitable and social activities of the church, would you not see some dangers in this?

Monsignor HIGGINS. I wonder if I could draw a parallel from the example raised by Congressman Landrum, Mr. Bell. He asked about the school lunch program. Now, this program was designed to help not only poor children, it extends, as I understand it, to all children in the schools. But in this context I think it takes on even greater importance. I wonder if basic remedial education is not more important for the poor child today than giving him a free lunch, as important as it is that he eat well and keep his health. And if the Congress, in its wisdom, over the years has been able to work out a formula within the Constitution, within the first amendment, which has made it possible for children in parochial schools to share in the school lunch program without, to my knowledge, any great difficulty about it over the years—it is quite extensive now—it seems to us that it would be equally important and in my judgment more important within the purposes and the spirit of this law, to work out some means within the Constitution and within the first amendment to enable the children, the deprived poor children in the types of schools I am referring to, to get the necessary education that they may need to lift themselves