

want to have more flexibility than they now have, particularly in title I. But we have not heard anybody give any indication that since the Federal Government began spending money in the Elementary and Secondary Act this has spurred local and State resources or people in charge of State and local resources to any greater efforts in the same areas that we have targeted this money toward.

Perhaps you gentlemen could speak to that.

Chairman PERKINS. Go ahead and comment on that briefly.

Mr. SPEARS. On the subject of compensatory education, when your act came along, we already put \$750,000 in our budget for compensatory education doing the same thing. When your act came along, we could not use the Federal money to replace local money, so we go beyond that. But the pump-priming principles you are talking about are working in the Vocational Education Act. We are putting in quite a bit of money now if we are to continue those programs.

I feel personally that this country needs more money for education and the local taxpayer cannot carry the burden. I would hate to see the Federal Government look at it as a stimulus for taking a property owner again, a small property owner, and taxing him more to support education because we get excited about what you have started.

What we want is additional funds from Congress generally. You don't know how many school systems might not be able to take advantage of the Federal funds just because they might have the State Vocational Education Act. The well-to-do States and communities will come up with extra money, but the poor ones will not.

Mr. FORD. That is all very well and I have been guilty of saying over and over again in my own area the local taxpayers can no longer afford to take the burden that they have, and the Federal Government ought to be relieving their burden. But that does not explain great disparity between the effort being made in one part of the country and the effort being made in another part of the country. We have one State that does not tax real estate one penny for schools, whereas in the State of New Jersey real estate is taxed so heavily that I don't understand how you can own real estate there. You can't say that everything is being done as long as this disparity exists, and I have heard no testimony thus far before the committee to indicate that there is any great ground swell of effort across this country to change the disparity between zero dollars to 80-percent support.

Mr. PHILLIPS. May I make a specific comment, if I understand the nature of the question, and give a specific illustration. I think that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 has served to point up and stimulate interest in many, many areas.

Title II for libraries—in our own community, since the inception of that support, has increased its own support for libraries by over 50 percent in addition to title II.

The General Assembly of the State of Indiana, from which I come, closed last week. The State's appropriation for education for the new biennial, I think, increased in their effort 23 percent. So I think there has been in many instances a stimulation by virtue of this help, and by the emphasis that has been placed on special needs.

Mr. SPEARS. I think you might have somebody to make this study for you, to make a study of the local tax issues that have come in