

lieu of lands because as you say there are no lands available in this case. And I think we do have—as you say, the 1960 Omnibus Act for Hawaii did make this provision, and so it is of record.

I understand that the amount of funds that are expected to be authorized then by the provisions of this bill would be something over \$7 million, right, on your original grant?

Dr. WIEGMAN. This would be the Morrill Act endowment, \$7 million.

Mr. SISK. In addition to that then you will become qualified for annual amounts in what sum now?

Dr. WIEGMAN. \$50,000 under the first Morrill Act, another \$170,000 under the Bankhead-Jones Act. Those are the only two sections under which we would get an annual appropriation.

Under the Smith-Lever Act we would have to work out yearly a memorandum with the Secretary of Agriculture to fund programs agreeable between the Department of Agriculture and the Federal City College in extension type programs. This sum could vary anywhere from a \$100,000 to \$700,000 a year, which would be charged to the Department of Agriculture appropriation budget.

(Subsequently, the following letter was received for the record, in clarification of participation under the Smith-Lever Act:)

FEDERAL CITY COLLEGE,
Washington, March 14, 1968.

Hon. B. F. SISK,
U.S. House of Representatives,
2242 Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SISK: I would like to supplement my statement of Wednesday, March 13 on the Hearing of H.R. 15280 and S. 1999. The supplement relates to the Smith-Lever Act which authorizes and funds extension services at the Federal City College.

We wish to make it clear that the Department of Agriculture's appropriations for extension services in the District of Columbia will not constitute the entire cost but that the Federal City College will fund from its operating budget certain extension services.

The college is already expending funds for extension services, especially salaries for personnel and we intend that this procedure will continue even after receiving Smith-Lever funds for extension.

We do not want to leave the Committee with the opinion that the extension services will be funded entirely by the Department of Agriculture but that the Federal City College will, as do other land grant colleges, set aside funds to carry on extension programs in the District of Columbia.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK FARNER, President.

(See also letter from Federal City College at p. 38.)

Mr. SISK. One other question that unfortunately I should have the answer to but I have not had an opportunity to look into thoroughly enough—which goes to the matter that I know Mr. Zwach was very concerned about and the one that was brought out here by Mr. Nelsen—and that is this cooperative effort whereby certain of these funds you expect to share with the Washington Technical Institute. Are there any legal problems in connection with that? I am not opposed to this sharing of funds, but I am curious to know to what extent this has been studied in connection with making the Federal City College a land-grant college, to what extent is that also going to qualify the Washington Technical Institute which is, after all, a separate institution, to share in these funds. Will they be sharing in the capital grant?

Dr. WIEGMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SISK. To what extent?