

help these children lift themselves up. They need certain remedial services.

Now, under my hypothetical case, these children would have to go, whatever the distance was, to a public school to receive this type of training. That, it seems to me, is an unnecessary restriction within the purposes of the bill.

If we are interested, as I say, in feeding these children, and feeding them in their own school—they don't have to leave the school and go over to the public school to get the free lunch, they eat right where they are—then it seems to me, that in many cases it would be just as feasible and just as necessary to provide whatever special remedial services are needed in the school which they attend, for psychological reasons as well as for purely practical reasons.

Mr. GOODELL. What it comes down to, from our viewpoint, what you are recommending is that we strike out 204(b), is it not?

Monsignor HIGGINS. No; perhaps I have not made my position clear yet, Congressman; 204(b) is fine if the services are going to be limited exclusively to public education agencies. Then surely the least the bill would want to say is that since it is to aid all children, the children of parochial schools, as well as other private schools, should not be excluded by the mere fact they do not go full time to a public school.

What I am suggesting is something additional—the constitutional experts would have to work this out—and that is why I hesitate and refrain from making any specific proposal, but I am suggesting that some thought be given to changing, rather adding, something instead of subtracting so as to make it possible, under whatever conditions seem to be necessary to stay within the strict limits of the Constitution, make it possible for special nonsectarian remedial services aimed at aiding poor children, make it possible for those services to be given in private schools.

Mr. GOODELL. Then the mechanics would be a grant to the organization that is running that school, would it not?

Monsignor HIGGINS. I must say, I would be rather weak on the mechanics because I am not an educational administrator but I would assume that if the mechanics have been working out successfully, as they have in the case of the school lunch program, the mechanical problem is not an insuperable one.

Mr. LANDRUM. Would the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. GOODELL. Yes; I will be delighted to.

Mr. LANDRUM. Back to the earlier colloquy that we had, Monsignor, I believe we stated that the principal concern here is not with the receipt by the institution or the organization of the assistance but the receipt by the child; I think we must not overlook that factor. The concern is with the child and not necessarily with the organization or institution.

Monsignor HIGGINS. I think we would all agree that in a matter as tragically crucial as this is, that any school that would be thinking of aggrandizing itself as a school under a poverty bill would be a pretty poor kind of school. Taking on this kind of extraremedial services, whether in a public school or in a private school, is nothing but a burden, that the school ought gladly to accept.