can check me on this—this is sort of the New York portion; isn't that where the figure came from originally in the facilities program?

Mr. MUIRHEAD. Yes; 12½ percent, as you know, is a governor to prevent too large an amount of money flowing to one State. By and large, I think the rationale for reaching the 12½ percent was that in most Federal programs that are based upon some measure of population—be it the number of high-school graduates, the elementary-secondary school enrollment, or college enrollment—about 10 percent of the money, or a little above that, tends to flow to the highest-population State.

Mr. BURTON. This is based on the 1963 standard?

Mr. MUIRHEAD. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. Well, then, would you have any objection that within the framework of this limitation, that we permit an upgrading, using that 1963 ratio? You are seeking long-term authorization, and my own State may well have more than 12½ percent of the college students toward the end of this program, and I wouldn't think you would be suggesting that a student in California would be precluded from the same consideration as students elsewhere.

Mr. MUIRHEAD. No, Mr. Congressman; the 12½-percent figure is there because it has been a kind of established governor. You are quite right that it probably should be reexamined.

Mr. BURTON. The other question I have is, the $15,000 family amount just simply does not mean the same thing in some States as it does in others. Would you object to some kind of an increment factor for those States that have a cost of living that is distinguishably greater than the national average; or, putting it somewhat differently, many workers in our city receive, including fringe benefits, just something around the order of $6 an hour and cannot be considered to be in the same kind of income limitation standards operative in Mississippi or some of the other States; that $15,000 figure means a good deal more to families in some parts of the country than they certainly do in our part of the country.

Mr. GIBBONS. Will you yield on that? I think you are off on a dangerous ground; grits cost the same out in Los Angeles as it does in Mississippi, and 10 pounds of potatoes cost the same thing, give or take a couple of pennies; and I think the people in California ought to be very thankful they have as high an income as they have without trying to distort this thing further.

Mr. BURTON. I am trying to ascertain from the witness before us his views, before we resolve this among ourselves.

Mr. HOWE. If I could comment on this, I think I would say that we are going to consider more precise measures than the $15,000 for establishing need, and this is why it is put in there. I think I prefer to look at the kind of measures that were being suggested by Mr. Reid earlier in this discussion this morning than trying to pull into this legislation the variable business of cost of living in different parts of the country.

It seems to me that it is possible to establish need in a more precise fashion than the way it is now done by financial-aid officers in institutions. There has been a customary practice, and there is a well-trained expertise to do this sort of thing, but I seriously question whether the direction you are suggesting would be the constructive one.