this concern, I think, but I think we can establish a better total working relationship, and a greater sensitivity. This is a matter of speculation, I would say, but I think so.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Briggs?

Mr. BRIGGS. I am sorry, but I am afraid I cannot agree to the extent that perhaps my distinguished colleague from New York has described the New York situation. I am afraid that if title I moneys in Ohio had been given merely to the State to distribute, according to a formula that they might have devised, that the people who live in poverty and the children from poverty would not have profited from these moneys to the extent that they have.

I am sorry, but I am sure that this is the case. We only have to look to title II of the same act to see this. Title II allowed for the State to develop a program for distribution, a State program of distribution of moneys. The only provision was that there should be devised by the State a formula that would take into consideration need.

Therefore, in Ohio today, the children from the city of Cleveland, who are—and, by the way, one-fifth of our children are from ADC homes—the children from the city of Cleveland have less money per child under title II than the average child in the State of Ohio, and much less than those from the rural sections of the State.

Mr. QUIE. Why is that?

Mr. BRIGGS. Because the State program, which the State established, approved by the State board of education, where they established their own criteria of need, is quite different than what was established under title I by the Congress.

Mr. QUIE. But need is not a basis of title II?

Mr. BRIGGS. It was a basis of the distribution in the State of Ohio, and it was a basis of the guidelines as established by HEW.

Mr. FORD. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. QUIE. Yes, I yield.

Mr. FORD. I believe that almost every State, if not every State, has a double factor, and need is a factor written into the State plans of almost all the States. They distribute part of the money on a per capita basis and then have a need factor that also kicks in. Is that pretty well true, across the country?

We had occasion to look into this at the end of last year.

Mr. BRIGGS. Yes, this is correct.

Mr. QUIE. In that sense, Cleveland has greater need than the rest of the State, they receive less money?

Mr. BRIGGS. No: according to the State plan, the State plan shows that Cleveland has a lesser need. What I am trying to say is that if you had distributed title I moneys the way you did title II moneys, the children in the poverty areas, in the ghetto, would not have profited the way they did. There is no question in my mind about that in the State of Ohio.

Mr. QUIE. Yes; go ahead. You give an answer, if you are ready.

Mr. BRIGGS. I finished my answer.

Mr. QUIE. No: I mean the next gentleman.

Mr. VINCENT. I speak for the city of Milwaukee, Congressman. We would have no hesitancy about permitting the State department to