

retire from or die in teaching which means there is a constant turnover of talent and capability. This has nothing to do with the strike.

You see the strike as a weapon has only been used really to secure for teachers better teaching conditions and to really shore up the stability of an educational system.

Mr. SCHERLE. At the expense of the students. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROTH. Those were your words, not mine, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, may I add just one slight addition to the question before this which Congressman Scherle asked?

Our director of education, Mr. Walter Davis, reminds me that we have regional meetings from time to time of our State officials at which we go over our policy declarations and such. He wants me to assure you that we will be checking into this question of making sure that our State federations take as much interest in rural education as they do in city education.

Mr. FORD. Thank you, gentlemen. I might say to Mr. Scherle in defense of my friends in the National Education Association, the other major teachers group, that in my district last fall we had four school districts out on strike at the same time and three of them were represented by the Education Association, one by the Federation.

I don't know whether the education association in my State has become more militant or not but there was a time when they used to say that the education associations did not strike, they used sanctions. We could argue all day about which has the greatest effect on the school district.

But at least in my State the teachers don't respond to local conditions much differently in either of the two organizations.

I might say in addition to this that in the two districts where we had the longest period of teacher discontent as evidenced by this type of activity, the issue that kept them out was not money or teacher salaries or classroom size or anything of the kind but the right to participate in the professional activity of developing curriculum for the students.

Strangely that has been one function that school boards in my State are most reluctant to share with the professional people that they hire to run their schools.

I would like to go back to the comments made in Mr. Biemiller's testimony concerning financing of this legislation in the current year.

Mr. Biemiller, preceding you by several days we have had testimony from the U.S. Office of Education, from the Secretary himself, and from the Commissioner indicating that their present intent is to cooperate with the Bureau of the Budget in requesting sums of money from the Appropriations Committee of this House approximating 49 percent of the amount we authorized last year.

However, in looking at what the Bureau of the Budget has determined as their idea of what should be financed, we find what appears to me to be a clear-cut invasion of the legislative process by the executive branch. Although they propose to finance title I assistance to basically underprivileged children at the rate of 49 percent, they propose to finance adult basic education—which for some reason the Budget Bureau finds to be a better program and I have no disagree-