Do I understand that what you have outlined to us is a pattern where if the appropriations bill is properly worded so that no State would receive less than it received last year that you would first meet that requirement and then take the balance of the increase, however much it might be over the last year, and reapportion that out to those States that would reflect an increase as a result of the change in formula?

Mr. ESTES. Yes; that is right.

Mr. FORD. What is the method of apportioning it out beyond the floor? Is it a percentage?

Mr. ESTES. Using the ratable reduction. It would simply be an amount that would be distributed among the States based on that formula.

Mr. FORD. Now, the thing that disturbs me is that for New York, for example, you did not show that they would get the floor, period. You show them as hitting $300,000 more than the floor. How did you decide that New York would get $300,000 more than that? Does that $300,000 represent part of the increase?

Mr. ESTES. That is part of the amount that is available after we subtract the amount from the total amount available to make sure that the 15 States do not receive less than they received during fiscal year 1967. As you can tell, I am no expert as it relates to this formula.

Mr. FORD. Only 15 States received less.

Mr. ESTES. No: no State will receive less in fiscal year 1968.

Mr. FORD. Regardless of all of the factors they can all start off with what they had in fiscal year 1968 regardless of the percentage of funding?

Mr. ESTES. That is right.

Mr. FORD. Supposing instead of $1.2 billion we give exactly the amount of money you spent last year, would this give them what they had last year?

Mr. ESTES. That is right.

Mr. FORD. I don't understand how you can do that.

Mr. ESTES. The appropriation language builds in the floor provision which requires us to allocate the funds in such a way that no States will receive less in fiscal year 1968 than they received in 1967.

Mr. FORD. Last year you did this to my amendments that changed the impact-aid formula. For a few short weeks we had a parade in the streets of New York, Detroit, and other streets because they were going to get impact funds.

Then a sentence was put in the appropriation bill and we have had a commitment from the people that that would be changed this year. That said that under this on-going program no program shall receive more than it had been receiving before the additional people were added.

Now, I see a little difference here because what we did in 1967 was rewrite the formula. I think the chairman raised this point this morning. It would certainly be shocking if when we go to the extent of rewriting the formula and redesignating the method of distributing funds if the Appropriations Committee could go on indefinitely thwarting our attempts to rewrite the formula by simply saying we will always keep everybody at the level they were.

Perhaps I am wrong.