

Dr. RALSTON. Well, I think the reasoning and logic behind it is—and maybe these gentlemen can answer it more effectively than I can, but most of the financial support for the District comes from Congress, whereas in the states we have state funds and their tax authorities and all of this so they ask that the state match whatever funds are appropriated.

As a matter of fact, in our Smith-Lever Act at the present time about 38 percent of our total funds are federal, about 42 percent is state, and about 20 percent is county, so you see we have a multiple financing arrangement in the original Smith-Lever Act which would be very much different I think than was felt could be handled effectively here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. HARSHA. Well, how much do you anticipate will be needed?

Dr. RALSTON. Well, I guess I really cannot answer this honestly until we sit down with the Federal City College to start to determine how much of a program and what kind of a program, when you get right down to specifics, we should try to conduct within the District of Columbia. But I think as Dr. Wiegman indicated, and as has been I think rather traditional of the Extension Service, we would think we ought to start with rather small funds and find our way and work through and let this grow dependent upon its success, and so forth, and report this back to appropriating bodies so they can determine the extent of the programs that should be carried on. As Dr. Wiegman indicated, somewhere between \$100,000 and \$7- or \$800,000 for this first year we might see as a figure that we could set about really having three kinds of staff: A staff who would administer the programs; then a specialist staff who would be part of the subsequent matter departments of the university probably, and then a field staff who would actually have offices in the District and become very much a part of those communities and neighborhoods that get access to those people.

Mr. HARSHA. Thank you.

Mr. SISK. Well, if I understand now, that—of course, the amount that might be available under the Smith-Lever Act would have to be a specific amount which is earmarked and appropriated by the appropriate committee of the Congress as approved by—for example, it would fall under the regular agricultural appropriation and be examined as an item.

Dr. RALSTON. Yes, sir; this is my understanding.

Mr. SISK. For example, Congressman Whitten of Mississippi is Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee; this would be a matter—it would have to be justified as an item in the budget.

Dr. RALSTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SISK. Now, I might say, by the way, that the Appropriation subcommittees are now in session, are now holding hearings, are very busily engaged in what actually you asking for. I would assume that you must have a figure already; if not, at what point do you expect to have it, if you are going to have funds in fiscal year '69.

Dr. RALSTON. Well, sir, we do not have a figure because we do not know what would be the disposal of this legislation. As a matter of fact—