

cation, and its management and its implementation were restricted by title I concepts, for instance, that we would have to be strenuously opposed to it. Under title I, of course, no public agency could contract with a private agency to conduct the program, and this would really tie our hands in offering any kind of viable, valid service to the community. Monsignor?

Monsignor McMANUS. I recall, Congressman, a similar question in 1946, when the issue was the school lunch program. Congressman Flanagan at that time was the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, and he asked, "If the program were transferred from the Department of Agriculture to the Office of Education, would the parochial school children eat?" and the answer was negative.

He said, "Well, then, the lunch program will remain in the Department of Agriculture," where it remains today.

I could say the parallel fashion that if the program were transferred from the OEO to the Office of Education, the decided probability would be that the nonpublic agencies, not only the church-related agencies, but all the other nonpublic agencies which have made a record in this, would be denied the opportunity to respond to their Government's call in the war against poverty.

Mr. CAREY. Well, the chairman will note that because of the need for members to attend to other duties, we will be forced to suspend the hearings at this point, by reason of our inability to maintain a quorum, but in closing the hearing, let me state this: that I feel that it will be unwise for me in the chair to operate with this particular panel, anyway, which could be described as ultra vires, or in any way except in a format of meticulous legality, which is not one of the comments that I was in the chair any way cooperating in anything but a wholly constitutional and legal way and proceeding in a correct way with this particular panel, or any witness to come before the committee at this time.

However, I do want to make this statement for the record, that I feel that we have before us two problems, and one is that we must act upon a bill, and move a program by extension in order that the obviously well-working features of the program can be extended through legislative and other acts on the part of the States, and that there is need for us, therefore, to be expeditious in moving the bill.

On the other hand, in a very real sense, this bill has uncovered more problems and more depth of challenge than we probably knew was in existence when we first began our deliberations on the original bill in 1965.

Therefore, I would hope that the committee in its wisdom would engage in a more professional and more extensive reading and discovery operation on the subsurface and long-term challenges in education today, long-term problems that need to be surfaced in education today.

We heard at least one witness from this panel, and another, a distinguished educator from Bank Street, indicate that there was need to inject competition for the good of the student into American education.

I would wholly second that. In fact, I believe we could spend a day or possibly a week or more, on what kind of competition would be