

get the bulk of the up-to-date AFDC data money are now New York and California; the two States that, given a fixed amount of money would lose the most by the \$3,000 figures are also New York and California.

Also, you suggested in answer to Mr. Quie that out of the \$146 million additional money you would anticipate if we got 100 percent funding of the \$1.2 billion you are asking for, you have already committed \$114 million of that to that one amendment, the Quie-Perkins amendment. By what kind of priority system do you determine that you will first fund that, and then fund the other amendments that begin this fiscal year 1968?

Mr. ESTES. Well, we don't take those amendments separately. They are all figured into—

Mr. FORD. But \$146 million won't pay for all of them.

It won't even pay for Quie-Perkins. I don't know where you got the figure on that, but by using the national average per-pupil expenditure closer to \$340 million would have to be added to last year's money to maintain the level of support that we provided last year. Mr. Quie could give me an exact figure, it was well over \$300 million; wasn't it?

Mr. QUIE. I don't recall.

Mr. FORD. I don't see how you can now tell Mr. Quie that his amendment would be paid for by the first \$114 million of additional money we are asking for over actual expenditures last year, when even that amendment would not be paid for by the total increase. The Carey AFDC amendment, which in the AFDC was estimated as something in the neighborhood of \$100 million, and the number of children that would be added by going to \$3,000 is a very substantial figure, which I am sorry I can't put my finger on, but it is much in excess of Mr. Carey's amendment.

Now if you don't add money, and you put all three of these things into effect, what you have to do is readjust, and I think Mr. Quie has got his finger right on the point. How can you say that New York would possibly get the same amount of money? I have some confusion as to whether you are talking dollars or talking percentage of entitlement. There is a difference, it seems to me. It seems like a little nicety that can make it sound like you are talking about the same amount. How can you assert that this kind of massive adjustment will take place in New York, and they will still get the amount of money they got last year or even the same percentage of its total entitlement that it got last year, unless you take the total entitlement that they would have through all the amendments and then say that since they are getting only 75 percent of what their entitlement should be, that the 75 percent is equal to 75 percent of what their entitlement was last year?

If you are talking about dollars, they can't possibly be getting the same number of dollars they got last year.

Mr. ESTES. As you know, this is a very complicated process. We would be delighted to submit this for the record, and then have further discussions with you, if you like. Perhaps our figures are incorrect.

(The table referred to follows:)