

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS 1713

projects 37,877 public school pupils and 1342 non-public school pupils were served.

In summary, Title I, ESEA has been effectively administered at the state level without undue interference from the United States Office of Education. Federal guidelines have been adequate and have allowed sufficient flexibility for state administration.

Title II—School Library and Instructional Materials

The State of Maine has made good and full use of Title II funds amounting to \$525,829. The state has served as the agency for distribution of books and instructional materials to eligible non-public schools.

Title III—Supplementary Educational Centers and Service

Maine was allotted \$659,025 under this title for fiscal 1966. Maine school officials worked industriously on these projects and had the distinction of preparing and submitting more projects than many other states. The scope of the projects indicated ingenuity and stressed creative thinking and innovation.

We recommend that the statute be amended to give the State Department of Education authority to approve Title III projects as state officials are in a position to know the needs of local schools and their ability to carry on worthy projects.

Title V—Strengthening Leadership Resources of State Educational Agencies

Maine was allotted \$143,000 for the purpose of strengthening the leadership resources of the Department. In the administration of the title, the state has been given considerable latitude in identifying its needs and designing programs to meet those needs. Projects have included In-service Training For Professional Staff, Employment of a Coordinator of Federal Assistance Programs, A Language Arts Supervisor, Adult Education Supervisor, Coordinator of Teacher Education Programs, and in the Fine Arts field a Supervisor of Music and another for Art. These programs should go a long way to strengthen the services rendered by the Department to local units.

With regard to the proposed amendment to Title V to establish a five-year program of grants to states by the Commissioner of Education for programs of comprehensive, systematic and continuous planning and for evaluation of education at all levels, it is strongly recommended that the State Department of Education be designated in the statute as the agency to be responsible for carrying out or supervising the carrying out of the comprehensive planning and expenditure of funds therefor. It is my opinion that an expenditure of funds under this amendment by the Department of Education could contribute substantially to the improvement of education in this state.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 2, 1967.

HON CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CARL: Recently I appeared with several schools from my district in hearings before hearing examiners in which the Department of Education, through its General Counsel, appeared in the position of making a case for "withholding funds." These schools had completely desegregated, in that all students were given complete freedom of choice. Nevertheless, I understand that the hearing officials have in one case and apparently are likely to make a similar finding in others that the Commissioner of Education has the right to withhold funds unless a plan is submitted and effectuated for integration, even if it requires orders of the school district officials and is against the wishes of the student and parents. This appears to me to be in violation of Title 4, Section 401(b) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

In connection with these cases I filed the enclosed memorandum brief. One of the main reasons given through the years for opposition to our Federal education programs is that it would lead to complete Federal control of our schools. The hearings in the cases in which I was present clearly show that unless your committee takes action to overrule the Commissioner, that is exactly what will happen.

In that connection I would point out we have every right to presume that the primary purpose of the Department of Education was and is to help education.

Accepting that, it must follow that since funds are essential to education—and federal funds promote education—that the *desire* of the Department should be to find ways to aid, rather than means to *cut off* funds.