

Has the AFL-CIO made any comment on that report?

Mr. BIEMILLER. We have made no comment on that report. The report broke as the executive council was in session and we were in the middle of problems. I have no doubt we will take a good look at it before the next meeting of our executive council but at this moment there is no comment on it.

Mr. STEIGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me thank you, Mr. Biemiller, and all of you gentlemen who accompanied Mr. Biemiller.

Mr. MEGEL. May I ask Mr. Roth's testimony be included in the record?

Chairman PERKINS. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The statement follows:)

TESTIMONY BY HERRICK S. ROTH, VICE PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS; CHAIRMAN, LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE, AFT EXECUTIVE COUNCIL; PRESIDENT, COLORADO LABOR COUNCIL, AFL-CIO

Upon the recommendation of AFT Washington Representative, Carl J. Megel, and the request of the Executive Council of the American Federation of Teachers, I have been asked to make this brief statement to your Committee today.

We are pleased that the 89th Congress saw fit to pioneer Federal support of key programs in the fields of elementary and secondary education and to expand, among others, programs in vocational services. These comments are directed specifically to these areas.

With regard to our elementary and secondary education, ESEA has prompted various kinds of program innovations—all meeting minimum standards established by the Office of Education, but few reflecting truly effective schooling for either the culturally and economically disadvantaged youth or the students of so-called majority or middle class schools in predominantly Caucasian attendance areas.

This is a challenge not to be taken lightly or without adequate explanation. The result might have been and was to be expected. The tendency of school administrators, school communities and their governing boards to respond with less than comprehensive programs grew out of their traditional orientations. The programs that you created and the Congress funded sought very properly, however, to find new educational avenues to reach students who had little to motivate them educationally, either at home or in the average school.

As a result, amendments to the ESEA in 1967 should seek to support fewer band aid type of remedial programs and a greater number of comprehensive, effective programs for total school attendance centers. Our experience in New York City's More Effective Schools Program—which is financed in its extra costs by new ESEA Federal dollars—is the proof of the pudding.

Here, though, we would like to emphasize that this program was achieved by the involvement—the total involvement—of teaching faculties. In our opinion, this could not have been achieved without the positive effect of a sole collective bargaining agent—Local No. 2 of the AFT, New York's United Federation of Teachers. It is significant that your Committee which is considering this testimony is appropriately a committee on "Education and Labor."

In our opinion, we believe you would be wise to include in any new amendments a recognition of the collective bargaining relationship as a desirable ingredient in the process of creating and funding effective schools. We recommend that you establish a priority for funding appropriate programs of school districts where boards of education recognize the sole collective bargaining agency with a teachers' organization. We assure you that Federal funds will be put to much more effective and beneficial use in all areas of the nation.

Examples in our Western areas, including Denver, Kansas City, Tulsa, Houston, Albuquerque, Tucson, Phoenix, Las Vegas, Pocatello, or Cheyenne, just to name some, are typical of cities where recognized teacher involvements would have provided more effective utilization of Federal funding. Since we are dealing with human development—with individual as well as group opportunity and growth—such a priority makes as much or more sense as, for instance, priorities established so wisely for the purchase of publicly generated electrical power for publicly owned electrical utilities in my part of the nation.

Remedial, "patched-on" programs can meet most requirements for spending Federal tax dollars, but the educational advantages of such patch-work appear