

and universities, although States could very well have undertaken such programs, could they not?

Mr. HITT. That is correct.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I am against the waste and duplication of unnecessary effort, which I guess is like being against sin. But I am very much concerned, as Dr. Miller phrased it, that we get the job done.

I am sure you have a lot of oil in Texas and you could raise a few taxes on that oil to do some of these jobs. But I am not unaware of the political difficulties in State legislatures. We could even lower the depletion allowance on oil right here in the Congress, but I am not going to hold my breath until that is done.

Let me ask a question, Sister, of you, and also of Dr. Miller. What about the relationship between public school systems and private, in particular church related, organizations in title III programs?

Have you any comment on that?

Sister FARRELL. I would say that ESEA certainly has worked out as it was intended to, that we have participated, and I think that in the overall picture of the projects, of course, they have not been awarded unless there has been some indication of this participation.

I might inject here that I think we should define our terms. I think State planning is consistent with the law as it is now in California.

Because of the State plan it has not seeped down to the area we are, but we are currently working on a project. I would say it looks very good.

I would caution this, however, that I think that even this morning's discussion being subject that we bypass the real spirit and intent of this law, which was to the child. Sometimes we get bogged down in all of this of who is doing what.

But what is happening to the child? We are trying to do something for the American child. We are trying to set up a service. I hope we will never lose this vision. I suspect, too, with the constant rewriting of guidelines we are in danger of losing this perspective.

We turned over the spotlight to the child in ESEA with some of the rewriting of the guidelines it tends to suggest that we are getting back to this institutional approach which I hope will never happen.

Getting back to your basic question, there has been participation. I might add that this ESEA has given us who are involved in the other parts of the American scene, the educational scene, in a pluralistic society, an opportunity to exhibit the real philosophy that we have always tried to exhibit.

In other words, we try to be a service and a resource to the community we serve. This is our philosophy. ESEA has given us an opportunity to exhibit this much more readily than was possible, let's say, in 1949 when this was a real touchy delicacy.

Thank you.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Dr. Miller.

Mr. MILLER. I concur fully with what Sister Miriam Joseph has said about the private-public relationship. They are growing. They are uncertain. This is a new area. But we have some good examples of where this is being worked out.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Dr. Miller, what about the relationship between title III and title IV programs as your survey developed? From what