

yet the determination of whether you are going to give more adequate education to the poorer kids, the socially and culturally deprived children, is your problem and your school board's problem, and not the suburbs or the rural people's problem.

Mr. BRIGGS. No, you misunderstand what I am trying to say. The point I was trying to make was not a matter of determination, but I was trying to say to you that in the big cities, there is less money available, even though the tax rate is higher. There is going to be less money available for the education of children, therefore, per pupil, much less per pupil, and this is true in every big city in America. We use only one-half as much money to educate a child in the inner city of Cleveland as we do in the suburbs around Cleveland, yet the tax rates of Cleveland might be greater than the tax rate in the suburbs, where twice as much money is available per child.

This is why I say it is important that we receive substantial moneys from both the State and the Federal Governments.

The point I want to make is that the foundation program in the system on distributing State moneys is such that the wealthiest school district in Ohio gets more money from the State than does the urban school district.

True, that what we have gotten from the Federal Government was properly earmarked for the real inner city problem, and if it had not been, the pressures for us to have spread that across our 154,000 children would have been so great that we could not have withstood it, despite the fact that the decision would have been ours.

Mr. QUIE. Well, I judge from the other superintendents here that they have enough political strength with their boards so that what they say goes as far as the distribution of general aid. They have the sensitivity to realize that the poorer kids should receive the benefit, as the Federal Government and this Congress does, and you say that there is something else.

Now it either has to be Cleveland, or else there is a problem in the makeup of the urban centers where this cannot be accomplished.

Mr. DONOVAN. I think if I may indicate here—and I know there are differences between cities and their approach to this matter—it is not necessarily the political strength of the board or the superintendent; I do not know what it has to do with, a number of general things. In the city of New York, the public is not objecting to the spending of money in the ghetto areas. Not only are they not objecting, they are saying that is where it should be spent.

"How about us; we need some more," but they are not complaining that they are spending, because I think we realize that we have to raise the children in these areas to the level of opportunity where they can compete with other children who have had a favored circumstance.

I do not think the Congress should predicate its action on the frailties of one State, nor on the successes of another State. I think this is so delicate a matter that it is not easily resolved, and is going to require a lot of talking, a lot more study than we have had the opportunity to do up to now.

What we really would like to see is general Federal aid, within some guidelines set by the Federal Government, but not 116 details to the guideline that cause all the redtape that has us choked at the moment,