

Mr. ERLNBORN. Thank you.

Mrs. GREEN. Dr. Martin, were you ever given any advance notice of the telegram from Mr. Karsh?

Dr. MARTIN. No, ma'am. Mr. Nix called me about it. We were in Washington the week after that, and Mr. Karsh was put on the spot—the chief State officer at the meeting, there. The telegram went to the State treasurer, the State comptroller, and the State superintendent, and in about six States the State comptroller did not get it, through State distribution of mail, you see, and we caught it.

Mrs. GREEN. There was no consultation with you in advance?

Dr. MARTIN. No. I said at the time if Mr. Karsh had just called us, we could have gotten this across to the State superintendent very easily.

Mrs. GREEN. May I call on George Mulling, the State director of vocational education.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE MULLING, STATE DIRECTOR OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Dr. MULLING. Thank you, ma'am.

Madam Chairman and members of the subcommittee, my name is George W. Mulling. My position is State director of vocational education, Georgia Department of Education.

I appreciate the opportunity to discuss with you my ideas and recommendations for the strengthening of relationships between State departments of education and the U.S. Office of Education as regards improved leadership for the national program of vocational and technical education.

Generally, concern within the States regarding relationships has grown out of the reorganization of USOE which has taken place in recent months. Let me say first there is no argument with the necessity for such action, for we in the States have also been reassessing and restructuring our vocational department staff organizations. The Vocational Education Act of 1963, as an outgrowth of an exhaustive study of the Nation's vocational education program, dictates that we approach program leadership activities at both the Federal and State levels in ways more imaginative and in keeping with the signs of the times.

Specifically, our concern in vocational education—and it has been well voiced through the American Vocational Association—is that due recognition and status in the organizational pattern has not been given to vocational and teaching education. It is our conviction that vocational and technical education should and must have recognition within its own right, at least equal to higher education and/or elementary and secondary education.

It is contended further that the matter of status for vocational and technical education should be equated with, and not inferior in rank to, its counterparts in other Federal agencies having similar or shared responsibility for the development of manpower resources.

Thus, we are pleading just recognition for an educational enterprise that historically grew out of neglect on the part of our educational leadership, which failed to see occupational training as a necessary