

Because of data not being up to date or other such possibilities, there may be a few exceptions to this. I think you will find these relatively few.

Chairman PERKINS. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. QUIE. Yes.

Chairman PERKINS. I think the gentleman from Minnesota discussed for a long time last year the inequities involved in the distribution of the money. The record of 1965 and 1966 will disclose that we spent day in and day out trying to find a more equitable approach than using the income factor and the census data.

Every time we would carefully study something, which at first seemed to show promise, we realized it was not as equitable as this approach. I know what the gentleman is driving at, or zeroing in, as he says, to the areas where we have the greatest need.

Last year by amendment which he and I both agreed on, we brought the poorer States up and put a floor under the poorer States; we brought per-pupil payments up to 50 percent of the national average in those States where per-pupil expenditures were below the national average.

It added an extra cost of about \$400 million a year. There is no good argument, in my judgment, as to why we should not support the deprived children in the areas wherever they are found.

With respect to the formula, I think it has been studied, studied, and studied. Until we can get some new census data, especially in view of the contribution the gentleman made last year, I just don't see how we could improve it.

Mr. QUIE. I don't have a formula that I am going to advocate as a substitute. I am just groping to see if we can't find something better in the future.

Mr. HOWE. I don't think we ought to say that this is the best one and we should never change it.

Chairman PERKINS. I agree with you that we ought to study this all the time.

Mr. QUIE. I have observed two problems. One is in the rural areas as different from a large city.

A large city like Minneapolis has one school district. In the city of Minneapolis, the superintendent has the responsibility of really determining which schools in the system are in greatest need.

The schools that are not in that great a need don't receive a cent, no matter how many poor kids are going to that school. They don't receive a cent of Federal money.

It goes to the schools which have the greatest need. I think this is the way the program ought to operate. But out in the rural area because of the entitlement that judgment cannot be made.

For instance, in one school district in my congressional district they had a very poor crop in 1959 and for that reason most of the families appear to have an income of less than \$2,000.

It can easily happen on a farm. The crops were better in the years after that. But because of that they received a large amount of money. In talking about deprivation of children, they are not any more deprived than another part of my district which had good crops.