

to write, and I did find out, somewhat late, that it would be possible to write an administrator into a program, particularly a planning program under title III, but it was not too easily done under title I.

Mr. QUIE. You run into difficulty under title III that if you used your own money for planning instead of using Federal money for planning then you were cut out this year from the operational part of it. That is a difficulty that some schools ran into which seems as unfair as it could be.

Let me ask a couple of questions here. You mentioned basic adult education and speak of this as an ongoing program. We find out that it is going to cease up there in your area. How do you plan to deal positively for basic adult education program?

Mr. EATON. We have a \$13,650 budget for the 1966-67 school year. I think we originally planned on \$16,000. I think we will wind up with about \$12,000. We can make some cuts, and the cuts will be in the area of guidance service and some ancillary services and we can still keep our program. A cut in the same proportion to Casper just virtually eliminates the program.

Mr. CIARAVINO. The only expense we have on basic education is teachers.

Mr. QUIE. You mentioned a type of Heller plan. I agree with you. I am a strong supporter of this, too. My one question is, this new way of providing aid for the church-related institutions or nonpublic schools in which the aid actually goes to the child and to the teacher like in title I and title II, if you have a Heller plan this means that Federal money would go to the States for them to distribute it as they saw fit. Conceivably, it would be the formula of the State aid to education. There is not one penny of State aid to education that goes to nonpublic schools, not even to the children and teachers of the nonpublic schools. How would you prevent the nonpublic school lobby from killing such a difficulty?

Mr. EATON. I don't know. I don't know how I could prevent it from being killed. I think that I would do so by having the money going to the public school and then go a great deal more of dual enrollment programs. I feel that to have the money go to the private school encourages the proliferation of private schools and drains money off the public school effort. My thinking would be that we explore much more fully this matter of dual enrollment and have the youngsters actually receive their benefits in the public school.

Mr. QUIE. Would it be necessary in the legislation to require that the State permit the children of the private schools to share in the use of this money in the percentage that they are to the total enrollment in the State?

Mr. EATON. I would say not.

Mr. QUIE. In effect, that is what we are doing in title I?

Mr. EATON. Yes. I would say not, because I think that certainly your private school problem is different in different parts of the country. I think here in New England we have not generally realized the extent that parochial education has weakened public education. Again, I know that there are programs outside the area of education where the money has been administered by the States, and not with the amount of unfairness that seems to be anticipated with educational money.