

think you could just set up a system whereby everything would be done at every school district on a local, State, and National basis.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Spears, in California you are receiving approximately 3 percent of your total educational budget in California from Federal funds under this act and the State of Alabama is receiving the maximum 40 percent.

Now, how do you equalize between 3 and 40 percent?

Mr. SPEARS. You are trying to equalize among the States. In the California district, we don't get the support in our district because of the wealth that some other district gets. But I didn't give any figure here. All I can say, if Federal support goes up only a Federal percentage greater, we ought to have the right to spend it for what is needed just as we spend State and local funds. That is more my concern than what the amount is going to be.

When I mention teachers' salaries I do not mean to raise teachers' salaries, but I know the salary account goes up for two reasons, more teachers but increased cost of living where you have to compete with other districts to raise teacher salaries. If that money is coming locally, I would say more of the Federal money would go for the same thing we have to spend local money for.

Mr. MEEDS. If we were to increase in the State of California substantial Federal contributions, is it your feeling that this would all be utilized to supplement present programs or do you think there will be a reduction of State and local effort?

Mr. SPEARS. This discussion started over here.

Mr. MEEDS. I realize you didn't answer one-third, but at least two of the other gentlemen did.

Mr. SPEARS. The implication was if you give more of a percentage on the Federal load from Federal sources then what would you spend it for and the question became how much would that be. That would be a figure anybody could guess at. I would not make a guess, but I am saying the more of the Federal spent, if you are going to reduce State or local money we have to spend some of the same thing that we are spending State and local money for. I think our concern right now is funding of the present program you have rather than getting tangled up on differences, to move this act along and get it to the Appropriations Committee so we can make maximum use of what we are getting now. I would settle for what we get now and not argue about what is wrong or right by it.

Mr. MEEDS. I would like to comment on a related subject.

Dr. Stimbert, I appreciate your presentation of support for extension of MDTA to support physical health and recreation. I support that.

Then as a last question, I would like to point out to you that there is a provision against this again under the Elementary and Secondary Act as Mr. Ford pointed out.

Now, assume this money that we would authorize and appropriate were handled by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, but was passed to the State departments of education. Do any of you people see State constitutional problems with, for instance, your State department of education contracting with a local parochial school to run a Headstart program, use parochial facilities and perhaps even parochial teachers? Do you see problems?