

prate overall formula is to obtain a grant amount in terms of the Hawaii grant and the ratio of populations of that State and the District of Columbia. Using data of the 1960 census, this method yields an amount of \$7,241,706 for a capital grant fund for the District of Columbia.

"The sum of \$7,241,706 is small in comparison to the total needs but is an amount which compares fairly to that granted to each State." (S. Rep. No. 888, p. 8)

The Land-Grant College program is the only educational program administered by this Department under which the District of Columbia is not eligible for benefits. We think it is desirable to include the District of Columbia in that program, and therefore recommend favorable action on the above-mentioned provisions of these bills. (We defer to the views of the Department of Agriculture on the other provisions of the bills.)

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

WILBUR J. COHEN,
Acting Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., March 20, 1968.

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN,
*Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter of March 12, 1968 asking for a report on H.R. 15280 and S. 1999 to amend Title II of the District of Columbia Public Education Act.

The proposed bills would establish the Federal City College as a land-grant institution in accordance with the provisions of the Morrill Act of July 2, 1862. The Acts administered by this Department referred to in the bills are the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914 (38 Stat. 372; 7 U.S.C. 341-346, 347a, 348, 349); and the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 1087; 7 U.S.C. 1621-1629).

We recommend enactment of the Bills as they relate to the provisions which would be administered by the Department of Agriculture. The Bills would extend the benefits of the Smith-Lever Act through the Federal City College to the people of the District of Columbia.

We believe that the citizens of the District of Columbia are entitled to the benefits of the Cooperative Extension Service programs, particularly in 4-H youth development and home economics which are effectively carried out in the 50 States and Puerto Rico. The Bills authorize funds for Extension programs in the District that are in addition to present appropriations under the Smith-Lever Act, thereby not reducing the Federal payments for such work to the 50 States and Puerto Rico. The formula provisions of the Smith-Lever Act provide that additional funds since 1962 be distributed among the States 20 percent equally and the balance on the basis of farm and rural population. Since the District of Columbia is urban instead of a rural community, under the formula it would share only in the 20 percent. Hence, this Department strongly favors the provisions of the Bills authorizing such additional sums without regard to the formula as may be necessary to extend Cooperative Extension programs to the District of Columbia.

The designation of the District of Columbia as a State would permit allotments under Section 204(b) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1623(b)) to appropriate agencies of the District of Columbia for cooperative projects in marketing research and marketing services.

We make no recommendation regarding provisions of the Act which would be administered by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. SCHNITKER,
Acting Secretary.