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the most significant work is done. In view of the similarity of House and Senate committee procedures and the repetition of information presented to both, this thesis deals primarily with information presented before the House Committee on Education and Labor. The first section deals with the issue of Federal aid to education because the author believes that this is background information necessary to understand the arguments which permeate each piece of education legislation. The remaining sections of this paper present outlines of and projected applications of Title V, Part A of H. R. 3000 and of H.R. 4955 and subsequent House and Senate actions on these measures.
PROS AND CONS OF FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Federal aid to education remains a controversial issue and has been introduced here in order to show party differences, pressure group influence, and the concentrated attention that any proposed major legislation in this area receives on Capitol Hill.

On January 29, 1963, the President of the United States sent a message to Congress setting forth a program for education and a draft of a bill designed to strengthen and improve educational quality and opportunity in the nation. In this message President Kennedy urged that this legislation be enacted as a whole since "education cannot easily or wisely be divided into separate parts."¹

With this proposal the 88th Congress was confronted with a controversy that rings not only in Washington, D.C., but throughout the country -- active Federal participation in education. This is part of the larger issues: to what extent shall the Federal government concentrate or disperse its powers? One side argues that education is a Federal responsibility because it is essential to the national welfare. It also contends that the state and local governments can no longer adequately support educational demands

¹Message From the President of the United States, p. 4.
without Federal financial aid.²

The broad argument against Federal aid is based on a stricter interpretation of the Constitution in an effort to limit the powers and responsibilities that the Federal government may exercise. It is contended that the Federal government has no specific powers in the realm of education. State and local agencies are in a better position to meet the needs of their schools and the school must be kept close to the control of the community. Also it is held that extensive Federal participation in this realm would be disastrous both to education and to the Federal government.³

Over the last one hundred years each side has sharpened the issues and made little progress toward a resolution. The specific arguments of the proponents of Federal aid to education are set forth as follows:

1. The present level of school support is too low to provide the type of educational system required in this atomic and space age. The American economy can afford to invest in education a far higher share of the national income than it does at the present time. Only the national government has access to the national economy and can obtain the necessary means. The Federal government can carry out its assigned functions and duties only by assuming a major part of the financial responsibility for public education.

2. The Federal government has long provided aid

²Legislative Analysis 1962, p. 8.
³Ibid.
for roads, public welfare, airports, health and hospitals, and many other state and local public functions. Those services are neither more important nor more worthy of Federal support than education. The principal of Federal support for education was established by the Ordinance of 1785 and pronounced in the Northwest Ordinance of 1787. It was reaffirmed by grants-in-aid for vocational education, for school lunches, to federally-affected areas, and in the National Defense Education Act.

3. Serious shortages of teachers and classrooms exist throughout the nation. The deficiencies are presently estimated at 142,000 classrooms and upward of 100,000 teachers and are soaring as enrollments continue to climb. Classes are overcrowded; teachers are badly underpaid. This deprives many children of a good education and harms their development beyond repair. Teachers could be paid higher salaries, more qualified persons attracted to and kept in the teaching profession, and sufficient classrooms built if Federal funds were provided for these purposes.

4. There is a direct and vital national interest in the adequate education of all American children. The Federal government, as the guardian of the national interest, has the responsibility to assure an equal educational opportunity for all children, no matter where they live. Both political parties advocated Federal aid to schools in their platforms and both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy have proposed it.

5. The Federal Government has vastly superior taxing powers. It now collects three-fourths of all taxes (Federal, state, and local) in the United States and has preempted the major and most productive tax sources. Its taxes are of a more desirable type than those levied by states and local governments. The latter are close to—or have reached—the limit of their fiscal capacity and cannot continue to boost their taxes and debts. If left entirely to state and local revenue sources, education (and other services) will suffer.
6. Federal financial support can be given without Federal Control. Federal aid bills under consideration stipulate that no agency of the Federal Government shall exercise any control over local schools. Experience with existing grant-in-aid programs in education has demonstrated that funds can be provided without undue control by the Federal Government.4

The need for an adequate educational system is further demonstrated by the fact that unemployment and inadequate education go hand-in-hand. Even when there are openings on the labor market, lack of sufficient education limits mobility and adaptability of workers.5

The fact that more students are being kept in school longer and are being offered a more diversified program cannot help but increase the cost of education in our nation today. The property tax used by most state and local governments to finance a large portion of education cost is geared to the productivity of an agrarian economy. We no longer have an agrarian economy able to support the need of our exploding urban and industrial society.6 Something must be done. Proponents of federal aid to education feel that it can best be accomplished by Federal grants to the states.

The opponents of Federal aid set forth their arguments as follows:

4Legislative Analysis 1962, p. 8-9.
6Ibid., p. 18.
1. Our present educational deficiencies are due not to a lack of funds, but to unwise use of the available resources. The financial support of education has shown spectacular increases, both in absolute and relative terms. It would have increased even more if requirements of national defense had not become so heavy. The share of the national income allocated to education has risen dramatically; it is larger—and education is more amply supported—than in other countries. A larger percentage of our young people participate in full-time education for more years than their counterparts under a system of state and local support. State powers and responsibilities in education are clearly established by the constitutions of the several states and are deeply embedded in the American tradition.

2. The Federal Government has, over the past 30 years, expanded the scope of its activities to encompass a multitude of state and local functions. This trend, if continued, will make the Federal Government all-powerful, leaving the states empty shells, a travesty on the Federal Union of Sovereign States created in 1787. The land grants and the later grants-in-aid affecting education—such as vocational aid, school lunches, etc.—were adopted to remedy a temporary situation then existing. They were not intended to become permanent nor to establish the principle of Federal responsibility to education.

3. Shortages of teachers and classrooms have been greatly exaggerated and are rapidly diminishing. The numbers of pupils per teacher and per classroom have been consistently declining. The rate of enrollment growth in the 1960's will be half that of the 1950's, and it will not be necessary to maintain the present rate of construction. Wasteful practices and inefficient school-district organization account for much of the often-quoted deficiencies. Many schools engage in activities which are outside their proper sphere while neglecting their primary responsibility to teach the essential skills.

Numerous proposals have been made for fuller and more effective use of the available resources.
facilities and manpower and for the employment of television and other technological tools. These much-needed improvements are often being resisted by the forces pushing for Federal aid.

4. It is true that there is a national interest in education—as well as in all other functions of state and local government. Likewise, there is a state interest in the various services provided by the Federal Government. All levels of government have a mutual interest in each other's activities. But, this means no more that the Federal Government should pay for state functions than that state governments should pay for Federal operations. The fundamental principle of the Federal system is a division of governmental authority and responsibility—not a sharing of every function by every type and level of government.

5. The Federal Government boosted its share of all tax collections (Federal, state, and local) from one-third to three-fourths during World War II to meet the cost of national defense. Ever since the war, the Federal share has been declining but is still unduly high (almost two-thirds) because the national government has entered several fields of state and local responsibility. The weight of Federal taxes is the major factor limiting state and local fiscal capacity. This cannot be corrected by adding to national responsibilities. A major entry of the Federal government into the field of education could well push the Federal share of all taxes to 80 per cent, 90 per cent, or more. This would turn the states into mere local administrative subdivisions of the national government.

The allegedly superior taxing powers of the Federal Government have been inadequate to meet even its own expenditures in 24 of the past 30 years. The national debt has increased by nearly $270 billion (from $16 billion to $285 billion) during this period, an average of $9 billion a year. Acceptance of responsibility for education would force the Federal Government either
to boost its already confiscatory taxes or to expand the national debt, thus feeding the fires of inflation.

If school outlays are to be increased at a faster rate than the growth of the national economy, then the funds will have to be obtained through higher taxes. To pretend that an additional tax dollar will overburden the taxpayers, if raised at state and local levels, but is available freely and without an added burden at the Federal level, is a snare and a delusion. Federal tax rates are already at extreme levels while state and local tax rates are low.

The real objective of the drive for Federal aid to education, and its result if successful, is a shift in the control of school policies and programs from the people to the educational bureaucracy.

6. It is naive to assume that Congress would appropriate billions of dollars without sooner or later trying to assure that the sums are efficiently spent. Most of the Federal aid proposals vest unprecedented powers over the distribution of funds in the hands of national and state offices of education—at the expense of the state and local general authorities.

Federal aid is being promoted by school administrators who face a growing dissatisfaction with their educational methods and results. Federal aid would make them more independent of their boards of education, state legislatures and local voters, and parents. The educational bureaucrats could, with the help of their counterparts at the Federal levels, turn the schools increasingly into institutes for social adjustment. To gain support they are trying to create the illusion that Federal money is free and that the taxpayers would get something for nothing.

The opponents of Federal aid hold that the obstacles to a higher level of school support lie largely in these three factors:
(a) The crushing weight of total tax burden--largely Federal--which now claims one-third of the national income;

(b) dissatisfaction of the parents and the public at large with the low standards of learning in the public schools;

(c) resistance of the educational bureaucracy to proposals for greater efficiency in the use of instructional manpower and facilities.

The opponents state that none of these factors would be remedied by Federal aid, and that more likely, they would be aggravated.7

In the past two decades the median number of years of education completed by adults 25 years of age and over has increased from 8.4 years to 11.0 years.8 School districts have consolidated and have reduced their numbers by 56%, thus eliminating many inferior schools.9 This has been accomplished by the state and local governments, and they can continue to meet the needs of the schools, claim the opponents of Federal aid. It is not denied that needs do exist, but a means of meeting them other than active Federal participation is required. The term "Federal aid" itself leads to confusion. Some members of Congress feel that the Federal government can give "aid" in such a way as to allow the states to continue financing their schools.

7Legislative Analysis 1962, p. 9-12.
9Ibid., p. 2.
One method for giving aid to higher education advocated by Congressman Ralph Harvey (R.-Ind.) is to provide tax exemptions at the Federal level to parents supporting college students. Congressman Donald Bruce (R.-Ind.), a member of the Education and Labor Committee, stated in a personal interview with the author that a reform of the Federal tax system would make it possible for education to remain a state responsibility. One specific suggestion was to allow institutions of higher learning to issue bonds on the same tax basis as municipal bonds.

Although there are individual differences within each party, it can be generalized that the Democratic Party is for and the Republican Party is against Federal aid to education.

The subject of whether to authorize Federal financial assistance for the "general support" of elementary and secondary schools has been before Congress since 1872 when such a bill passed the House, but not the Senate.\textsuperscript{10} Until 1958 with the enactment of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, no such bill providing general support had passed both Houses.\textsuperscript{11} This bill was a compromise growing out of the accelerated educational program resulting from the "Spirit of Sputnik". It was evident, therefore, that President Kennedy's comprehensive 24-point proposal, covering

\textsuperscript{10} Bill Analysis, p. 1.
\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., p. 2.
education from elementary to graduate school, and from teachers' salaries to libraries, and also including a section on vocational education, was not new, but in view of Congress's past actions it was very unlikely that this bill would be enacted in its original form.
BACKGROUND AND GENERAL OUTLINE OF H.R. 3000

The National Education Improvement Act of 1963 was proposed to Congress in a message from President Kennedy on January 29, 1963. On that same day the bill was introduced in the Senate by Mr. Morse for himself and for Mr. McNamara, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Clark, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Pell, Mr. Mansfield, and Mr. Humphrey. The bill received the number S. 580 and was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. In the House of Representatives the bill was introduced by Mr. Adam Clayton Powell, was given the number H.R. 3000, and was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The bill was divided into six main parts under which 24 specific points were incorporated. Title I was called Expansion of Opportunities for Individuals in Higher Education; Title II was called Expansion and Improvement of Higher Education; Title III dealt with Improvement of Educational Quality; Title IV proposed a program for Strengthening

1For list of committee members see Appendix p. 41.

2It may be noted here that while any number of Senators may lend their names to a bill, it is the custom in the House for only one Member to do so.
Elementary and Secondary Education. Title V, which will be dealt with later at greater length, is concerned with Expansion and Improvement of Vocational Education and Special Education. Title VI is entitled Expansion of Continuing Education. Federal control of education is prohibited by Title VII. Fourteen of the twenty-four points provided in the bill were considered major proposals.

A summary of these proposals follows:

**Student Loans**—Raise the ceiling of $90 million on annual Federal appropriations for college student loans to $135 million and eliminate the yearly ceiling of $250 thousand on loans to students at any one institution.

**Loan Insurance**—Supplement direct college student loans by insuring commercial loans to students who could not meet the criteria for direct Federal help. Insured loans would be limited to $2,000 a year.

**Work-Study**—Appropriate $22.5 million to pay half of the wages for student campus employment of an educational character of up to 15 hours per week.

**Fellowships**—Increase the National Defense Education Act graduate fellowship programs from 1,500 to 10,000 annually for the next three fiscal years, plus 2,000 additional summer session fellowships. These fellowships now pay from $2,000 to $2,400 a year.

**Construction**—Authorize $1 billion over three years of Federal loans to public and private colleges for the building of academic facilities.

**Junior Colleges**—Appropriate $50 million for Fiscal 1964 "and such sums as are necessary for two succeeding years" for grants to states to construct community junior colleges.

**College Libraries**—Appropriate $40 million for the first year of a three-year program to help colleges and universities build libraries and acquire books. Construction grants would be on a 50-50 matching basis, with Federal funds
going for only 25 per cent of book and material costs.

Graduate Schools--Appropriate $40 million to start a similar grant program to expand graduate schools.

Languages--Extend for two years existing laws aiding public and private institutions of higher learning in the study of foreign languages with an increase in funds from $8 million annually to $13 million for fiscal 1964.

Teacher Institutes--Expand authority for teacher institutes financed by the Office of Education to admit teachers of English, humanities, social sciences and library personnel; increase funds from $14.5 million to $37.5 million.

Specialized Training--Finance, with an initial appropriation of $7.5 million, a three-year program to help train teachers for the mentally retarded and other handicapped children, of gifted or culturally deprived children, and of adult literacy.

Teacher Preparation Programs--Project grants to colleges and universities to strengthen departments and programs which prepare elementary and secondary school teachers. Emphasis will be on subject matter courses. For fiscal year 1964 $7.5 million and necessary sums for the next two years. Public and private non-profit education institutions eligible.

Vocational Education--Vocational Education programs to be expanded to meet the needs of individuals in all age groups for training in occupations where they can find employment in today's diverse labor markets. By increasing Federal expenditures from $50 million to $73 million for the fiscal year 1964, and "necessary sums for each of the succeeding four years".3

The total cost for this program for four years would be approximately $5.3 billion. The comprehensive program calls for new obligational authority of $.2 billion and actual

spending of $43.6 million--above present levels--in the 1964 fiscal year.\footnote{Ibid., p. 2.}

While President Kennedy strongly urged the passage of the bill as a whole, it was doubtful from the beginning that Congress would do so. The \textit{National Education Improvement Act of 1963}\index{National Education Improvement Act of 1963} has been called "too big a bite" for Congress to swallow all at once. It was clear, however, that Congress intended to strongly consider some of the proposed measures individually. One such proposal was Title V-A, entitled \textit{Expansion and Improvement of Vocational Education}.\footnote{Ibid., p. 2.}
OUTLINE AND PROJECTED APPLICATION OF
TITLE V-A AND 4955

Since 1917 the Federal government has been partici-
pating in the public vocational education program. In that
year the government entered the field as a result of the
passage of the Smith-Hughes Act, which provided $7 million
per year for the promotion of vocational education.\(^1\) This
bill is still in effect today. In 1946 the George-Barden
Act was passed, providing $29 million per year. This act
established vocational education categories.\(^2\) Each state
receives an allotment for each category, the amount arrived

\(^1\) Appropriations for allotment to states under Smith-
Hughes Act (P.L. 347, 64th Congress) as follows:

For vocational instruction in: Allotted on the Basis of: Amount:
Agriculture Rural Population $3,000,000
Total rural population of State X $3,000,000 = State's Allotment
Total rural population of U.S.

Trade, home economics Urban population $3,000,000
and industry
Total urban population of State X $3,000,000 = State's Allotment
Total urban population of U.S.

Teacher training

Total population of State X $1,000,000 = State's Allotment
Total population of U.S.

\(^2\) For list of vocational categories see chart on page 18.
at by a fixed formula. In 1956 $5 million dollars were provided by the Practical Nurse Amendment, and the Fishery Training Amendment pulled another $180,000 per year into one of the fields of vocational education. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 established a new Title III in the George-Barden Act authorizing $15 million per year to assist in technical training. The Manpower Development and Training Act, 1962, provided $20 million for job training for those who have lost their jobs as a result of technological advance or a change in the structure of the economy. To establish a program to alleviate conditions of substantial and chronic unemployment and under-employment in economically distressed areas, the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961 was enacted and provided $3 million for job training in 1962.

---

3 George-Barden Act (P.L. 586, 79th Congress):
Title I - For Vocational Instruction in:
Agriculture---------------- Farm population $10,000,000
Distributive occupation------ Total population 2,000,000
Home economics-------------- Rural population 8,000,000
Trades and industry-------- Non-farm population 8,000,000
Fisheries occupations------ Extent of industry 375,000
Necessary to guarantee minimums on above-------- 1950 census 767,080

4 Education for a Changing World of Work, p. 6.
5 Ibid.
6 Ibid.
7 Ibid., p. 7.
These acts are the major vocational education statutes. This summary does not include the laws authorizing special vocational education programs which trained 7.5 million people during World War II at a five-year cost of $297 million.\(^8\)

On February 20, 1961, in a message to Congress President Kennedy stated that "...our vocational education effort is sound and sufficiently broad to provide a basis... however, the technological changes...call for a review and re-evaluation of these acts...." The President requested that Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare convene an advisory body drawn from the professions of agriculture, labor-industry, and education to meet with representatives from the Departments of Agriculture and Labor.\(^9\) The purpose of this group was to review and evaluate the current National Vocational Education Acts and make recommendations for improving and redirecting the program. The Panel of Consultants began work in October, 1961, and published their report in November, 1962. This group concluded

\(^8\)Ibid., p. 6.

\(^9\)Message From the President of the United States, p. 24.

\(^10\)List of members on Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benjamin C. Willis, Chairman</th>
<th>Charles W. Engelhard</th>
<th>Charles E. Odell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary C. Bingham</td>
<td>Edward B. Evans</td>
<td>James G. Patton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles F. Carroll</td>
<td>Henry A. Gonzales</td>
<td>J.B. Perky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred T. Corletto</td>
<td>Francis A. Gregory</td>
<td>Thomas Quigley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest H. Dean</td>
<td>Floyd D. Johnson</td>
<td>Helen N. Radke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ellingson</td>
<td>Helen R. LeBaron</td>
<td>Peter Schoemann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret C. Eells</td>
<td>William B. Logan</td>
<td>Paul H. Sheats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dael Wolfe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that vocational education is a local-state-Federal partnership. At the present time local sources provide $117 million, states provide $89 million, and the Federal government provides $48 million. Today's $250 million program benefits four million students (half are adults) in 2/3 of our high schools and many colleges. 11 It has been projected that by 1970.58 million people now working will still be employed, 26 million young workers will enter the labor market, and 3 million women will leave housework for full-time employment. 12 This Panel resolved that the Federal Government should provide at least $400 million in 1963-64 for vocational education. They proposed that the 1963-64 Federal appropriation include:

For youth in high school who are:  
1. preparing to enter labor market or become homemakers...............$200  
2. for high school youth academic, socio-economic or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education program...............$10  
3. for youth and adults who have left or completed high school and are full-time students preparing to enter the labor market...............$50  
4. youth and adults unemployed or at work who need training or retraining to achieve employment stability...............$100

12 Ibid., p. 2.
5. for services and facilities required to acquire quality in all vocational and technical education programs ........ $40

Title V-A of the National Education Improvement Act is a result of the findings of this advisory body. In this act vocational education is defined as follows:

...vocational or technical training or retraining which is given in schools or classes (including field or laboratory work incidental thereto) under public supervision and control or under contract with a State or local educational agency, and is conducted as a part of a program designed to fit individuals for useful employment as skilled workers or technicians in recognized occupations....

This act would up-date and expand the present permanent program of Federal grants to the states for vocational education, particularly the provisions of the George-Barden Act enacted in 1946. This is part of an effort to provide vocational training and retraining for young people and adults for productive employment in an expanding and changing labor market.

Title V-A is based on two conclusions. One is that in view of our rising population and school costs the appropriation levels provided in our present statutes are insufficient. The second conclusion is that the occupational categories established by the George-Barden Act are not longer adequate to meet the needs of our labor market. The present categories are agriculture, home

---

14 National Education Improvement Act of 1963, p. 126.
economics, distribution, fisheries, practical nursing, technicians, and trades and industry. An appropriation is made for each of these categories and each state is allotted by formula a fixed amount for each category.

It has been charged that under the present regulations a state operates its vocational education program according to allotment, not according to training needs.

Title V-A specifies that funds would be allocated to the same groups recommended as eligible by the Panel of Consultants. This bill calls for an increase of Federal expenditures from $50 million to $73 million for the 1964 fiscal year and "necessary sums for each of the succeeding four years". The President refused to go along with the Panel of Consultants on their request that the appropriation be increased to $400 million. Additional provisions are for construction and equipping of required area vocational education school facilities and services to improve the quality of vocational education programs. This includes teacher training and supervision, research, demonstrations, program evaluation, development of instructional materials, and administration.16 States would receive allotments based on various age groups needing vocational education and per capita income. A transition period of two years during which states may continue to follow previous programs is provided. The states must, however, conform to the new

16 A Compilation of Materials Relevant to the National Education Improvement Act of 1963, p. 57.
plan requirements by 1966. Grants under the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 will continue. Public schools only are eligible.

This act provides for a substantial increase in funds for vocational education by completely replacing appropriations under the George-Barden Act and eliminating the category system therein. Except in the appropriations aspect this bill follows very closely the recommendations of the Panel of Consultants.

On March 18, 1963, Representative Carl Perkins (D.-Ky.) introduced a related vocational education bill H.R. 4955. This act would retain the present vocational education laws and would amend them to authorize additional funds. H.R. 4955 would provide for an authorization of $45,000,000 for fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for fiscal year 1965 $90,000,000, for fiscal year 1966 $135,000,000, for fiscal year 1967 $180,000,000, and $180,000,000 for each fiscal year thereafter. These Federal funds are to be used in vocational education programs for persons attending high schools, persons available for full-time study who have completed or left high school, persons who have entered the labor market and need training or retraining, persons with academic, socio-economic or other handicaps, construction, and services and activities to insure quality in vocational education programs. One section provides

---

17Vocational Education Act of 1963, p. 2.
18Ibid., p. 5-6.
for the extension of practical nurse training and area vocational education programs by amending the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to read "succeeding fiscal years".¹⁹

The final section of the bill proposes a periodic review of programs and laws dealing with vocational education.

The major differences between Title V-A and H.R. 4955 as originally introduced are the amount of appropriations needed, the length of the program (Title V-A provides for five year program while H.R. 4955 proposes a permanent program), and the program most suitable to meet existing needs (Title V-A allocates funds according to recommendations of the Panel of Consultants while H.R. 4955 continues the category system established under the George-Barden Act).

¹⁹Ibid., p. 21.
COMMITTEE ACTION ON TITLE V-A AND H.R. 4955

This section of the paper deals with the House and Senate committee action on the proposed legislation. Hearings were held in Washington, D.C. for twelve days by the full Committee on Education and Labor to consider H.R. 3000.\textsuperscript{1} During these twelve days of hearings the Committee received testimony, both oral and written, of 32 witnesses, as well as numerous letters, resolutions, and platforms from interested persons and groups.\textsuperscript{2} Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, appeared as the first witness on February 4, 1963, to urge the passage of H.R. 3000, also known as the Omnibus Bill. The Committee heard testimony from many distinguished persons in the field of education. The Committee went into executive session at the conclusion of these hearings to evaluate its findings and plan subsequent action. The bill was referred to the Subcommittee on Education. In March 1963 the Subcommittee held further hearings on the several sections of the bill.\textsuperscript{3}

The office of the Education and Labor Committee released the information that the Subcommittee decided to consider H.R. 3000 as four separate bills. The

\textsuperscript{1} February 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 26, and 27, 1963.

\textsuperscript{2} For list of Committee Members see Appendix, page 40.

\textsuperscript{3} Hearings on Title V-A held on March 25, 26, 27, 29, April 2, 9, 10, 22, 23, 24, 26, and 30.
vocational education section to be known as Title V-A.

Three alternative measures for vocational education were subsequently considered by the Subcommittee, the President's proposal as set forth in Title V-A, Carl Perkins' bill entitled H.R. 4955, and a possible compromise "clean bill". According to Charles Ratcliff, Minority Counsel, the Committee considered a compromise bill which would provide an increase in spending closely following the President's proposal for increased funds. It would have retained the category system. There would have been included, however, a provision for the transposition of funds from one category to another to meet the individual needs of the different states. This would provide greater flexibility for the states to meet the changing demands of the labor market. It would also circumvent the charge that the Federal government would be dumping money into vocational education without specific provisions. On June 6, 1963, the Committee ordered H.R. 4955 reported favorably to the House. On August 6, 1963, this bill passed the House by a vote of 377 to 21.4

The Senate Education Subcommittee held 17 days of hearings on Title V-A of S. 580 beginning April 29 and ending June 25, 1963.5 The Senate received H.R. 4955 on August 7, 1963, and it was referred to the Committee on

4 Senate Report No. 553, p. 2.
5 Ibid.
Labor and Public Welfare. In executive session the Education Subcommittee considered both bills on September 10 and 11. The Committee recommended that H.R. 4955 be considered in the light of the June 19th message from the President wherein he stated:

(C) That the pending vocational education amendments, which would greatly update and expand this program of teaching job skills to those in school, be strengthened by the appropriation of additional funds, with some of the added money earmarked for those areas with a high incidence of school dropouts and youth unemployment, and by the addition of a new program of demonstration youth training projects to be conducted in these areas;

(D) That the vocational education program be further amended to provide a work-study program for youth of high school age, with Federal funds helping their school or other local public agency employ them part-time in order to enable and encourage them to complete their training.

The Senate Subcommittee amended H.R. 4955 by striking the text of the bill as passed by the House and substituting four new parts. Part A incorporated the text of Title V-A modified to incorporate provisions for a five year program as presented in the above June 19th message. Part B dealt with the extension of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Part C provided for the extension of P.L. 815 and 874. Title VI-C of S. 580 was incorporated as Part D.

On September 25, 1963, the full Committee deleted

---

6 For list of Committee members see Appendix, p.
Part D and ordered H.R. 4955 as thus amended reported favorably to the Senate. A comparison of the authorized appropriations in the House and Senate versions of H.R. 4955 is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocational Education</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal year 1964</td>
<td>$45  million</td>
<td>$108 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal year 1965</td>
<td>$90  million</td>
<td>$153 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal year 1966</td>
<td>$135 million</td>
<td>$198 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal year 1967 and after</td>
<td>$180 million</td>
<td>$243 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Schools</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal year 1964</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following four years</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work-Study Grants</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal year 1964</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The versions of H.R. 4955 as passed by the House and Senate are virtually different bills. The House passed a rather uncomplicated vocational education bill. The Senate, in an attempt to enact as much as possible of the President's program for education, amended the bill until it read like Title V-A with amendments. The reason the Senate Committee amended the bill in this manner rather than pigeon-holing it was because if the Senate passed Title V-A it would be necessary for this bill to proceed again through all the proper channels in the House. Both versions of the bill were sent to a Conference Committee having the authority to change or amend a bill in any way to make a compromise suitable to both legislative bodies. The rule sending the bill to

---

9Ibid., p. 3.
conference was granted on October 24, 1963. The Committee published its report on December 10, 1963. The bill as approved by the House-Senate conferees was a modified version of H.R. 4955 as passed by the Senate. The appropriations were cut to $60 million for fiscal year 1964, $118.5 million for fiscal year 1965, $177.5 million for fiscal year 1966, and $225 million for subsequent fiscal years.\(^\text{10}\) The conference reduced the Senate proposed program for residential vocational education schools and payments for student work-study programs from a five year to a four year program. The Senate amendment Part B extended the National Defense Education Act of 1958 for three years beyond June 30, 1964. The House version had no such section. The conferees amended this extension to one year. Part C was reduced by the conferees from a three year to a two year extension of P.L. 815 and P.L. 874, which deals with schools in federally affected areas.

This bill entitled the *Vocational Education Act of 1963* became law when signed by President Johnson on December 18, 1963. It was numbered Public Law 88-210.

---

\(^{10}\text{Public Law 88-210, p. 1.}\)
PRESSURES THAT INFLUENCE DECISIONS

Once legislation has been introduced it is necessary to establish a need for such legislation and the priority it should receive. In order to handle the cumbersome job that this entails, bills are referred to a related standing committee, in the case of the bills under discussion the Education and Labor Committee. Some of the principal means the committee has of determining need and priority are the testimony, letters, and resolutions of national groups, representatives of educational organizations, Federal officials, and state officials. The vocational education programs before the 1st Session of the 88th Congress received the attention of national organizations concerned with this area.

In testimony before the House Education and Labor Committee the AFL-CIO Executive Council endorsed the Omnibus Bill in general terms. It expressed its approval of the new, broader basis for allotting Federal funds to the states. The Council, however, feels that the appropriation for vocational education should be at least $150 million. The Council expressed its support of the findings of the Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education and agreed that if vocational education is to keep up with the changing labor market it must develop and improve the skills in those areas advocated by the Panel.
The International Union of Electrical Radio and Machine Workers, AFL-CIO has resolved that legislation for vocational education "should be still enlarged and strengthened to meet modern needs and conditions".¹

Paul Cooke, National Vice Chairman of the American Veterans Committee, testified before the subcommittee to express his organization's support of Title V-A. Mr. Cooke stated that the American Veterans Committee was keenly interested in education legislation because his group felt education to be the cornerstone of our country. The AVC endorsed Title V-A as a step in improving education for a better tomorrow.

George L. Ramey, Director of Mayo State Vocational-Technical School, appeared before the House Subcommittee on Education to express the view of the vocational leaders of Kentucky in urging the passage of H.R. 4955. Mr. Ramey statement supported H.R. 4955 because it provided for people who need vocational-technical training, but cannot get it because of lack of funds. He spoke of H.R. 4955 as follows:

This bill is unique in that it recognizes the fact that too often people who perhaps need vocational-technical training simply cannot afford to attend school due to their financial conditions. This has been one of the major factors in creating a high unemployment rate in many areas, not only this, but it has contributed much to the problem of delinquency, which is becoming a problem of National concern.

¹The Resolution on Skilled Trades and Apprenticeship Training, p. 7.
The American Vocational Association, the chief lobbying organization for vocational education and an organization with considerable influence on Capitol Hill, went on record as "favoring the general intent" of H.R. 3000, but expressed the opinion that the vocational education provisions (Title V-A) were "far from adequate". The AVA based its objections on these two major considerations:

1. It would do away with the allocation of federal funds among traditional categories.

2. The bill does not provide for permanent legislation, as the George-Barden Act does.²

It is this author's opinion that witnesses have an influence upon the committee's decisions, however, this influence is secondary to other pressures. The witnesses are very helpful in the work of gathering information and statistics to support their case. Those persons testifying on H.R. 3000 and H.R. 4955 were those in favor of increased vocational education legislation. This type of one-sided testimony forced the committee to assume a seemingly negative side because all the witnesses brought out the positive aspects of the bills. The author feels that the hearings would have been more beneficial if groups or individuals opposed to the bills or having other suggestions for providing for vocational education had appeared, giving the committee of an attitude of a neutral judge.

Two even more significant sources for establishing are priority/constituent opinion and party policy. On a controversial or well-known bill constituent opinion, most generally express through mail, is a most influential source in determining the actions in committee and the floor vote of their respective Congressmen. This is due particularly in the House to the fact that Representatives are elected every two years.

Party policy is a very important means of determining the future of proposed legislation. The bills discussed in this thesis were proposed by a Democratic Administration and introduced by Democratic members of both Houses. It was therefore obvious that the Democratic Policy Committee would support some type of vocational education legislation. The Republican Policy Committee objected to the Administration proposal as inadequate. It expressed that needs call for additional funds to expand vocational education facilities. This made it clear that the Republican Party favored some type of vocational education legislation and helped to determine that there would be no strong Republican objections to such legislation.

All of these influences are very much at work in determining whether or not a bill will be reported out of committee, what type of bill it will be, and how much support it will receive on the floor of the House or Senate.
CONCLUSION

After compiling the materials for this thesis, it is this author's opinion that a program for vocational education is needed. The technological changes in our economy demand that workers have special skills and training. The burden for teaching many of these vocational skills primarily falls on the schools. The Federal government has been providing aid for such programs since 1917. Since there are such strong precedents for Federal aid to vocational education, this legislation escaped many of the arguments generally concerned with Federal aid to education.

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 was proposed and passed as the result of a review and re-evaluation of existing vocational education acts by the Panel of Consultants. It is this author's judgment that the Panel only partially fulfilled its obligation. The Panel seems to assume that vocational training is automatically good. In evaluating existing programs the Panel did not give adequate consideration as to the effectiveness of such programs. It would seem that unless the present programs are sufficiently effective, it would be wasteful to appropriate additional sums to extend them. Also the author feels that the Panel was more idealistic than practical
in its appropriations recommendation which totaled $400 million for the first year. This is eight times larger than the current outlays for fiscal year 1964. It is hardly possible that such a large increase could be implemented into effective programs in one year. This author is also dissatisfied because the Panel did not propose programs to moderate public vocational training which could be implemented by sources other than the Federal government.

Two of the main purposes of vocational education legislation are to alleviate unemployment as a result of technological changes and to reduce the school dropout problem.

There is an evident need for up-dating and coordinating our vocational education laws and for this reason this author supports, with some reservations, the Vocational Education Act of 1962. This bill incorporates most of the provisions of Title V-A, which provides for a limited increase in appropriations as well as a new program for allotting funds. This means of allotment is the result of the findings of the Panel of Consultants, who thoroughly studied our present category means of allotment and found it ineffective. H.R. 4955, as introduced, had no provisions for up-dating this allocation system established by the George-Barden Act of 1946, for this reason the author finds this proposal inadequate to moderate our present legislation.

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 does provide for some additional funds and a newer method of allocating
them, however, this is just one step in helping to train workers for our changing labor market. The author feels that a greater share of the responsibility for this training must be given to industries themselves, for it is technological and industrial changes that have been most pronounced in creating the need for increased training. This could perhaps be accomplished by providing for a significant tax reduction to industries to encourage them to assume a greater responsibility in industrial training for their own workers needing retraining and for those about to be employed in their organizations. This would decrease the role of the Federal government in organizing and administering programs for vocational education. This would also provide a means of adjusting to the special training needs particular to each community.

Even though the Vocational Education Act of 1963 has been passed, there is a definite need for additional proposals to meet these problems. This is only a partial solution. Similar laws have been effective since 1917, but Federal aid has not adequately solved the problem in the past and is not likely to do so in the future. Federal vocational education legislation is not the miracle drug to cure the ills of unemployment and school dropouts.
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