

Mr. ESTES. No, the national average this year, we estimated would be 85 percent actually, the appropriation provides about 74 percent of the total amount authorized, nationwide.

Mr. QUIE. So New York, however, if I recall correctly, spent all of her entitlement in the first year.

Mr. ESTES. I am not sure about those figures. It was possible, because of the language that was adopted during fiscal year 1966, for a State to spend up to its full entitlement, based on the maximum basic grant.

Mr. QUIE. Right.

Mr. ESTES. And it would be possible for a local school district for instance, in 1966, to spend up to its full entitlement.

Mr. QUIE. Right, and if I remember correctly, New York did expend her full entitlement, which would mean in 1967 she would still have to receive that same amount, even though the national percentage now was considerably less. I did not realize it was as low as the Commissioner indicates.

New York would not receive the national percentage payment as a percentage of her entitlement, because she spent the full amount before. Minnesota, I understand, spent \$6 million less than their entitlement in 1966 and therefore, is receiving not a percentage of her entitlement, but less than that amount, because the States who on the previous year in 1966 had spent the full amount of their entitlement took a part of those other States share away from them, by the language in the law.

Mr. ESTES. That is exactly right.

Mr. QUIE. Now you say you are going to use that same language, that no State shall receive less. How then, does New York come to 50 percent of her entitlement?

Mr. ESTES. Well, actually, New York would be on the floor for next year. That is, New York would receive the amount that she received in fiscal year 1967. It may be less than 49 percent. It may be somewhere between 45 and 49.

Mr. QUIE. It could not be.

Mr. ESTES. I am talking about 49 percent of the total entitlement. That is 49 percent of the basic amount, the maximum basic amount.

Mr. QUIE. But the maximum basic grant for New York has not changed, won't change very much, it will only change because of the \$3,000 figure.

Mr. ESTES. It will change because of the \$3,000 figure. It will also change because of using the latest AFDC information, which in fiscal year 1968 will be 1966 data, instead of 1965, so these figures would change. In addition—

Mr. QUIE. Assuming of course, that the 1966 figure showed a substantially larger number of children.

Mr. ESTES. Right, assuming there is a larger number—we won't anticipate that there will be a significant increase in any one given State. In addition to that—

Mr. FORD. Would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. QUIE. Let me just finish this, and I will be glad to.