

tional assistance and so on. But to face the States with the necessity of providing 50 percent of the cost of these projects at this time——

Mr. STEIGER. Only if they wanted to. This is a voluntary feature. Only if the State desired to do so.

Mr. DAY. If the State did not what would happen?

Mr. STEIGER. The money would not go to the State.

Mr. DAY. Now you realize that the States, at least our States' tax resources are pretty much overtaxed at the present time. We have difficulty raising enough money to handle our present State functions. I would suspect that the States would be rather reluctant to put up the amount of money that would be necessary to be 50 percent of the present money put in this type of program.

Mr. STEIGER. It is not 50 percent of the present money. This is a completely new feature. This would be a bonus feature. If the State wanted to come in and expand what the local community is doing on a matching basis.

Mr. DAY. We have done that locally, not on the State basis. We can't get funding for something, and if we can justify it, either local institutions or the county government has stepped in and given us money. We have not had this experience with the State. We have not tried it.

I think at the present time that if the State could appropriate money for this purpose I would hope they would.

Mr. McELROY. The feature of it as being a bonus has appeal. However, I agree with Mr. Day that I don't believe that the States are in a position at this time. I know that we just do not have the fundraising abilities to match those that our Federal Government has. If this program is successful I think we would look forward to the time when the sheer economics of the thing justifies the local continuance of it without Federal support because if it is successful we will increase the economy of our communities to where the additional funds from Federal sources will not be necessary. I think it is very important that the 90-percent feature be continued for some time.

Mr. STEIGER. Mrs. Small.

Mrs. SMALL. This may not be a realistic view but I would wish that the entire antipoverty program were State supported and locally supported, if you will. However, this is not possible with the funds available, taxable funds available in the States. Until such a time as Mr. McElroy said, when we are able to raise our economic standard to meet the requirements economically statewide, I think 90-10 will have to stand to have the programing.

Mr. STEIGER. What about the bonus feature?

Mrs. SMALL. Well, I am speaking in respect to that, too. I think ideally it is wonderful. Practically, I think we will find it difficult to get the States to go along because they cannot.

Mr. STEIGER. Mr. Templeton.

Mr. TEMPLETON. Not knowing the details, the financial structure of the State of Kentucky, it would be my opinion that they could not financially come up with their share. If they could, surely we would have kindergarten in the State today. We do not understand the public school system. I wonder also within H.R. 10682, as is proposed, who would establish the guidelines in the conduct of the program at the local level. Would this be a Federal guideline, or would it be State, or would it be on the local level? Now, this within itself, I think, has a real