

doubt about it and I think the attorney general should have ruled otherwise.

I think all of us will agree extending the date will be reasonable to put these States on notice once and for all they have to move in this direction.

Mr. HAGENESS. As the representative here from the State of Washington I would be very happy to get a copy of the transcript of Mr. Ford's remarks that I could take back to show some of our legislators right now because we are having that problem.

Mr. FORD. I said it on television out there last year; maybe you didn't hear it.

Mr. HAGENESS. I would be glad to have it repeated. I do want to make this statement however in a State that equalizes, as the State of Washington, where there is a guaranteed figure statewide per pupil, the State does have some right.

As I explained this morning, there are some things about impact districts that the State and legislature as a whole do not understand but I think they would understand a statement of this kind and it would help us to clarify the picture.

We need to do something.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, could we go one further step. We did examine the possibility of a formula. Take, for example, your State. As I recall, it is 65/35 percent.

Mr. HAGENESS. It is less than that now but it is around 60 percent.

Mr. FORD. One approach to this might be to build a formula into this bill which equalizes the Federal aid with State aid given to the local district, whether it be 65 percent or 60 percent or 55 percent. If the State is giving you 65 percent of your local money then they can take into consideration 65 percent of your Federal fund in working out the utilization but not 100 percent of your Federal funds because they do not do it with the State money so why should they do it with Federal money?

Mr. MEEDS. I am not in entire agreement with the approach of the State of Washington, but it is heavily financed by the State.

Under our State law, and correct me if I am wrong, 80 percent of these impact funds will be counted in 1969.

Mr. HAGENESS. In 1968 you are right, it will be 85 percent.

Mr. MEEDS. We would appreciate that kind of amendment from you, Mr. Ford, to take care of that problem prior to 1969. I could hardly sponsor it.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me say that the State of Washington and the State of Michigan are really well represented here.

Mr. HAGENESS. We appreciate it, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Steiger.

Mr. STEIGER. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Mr. Rose, let me try to get clear, and I have gone through your testimony and I listened to you this morning and in checking through the bill and then rereading your testimony I will admit that I have some problems deciding where you think we ought to amend as compared to where the bill suggests we do amend.

You now agree that it would be possible to delay the date 1 year, is that correct, for the impact area?