

dial services, with speech and hearing therapy, with new and innovative programs and equipment that are not present in the white school, in the white neighborhood, simply because we can't afford them in our budget, strain as we will, in the city of Pittsburgh.

The benefit of the ESEA moneys, therefore, has to be concentrated where the poor children are. When you have now a 700-pupil school, 600 white and 100 Negro, this is splendid. It is a good environment for both white and Negro children.

By the time you spread those 100 Negro children among eight grades, you have about 10 to a grade, or about three to a classroom. You no longer have a workable context in which to pour out these additional services of ESEA. Therefore, the child comes to the favored school, presumably learning in an integrated environment, but he is still hungry.

Mrs. KOONTZ. May I interrupt, Mrs. Green, and make a comment here?

You directed this question toward Dr. Marland, but I do feel I can make a significant contribution.

In contact with teachers all over the country for a year on leave from my job, I was able to see many programs in effect where the ultimate desire of the community was to effect a more productive school system. There was the recognition that there were schools that needed these services as total school units far more than others.

But at the same time, they recognized the fact that there must be a change in attitudes of people to people, and that one of the best means of achieving this was to have what we call open school enrollment. This has been a problem in many communities, certainly in the South.

However, when one must make a decision between receiving certain kinds of services available in one school over a desired program of integrated education generally in another school, there would be a tendency to remain where the ESEA program is, especially if it contained a food element, as with many of these disadvantaged children.

We are certain that this should not be a point of conflict. Therefore, it is important that children receive the services rather than schools. But the extent to which these children may be able to receive it must, of course, depend upon many of our older plans of operation that we put the money where there seems to be an operational procedure already set.

This entire program is based on an idea that this will be innovative. I don't like the term "innovative," I must say, Mrs. Green. I think it has connotations that were never intended. However, I know that more of the same will not relieve the problems that we face among these children and in schools and education.

Therefore, what we are looking for is not necessarily what even some people might term creative. I say we are just dealing with what we have been saying for a number of years as our philosophy of education: that every child is worth something, and what he is worth will determine the future of this country.

So we have overlooked the needs, because we didn't have the funds. Now we are saying if we really believe what we have been saying all this time, that children who come from poor backgrounds are not going to make the significant contributions that they might if they