

opportunities that would enable each individual student to develop to the maximum of his potentialities, and they are not equal, and they will not take the equal amount of money or books or time or teachers.

There are teachers who are far better than others. Would equal opportunity mean that these teachers would not be permitted because others would be denied their presence or their benefit?

Would equal opportunity deny a program such as drivers education in the State of Maryland. Only three counties instituted this when it began. The others did not have it, did not want it, in fact. When it was proven to be successful, it then became a statewide program. Would equal opportunity for education have defeated the program from even coming into being?

How about a program such as began in 1962 in Meadowbrook, Massachusetts. Would equal opportunity permit a building built for 1,000 student capacity to enroll 150, in a new concept of education? Let the pupils choose the courses and the teachers—would this be permitted under equal opportunity? It took four years, until 1966, before the entire enrollment was permitted because by then, the pilot project had proven successful. The students were able to work out a program with the teachers, and this is regarded as one of the greatest innovations in education. Equal opportunity, I contend, would not have permitted a one teacher to ten pupil ratio in a state that has a different ratio entirely.

It is true that we must judge by the end result, but unfortunately all of us do not come to the same end result. Given the same amount of time and the same teachers, we will not arrive at the same point.

Baltimore City needs federal funds, such as New York has achieved. Baltimore City need federal funds because it costs three to four times as much to teach a pupil in Baltimore City, who is culturally or socially or economically deprived. That student does have the right, but under equal opportunity, he would not get it. He needs additional opportunity, and I suggest to you that the language that we are attempting to expunge from this particular article is language that must not go in. It will do the reverse of that which we want. We do want, and I am sure all educators want, to develop to a maximum the individual's potentialities.

Let us leave the constitution free to do that, with whatever expense, whatever

necessary, and whatever program the Board of Education see fit to implement.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Wheatley—I am sorry, you are reserving your time. Delegate Lord. Delegate Lord, you have four minutes remaining; Delegate Wheatley, you have a little less than six minutes remaining.

DELEGATE WHEATLEY: Mr. Chairman, I had omitted one of the scheduled people on our scheduled time, Dr. Pullen for three minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well. Delegate Pullen.

DELEGATE PULLEN: Mr. Chairman, I am a little disturbed by the discussion because I am sure that everybody here wants the same thing, but we are talking in the light of our background, which in some cases is a little mingled, but I would like to say, sir, I do not mean that critically, and if I have offended, I apologize; but what I would like to say to one delegate here is this: there should be no need for a head start if we educate our children all over these United States. Why should poverty and ignorance exist anywhere in this country? Why should it exist anywhere in Maryland? We are talking about two levels of educational opportunity. St. Mary's County, my impassioned friend, gets eighty percent or more money from the State of Maryland than the federal government to educate its people; Garrett County, the same; Caroline and others. That is what we mean by educational or as near equal opportunity; the state and the federal government going down and putting money where it is needed to you. That is an entirely different thing.

Then we have another level of educational opportunity, Mr. Chairman. This is on the college level. I am not so much disturbed how you vote on this, because I believe that the courts are going to decide this case inside of ten or fifteen years. Let me give you a simple illustration. We maintain public institutions, and we maintain them for only those people who can afford to pay. I hope you will forgive me for this illustration. Two boys equally well qualified applied for admission to our university. One is accepted and goes through. The other one cannot, and he is drafted; and as Mr. Clark said at our meeting, in Vietnam, God knows what happens to him. We have passed here a Bill of Rights, a statement that no one shall be deprived of life, liberty or property, for any reason, and yet we deny by sins of omission which in my opin-