

Mr. ESTES. Instead of the floor provision?

Mr. QUIE. Yes.

Mr. ESTES. This would mean that some States would receive considerably less than they received in fiscal year 1967. They would have to reduce their programs.

Mr. QUIE. Then could you give me the figure of how much this would be for each of those States in the event we use the same percentage of entitlement for all of them and then the change in each State that this would bring about?

Mr. ESTES. Yes.

Mr. QUIE. Secondly, what the appropriation would have to be if you used the same percentage of entitlement for all States so that no States would receive less than they did in a previous year?

Mr. ESTES. We can do that.

Mr. GOODELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. Yes.

Mr. GOODELL. I have supported this amendment because from the outset we felt that the allocation formula was giving more to the rich States than to the poor States. But I would point out setting aside the indubitable fact that we are increasing the expenditure per pupil faster than most of the other States, New York has gone up to \$300,000 by the figures that I have heard, last year in fiscal 1968, Kentucky has gone up \$7 million, Minnesota almost a million dollars.

You have had an impact sort of freezing New York out. Your formulas obviously have an impact on States that are progressing and moving forward, increasing their per pupil expenditure. I don't know how far you want to go penalizing the States that are moving to meet their own problems.

Mr. QUIE. I think our greatest need is in the poorer States. It is clearly evident that the problems the Northern States are having in the cities are that the children move into the suburbs, from the southeastern part of the country particularly.

I would like to see better education in the breeding ground of educational problems.

Mr. GOODELL. I agree with the equalization principle. Then after we get through distributing the fund we find ourselves with special assignments that will meet just the needs of the city areas, leaving out the rural areas. We end up giving back with the right hand what we took away with the left. I don't know how it ends other than it will do much good switching the formula around.

I think every State that is below the national average should have a bigger allotment. I don't think we ought to go to the point of discourage the States from meeting their own problem.

Mr. QUIE. Is it possible to secure from the Bureau of the Census any estimate of the number of children with families of income less than \$3,000 in the States now as compared to 1959, 1960? You can secure estimates of the change in population.

Can you find estimates broken down to the number of families with low income?

Mr. ESTES. We can certainly ask and provide that information for the record, if you like.

Secretary GARDNER. I am certain that such estimates exist.

(Secretary Gardner submitted the following table:)