

in general, accepted the philosophy that considerable good judgment and discretion should be used in developing the best possible programs under this title; rather than simply spending the money because it was available.

As a result of our exercise of educational judgment and restraint, Minnesota school districts ended up spending about \$18.2 million of the \$24.5 million available under this title. In my judgment the funds were well spent on worthy educational projects and I am not overly concerned about the fact that we were not able to spend all of the allocated amount.

I am concerned, however, about the fact that Minnesota is being penalized in allocation for 1967 because of the fact that we did not spend all that was allocated in 1966. I think this procedure is both unwise and dangerous. On any future program it is going to be difficult indeed to prevent spending for the sake of spending in order to keep from being penalized in a subsequent year.

Title II—School Library Resources, Textbooks, and Other Resource Material, does not come in for much discussion and/or change. I think there are two reasons for this.

First, title II provides for a State plan which makes it easily administered by the State, and school districts and therefore not much comment or difficulty.

Second, title II is unquestionably the title of this act which most specifically gets entangled in the church-state issue. In my judgment, its administration within the many school districts across my State and the Nation will have many instances of clear cut, legal violation of the separation of church and state.

It is also my opinion that, within reason, it is impossible to administer this particular title in many of the States without a breach of the church-state separation. In this regard, as well as with all Federal education legislation, I would strongly support the establishment of a workable judicial review procedure.

Title III—Supplementary Educational Centers and Services has been the focal point of my concern about ESEA 1965 from the day it was introduced in Congress 2 years ago. I am extremely disappointed about the fact that the executive branch of Government has not deemed it wise or necessary to introduce amendments regarding this title.

I strongly oppose the present form of this title, and the new amendment for the Vocational Education Act of 1963 resembles this one to a shocking degree, whereby the U.S. Office of Education, for all intents and purposes, completely bypasses the legally constituted State agency in dealing directly with local school districts within each State.

When I make such a statement I am well aware of the "review and recommendation" provision for State departments and the fact that in the President's message he indicated that "the recommendations of the State have been sought and followed in more than 95 percent of the projects" under this title.

It does not take an unusual amount of insight or intelligence to see how the percentage can get that high so easily when one realizes that the U.S. Office of Education has the sole decision making authority and the States can't possibly do anything about the situation no matter how strongly they might differ with the judgment of those in USOE.