

Some of the money could go for the kind of projects that reduce the number of pupils that a teacher must be related to.

Mr. DELLENBACK. You would put this at the top of the list?

Mr. STIMBERT. That will improve what will happen in the classroom.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Would you put it above increasing teachers' salaries?

Mr. STIMBERT. I don't think we would.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Any second priority besides hiring additional teachers that you put at the top of the list?

Mr. STIMBERT. We would have to go to construction because we need \$4½ million to put in a citywide kindergarten.

Mr. DELLENBACK. What would be the fourth answer?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is a difficult question because you would have to take those steps which would improve the quality of education. In addition to some of the comments that have been made here, I think we would extend education downward. We would improve the teacher-pupil ratio. I think we would upgrade vocational training. I should call it noncollege bound education and we would probably extend—

Chairman PERKINS. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BELL. As I understand it you all generally agreed the money would be used for teacher salaries. Isn't it true if you increase the teacher-pupil ratio really your money is going for salary? You are hiring new teachers so it is going for teachers' salaries.

Mr. MEEDS. If I got your consensus, generally, most of you favor approximately one-third, one-third, one-third of Federal, State, and local. I would like to point out to you that under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act we had an arrangement last year which in effect curtailed any State in receiving more than 35 percent of its educational budget under the terms of this act and I think it was raised to 40 percent last year, if I am not incorrect.

At the same time we enacted legislation which would become effective in fiscal 1968. The amounts received would effect States spending less than the national average.

In other words, they could take the national average or they could take their State average whichever was higher, and this would increase substantially the funds to those States which prior to this time have been receiving on their State basis and mostly those States were in the South. As a matter of fact, the State of California would not benefit by this and many other States.

Now, if you gentlemen are suggesting that this should be on a one-third, one-third basis it seems we are headed in opposite directions.

Let me point out to you we presently have States which are at the maximum rate now of 40 percent. I think Alabama and Mississippi both are at the maximum. This would mean we should increase our Federal support to high-income States—in other words, just go the other direction from what we have done.

Now, may I have your comments on that?

Mr. KEITH. When I was suggesting a partnership I thought the gentleman was asking a question of overall responsibility on the part of each, a total figure. You would have equalization and you would have differences within the school district or the States. I would not