

there is almost no difference in the voting between the large States and the small States. In the membership of the council of superintendents and commissioners in the large States, recognize these problems.

I might tell you that California and New York both voted for an increase in the flat grant, very close to the consensus, as a matter of fact.

Mr. FORD. You said they would support an equalization factor and then you proceeded to defend this on a per capita distribution beyond the basic grant.

That is not what most of the States consider an equalization formula within the States. Normally equalization takes into account the relative ability of the respective districts within the States to distribute the money and they distribute a portion of their money on some per capita basis and the balance of their money taking these other factors into consideration.

What we have here is a flat grant with everybody getting a minimum guaranteed amount of money and then we have a straight per capita distribution.

What we are talking about in title I is not that sort of distribution at all. We are saying notwithstanding the fact that you have the large number, that you have the expense, that we will take into account the relative costs of education in your State per pupil except that we will allow you the option of considering to your benefit the national average which results from the high-cost States being thrown into a common fund.

If we did that with title V do you think your people would approve of that?

Mr. FULLER. I think they would. I know of no instance in the past 20 years in which the States, as a group and the chief State school officers as a group, would not approve an equalization formula based on the equalization grounds.

I might say that this title V formula that is in the bill and that is the consensus of opinion of the chief State school officers does have, when it is figured out, a great deal of equalization.

There are two or three exceptions in it, very small States which have limited geographical areas and not very many school districts. They provide the exceptions. But after these returns were in, the Office of Education spent a couple of weeks trying out empirically a large number of formulas. They ran one formula after another.

When this report and recommendation of 40 percent, 60 percent in title V was presented at a White House conference with Mr. Cater, Mr. Howe, and with Mr. Ralph Huitt, of HEW, and Sam Halperin and a member of the Bureau of the Budget, the immediate reaction from those gentlemen was that that moves too far favoring the smaller States.

We left it for consideration and they went ahead and spent a couple of weeks as I say and ran all kinds of empirical tables testing it out.

The next thing that happened after 2 or 3 weeks and two or three visits was that they said, well, we can't do any better than this, considering all of the States and considering their real needs.

Here there was a consensus of the chief State school officers of which the Office of Education said they could not improve on so they adopted