

Statement of Honorable John E. Fogarty
Before the Committee on Education and Labor, House of
Representatives, in Support of H. R. 357, March 16, 1960

I have long found the subject of general university extension education both challenging and provocative. I can see through the expansion of the extension program an educational instrument which will enable multitudes of people to continue their formal education throughout life. I look upon it as a means whereby those having industrial, business and professional responsibilities can improve and enrich their contribution to the Nation and society. I envision that general extension courses will contribute materially to the cultural aspirations of the Nation. In short, I find myself an enthusiast for expanded educational opportunities through general university extension programs.

Through the years extension education in its various forms has made a significant contribution to the cultural and professional attainments of our Nation. Extension education has been one of the major channels through which land-grant colleges and universities have served their constituents. The steady progress in agricultural extension programs is well known. In fact, the cooperative extension

program in agriculture and home economics could well serve as a pattern for all general university extension programs. The success of cooperative extension programs in agriculture is traceable largely to the substantial appropriations by the Federal Government for this form of education.

The differences between cooperative extension and general university extension are of enough importance to warrant comparison. Cooperative extension is tax-supported, whereas general extension is supported chiefly by student fees. Cooperative extension is focused primarily on farm problems. General extension has tended to serve the populations of urban areas. Cooperative extension has developed into a well-integrated national system, whereas institutions engaged in general extension have operated independently.

The apparent differences between cooperative and general university extension lead one to conclude that services rendered to the farm population through agricultural extension programs have been far more effective and productive than the extension services of other areas of the university curriculum. Undoubtedly, a major contributing factor to this difference

in quality is the financial assistance contributed by the Federal Government to the agricultural extension programs. The bill under consideration would, as I understand it, seek to provide a similar stimulant for general university extension.

Even though there are differences between cooperative agricultural extension and general university extension, there are forces at work which are narrowing these differences. Specifically, the shift of the Nation's population from rural to urban areas has gradually reduced the number of individuals who can benefit from agricultural extension. At the same time, and dramatically, it has increased the number of citizens who would benefit from general extension. In the past thirty years there has been a decided change in the Nation's farming operation. The period has seen the rise of commercial farming, the modernization of farm home and agricultural equipment, and the advent of rapid transportation which has virtually eliminated the isolated farm home. During the same period, the Nation's industrial potential has doubled and trebled. The amazing developments in science and technology have consistently prepared the

way for increased employment in old line industries and have opened up entirely new fields offering employment and advancement for those possessing requisite knowledge and skill in these new areas.

The amount and the quality of cooperation between labor unions and institutions of higher learning has been increasing significantly. There are now some eighty universities, including about twenty denominational colleges, which render educational services of a kind to labor groups ranging from occasional conferences and institutes to year-round services by a department staffed with full time personnel.

No uniform pattern exists, however. Some unions have almost no recourse to outside assistance and conduct their educational programs solely under their own auspices and with their own resources. At the most, these unions might be using classroom facilities and living accommodations of the universities. On the other hand, some unions operate almost their entire educational program through universities, leaving to them a large measure of discretion in curriculum planning and course content as well as selection of teachers.

No direct Federal funds are available for education programs in labor unions at the present, but some indirect Federal support is possible through the use of George-Barden funds for vocational purposes. Use is made of this support by some States through joint programs with universities. Labor has repeatedly gone on record in favor of some form of legislation that would set up a permanent extension service that would benefit all classes of our population.

The Morrill Act, passed over one hundred years ago, committed land-grant institutions to provide educational services to "agricultural and industrial classes" in return for substantial grants of land. This promise has been well kept as far as agriculture is concerned. It has been largely ignored as far as the "industrial classes" are concerned.

General extension and cooperative education had a common origin and common ancestors. The educators who were interested in extending the teaching resources of universities drew no arbitrary lines. They felt that institutional resources in every field should be carried to the people. If agriculture was of first importance, it was because the

majority of our people were engaged in it, and either because of it or, more likely as a result of Federal support, scientific knowledge in agriculture has been in advance of that in other fields of knowledge.

The Smith-Lever Law of 1914 gave the cooperative extension services the funds with which to grow to great size, and because these funds were restricted to use in specific areas cooperative extension services became more and more separated from other aspects of higher education. Over the years, the differences have become even more accentuated. General extension has had to earn its own way from fees and has grown sporadically, moving far ahead in some places but lagging far behind in others.

Practitioners in every field of human endeavor find that they must be constant students of their specialties if they would keep abreast of the developments in their fields. There is an increasing need for an effective adult education program which knows no curricular limitations and which is fluid enough to serve all individuals in our complex modern society. General university extension service is apparently the only educational tool prepared to meet this need and capable to do it. If

such services are to be made universal, an effort equal in imagination and energy to that of cooperative agricultural extension should be directed toward the development of general university extension programs.

If our Nation is to be perpetuated as a union of strong democratic States, if we are to maintain our leadership of the free nations of the world, education of all the people and particularly the active segment of our population who are already beyond the normal college age must have ready access to all of the facilities of the modern university. In the accomplishment of this objective the university will surely find its extension division one of even greater import and perhaps its most indispensable instrument.

H. R. 397 would authorize the appropriation of Federal funds for allotment among the States, to pay one-half the costs of carrying on general university extension programs in the State universities and in the land-grant universities and colleges. Each State would submit a plan to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare showing how the money is to be utilized and how the university extension programs in these

institutions are to be expanded, improved, and coordinated so that the whole population of the State may be better served.

As an indication of the expressed need for legislation of this type I would like to quote from a letter which I have received from President Francis H. Horn of the University of Rhode Island, Kingston, Rhode Island. Doctor Horn states, "This legislation, which provides matching funds for general extension courses in adult education, would give assistance to a growing program here at the University. Our Extension Division in Providence presently has 3,000 adult students enrolled in evening classes in business, professional and technical subjects. Enrollments in this division have doubled during the past five years." Dr. Horn further states, "Although the Congress has provided millions for extension programs in agriculture, nothing has been done to date to assist similar programs designed to benefit an industrial economy." With this statement I heartily agree.

Mr. Chairman, in order that educational opportunities may be extended to all individuals in our society, irrespective of occupational or intellectual interest, I strongly urge upon this Committee the enactment of H.R. 357 at this session of Congress.