

Mr. GOODELL. As you describe it, in terms of the national situation, experience, I think that is exceptional.

Mr. SPARKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. GOODELL. Let me change to another topic for a moment. Many of us have been troubled at the cumbersome nature of the allocation formula, particularly as it applies to allocation down at the county level and subsequent distribution to the school district level under title I.

How would you feel about a provision that gave the States the authority to allocate within the State itself, to the school districts? In other words, permit the State to apply whatever equalization it wishes to in the allocation of funds under title I, eliminate the present allocation to counties on the basis of the number of poor children, under the ADC formula and all the rest of it?

Mr. SPARKS. We could do this and I think do it more effectively on the basis of need. We can do it more effectively on the basis of need. But we would have to follow a formula similar to what has been applied.

We haven't objected to the formula that you have applied at the national level, but we could, we might be able to meet need to some extent but as far as we are concerned it has worked very satisfactorily.

Mr. SPARKS. I think, too, some of the statistical data, especially in metropolitan areas such as Chicago, are confusing. For example, in Chicago alone, as far as the eligibility of children are concerned, the figures are based on 1960 data.

Now there are more children in the Puerto Rico wards on ADC now than there were children in those wards in 1960. This, is, in my opinion, important.

Mr. GOODELL. This point was raised in our original hearings on the act. Actually Census Bureau's latest data is 1959 data. It is the 1960 census data collected in 1959.

This has been a problem that was pointed out originally in the allocation formula. That is part of the reason some of us are still seeking to introduce a greater flexibility into this.

Chairman PERKINS. If the gentleman will yield to me on that point, the gentleman from New York helped us work out a formula that I personally feel is equitable. Now, if there is not flexibility at the State level from the guidelines received from Washington, that is in connection with coming up with ways and means of determining need in the local school districts, isn't that left up to the State educational agencies to make that determination under present law under the guidelines established in Washington?

Mr. PAGE. Mr. Chairman, that is the thing that is bothering us at the moment.

Chairman PERKINS. I am not talking about the 1960 data.

Mr. PAGE. You are talking about this question of flexibility and guidance. We, too, want to compliment the Congress on title VI for the special education program. I think you can search this Nation from State to State and you will find no State with more special education than the State of Illinois.

Our appropriation for special education is \$45 million. We have a compulsory law requiring every district in Illinois in 1959 to provide programs for the handicapped children of our State.