

I wonder if it is in order to say to my colleague, if you can give us any comment as of your 1967 report on that particular problem.

Dr. MARLAND. Speaking only for the Council now, instead of as a school superintendent, I would say that the Council has not detected either any major concerns on the affirmative side or the negative side in this relationship. I account for this as being largely one of, again, time. I think that there is wide variation throughout the United States as to the application of the intent of 89-10, not because of any ill will or faulty discussion of the law, but simply because for many communities and in many States, this is such an unusual thing that it has taken time to find out where the doorknobs are.

We have sensed, and through our field studies, both by our consultants and by ourselves, wide variation.

For example, people have pointed to Pittsburgh and said, "You folks are doing quite a lot with this, and we think that is fine," and they refer to X, Y, and Z towns where they are just beginning to visit and get acquainted.

I think this is purely a function of time, Mr. Brademas, and I think that there is high promise in this aspect of Public Law 89-10 for the children of America. Fortunately, many of the poor children live in the same neighborhoods, and attend schools that are nearby, and, therefore, it is quite simple to arrange the outreach from the public school to the parochial school, because those same children in that poor neighborhood are nearby.

Mr. SCHUEYER. If my colleague will yield on that point, I was author of the amendment setting up the National Advisory Council, and it was clear from the committee report, as well as the debates on the House floor, that a major purpose of the Council was to run a continuing scrutiny of the church-state relationship.

As Congressman Brademas mentioned, we wanted to make sure that the disadvantaged children in the private schools got their fair share of help under this program.

We also wanted to make sure that there was no abuse of congressional intent to maintain the majority of the services in the public schools and, hence, provide the shoulder-rubbing between the private school children and the public school children.

Now, I have been tremendously impressed with all of your reports. They have been brilliant and compassionate and full of insight. But there has been very little treatment of this primary subject, which was the original purpose of the National Advisory Council.

I have heard of two major problems from many groups. I have heard from a number of people who were concerned in some parts of the country, particularly in the Middle West, that the private school children are getting far less than their share of the benefits, and there are large numbers of disadvantaged kids in private schools who aren't getting benefited.

If this were true, it would be of concern to this committee.

On the other hand, there have been a few cities, New York and Philadelphia among them, where allegations have been made that the intent of Congress has not been followed, and that services have been performed at the private schools, which was contrary to the intent of Congress.