

For instance, this year we will probably now increase our foundation level to \$400. When I first went into the State legislature some 10 or 12 years ago it was \$200 or less, \$180 I think.

Now in the meantime the Federal Government is beginning to devote more and more of these available tax dollars to education. Still the burden at the local level has not been reduced. We are still devoting about 80 cents out of every tax dollar to the support of our education system. Where is the proper mix, where is the optimum? How much can the tax system support? Do you have any simple answer to that?

Mr. LUMLEY. I don't have a simple answer to it. Let me say that our finance committee, the NEA Finance Committee, would say that the main problem of the financing of schools is that we have depended primarily on the property tax at the local school level.

This has put an undue burden on property. It has also limited the financial resources for schools. As you say, not only has it happened in Illinois, it has happened in every other State, it has moved to the State level to provide for foundation programs but it did not relieve that local property level. Of course we have to hasten to say that this is not true of all school districts.

In some school districts certainly the property tax is not a heavy burden. It all depends on the kind of value there is. But generally, the increased enrollment, the increased need of education of boys and girls, the need to stay in school longer, has increased costs.

Not only the elementary and secondary but the junior college, the college, and university are being funded. This has increased the cost of education and the Federal Government has had to move in. As I am sure you are aware, for a long time the National Education Association argued that the best program was a general Federal aid program, a general support program where every boy and girl whether they lived in X district or Y district Y would have at least a basic education.

The Congress decided in its wisdom that there were certain needs that were national needs. This moved us to the categorical aid in 1958 when the National Defense Education Act came along.

As I say, this was a tremendous thing to school districts even though it was a matching program.

Then for quite a while we could not move from that, for various reasons, until we got 89-10. This committee went to work and put together 89-10 which, as we see it subjectively, has done a tremendous job.

As I said this morning I think it is one of the best things that happened to school people, 89-10. It shook us out of our lethargy too. As a superintendent of schools if you keep on doing the same thing over and over again your problems are great and you have in the back of your mind some of these things that you ought to do but you just don't get time or the State legislature does not have enough money to let you do it and it does not get done.

89-10 came along and here was a grand opportunity to take care of compensatory education for the people who are disadvantaged, the innovation in title III and title II with its textbook and instructional materials. Title V we think has strengthened State departments.