

Proceedings
OF THE
GOVERNORS'
CONFERENCE
1964

Proceedings
OF THE
GOVERNORS'
CONFERENCE
1964

FIFTY-SIXTH ANNUAL MEETING
SHERATON-CLEVELAND HOTEL
CLEVELAND, OHIO

June 6-10, 1964

THE GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE
1313 EAST SIXTIETH STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60637

Published by

THE GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE

1313 EAST SIXTIETH STREET

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60637

CONTENTS

Executive Committee	ix
Other Committees of the Governors' Conference	x
Attendance	xiii
Guests	xiv
Program	xv

Morning Session—Monday, June 8

Opening Session—Governor John Anderson, Jr., Presiding.	1
Invocation—The Most Reverend Clarence E. Elwell	1
Address of Welcome—Governor James A. Rhodes	1
Address by Chairman of the Governors' Conference— Governor John Anderson, Jr.	5
Adoption of Rules of Procedure	12
Report of Interim Study Committee on Federal Aid to Education—Governor Terry Sanford	19
Report of Committee on Federal-State Relations—Governor Robert E. Smylie	22

Afternoon Session—Monday, June 8

General Session—Governor John B. Connally, Presiding	24
<u>Federal-State Relations—The States and Congress</u>	
Remarks—Senator Ernest Gruening	27
Remarks—Senator Frank Carlson	29
Remarks—Senator J. Caleb Boggs	31
Remarks—Senator Frank J. Lausche	33
Remarks—Senator J. Howard Edmondson	35
Remarks—Senator Len B. Jordan	36
Remarks—Senator Milward L. Simpson	37
Discussion by all Governors	39

Evening Session—Monday, June 8

Address—The Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower	49
--	----

Morning Session—Tuesday, June 9

Plenary Session—Governor John Anderson, Jr., Presiding.	57
Invocation—The Reverend Lewis Raymond	57

Civil Rights

Report of Panel on Education—Governor Richard J. Hughes	62
Report of Panel on Employment—Governor Matthew E. Welsh	64
Report of Panel on Public Accommodations—Governor John A. Love	66

Afternoon Session—Tuesday, June 9

General Session—Governor William W. Scranton, Presiding	69
Address—The Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze	70
Commentators:	
Governor George D. Clyde	77
Governor John Dempsey	80

Evening Session—Tuesday, June 9

The State Dinner	
Address—Senator Frank J. Lausche	83

Morning Session—Wednesday, June 10

General Session—Governor John Anderson, Jr., Presiding.	90
Report of the Committee on Cold War Education—Governor Farris Bryant	90
Report of the Advisory Committee on the National Guard—Governor Otto Kerner	94
Report of the Committee on Juvenile Delinquency—Governor Edmund G. Brown	96
Report of the Committee on Civil Defense and Post-Attack Recovery—Governor Farris Bryant	100
Report of the Committee on Public Health and Welfare—Governor Richard J. Hughes	106
Report of the Committee on Roads and Highway Safety—Governor Paul Fannin	109
Report of the Committee on State Planning—Governor Grant Sawyer	114
Election of Officers	129

Appendices

Governors, June, 1964	132
Articles of Organization	134
Rules of Procedure of the Governors' Conference	137
Treasurer's Report	140
Governors' Conference Annual Meetings	141
Chairmen of the Governors' Conference, 1908-1965	142
Report of the Committee on Federal-State Relations	143
Report of the Interim Study Committee on Cold War Education	154
Report of the Advisory Committee to the Executive Committee on the National Guard	169
Report of the Committee on Juvenile Delinquency	178
Report of the Committee on Civil Defense and Post-Attack Recovery	180
Report of the Committee on Public Health and Welfare	184
Report of the Committee on Roads and Highway Safety	195
Report of the Committee on State Planning	203
Summary of Policy Actions and Resolutions Adopted by the Governors' Conference at Its 56th Annual Meeting	207

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

1963-64

Honorable John Anderson, Jr.
Governor of Kansas, Chairman

Honorable William Wallace Barron, Governor of West Virginia
Honorable Frank G. Clement, Governor of Tennessee
Honorable Richard J. Hughes, Governor of New Jersey
Honorable John A. Love, Governor of Colorado
Honorable John H. Reed, Governor of Maine
Honorable James A. Rhodes, Governor of Ohio
Honorable Albert D. Rosellini, Governor of Washington
Honorable Matthew E. Welsh, Governor of Indiana

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

1964-65

Honorable Grant Sawyer
Governor of Nevada, Chairman

Honorable John Anderson, Jr., Governor of Kansas
Honorable Tim Babcock, Governor of Montana
Honorable Henry Bellmon, Governor of Oklahoma
Honorable Edward T. Breathitt, Governor of Kentucky
Honorable John H. Chafee, Governor of Rhode Island
Honorable Richard J. Hughes, Governor of New Jersey
Honorable George Romney, Governor of Michigan
Honorable Carl E. Sanders, Governor of Georgia

OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE GOVERNORS'
CONFERENCE, 1964*

Advisory Committee to Executive Committee
on the National Guard

Governor Otto Kerner, Illinois—Chairman
Governor George D. Clyde, Utah—Vice Chairman
Governor John M. Dalton, Missouri
Governor Paul B. Johnson, Mississippi
Governor John H. Reed, Maine
Governor William W. Scranton, Pennsylvania
Governor George C. Wallace, Alabama

Committee on Civil Defense and
Post-Attack Recovery

Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller, New York—Chairman
Governor Farris Bryant, Florida—Vice Chairman
Governor William Wallace Barron, West Virginia
Governor Edmund G. Brown, California
Governor Jack M. Campbell, New Mexico
Governor John H. Chafee, Rhode Island
Governor John B. Connally, Texas
Governor John W. King, New Hampshire
Governor James A. Rhodes, Ohio

Committee on Federal-State Relations

Governor Robert E. Smylie, Idaho—Chairman
Governor John Dempsey, Connecticut—Vice Chairman
Governor Tim Babcock, Montana
Governor John A. Burns, Hawaii
Governor William A. Egan, Alaska
Governor Harold E. Hughes, Iowa
Governor John A. Love, Colorado
Governor Endicott Peabody, Massachusetts
Governor George Romney, Michigan
Governor Donald S. Russell, South Carolina
Governor Carl E. Sanders, Georgia

Committee on Juvenile Delinquency

Governor Edmund G. Brown, California—Chairman
Governor Archie Gubbrud, South Dakota—Vice Chairman
Governor Edward T. Breathitt, Kentucky

* As of June 6, 1964—opening date of conference.

Governor Farris Bryant, Florida
Governor John Dempsey, Connecticut
Governor William A. Egan, Alaska
Governor William L. Guy, North Dakota
Governor Clifford P. Hansen, Wyoming
Governor Albertis S. Harrison, Jr., Virginia
Governor Mark O. Hatfield, Oregon
Governor Terry Sanford, North Carolina

Committee on Public Health and Welfare

Governor Richard J. Hughes, New Jersey—Chairman
Governor Mark O. Hatfield, Oregon—Vice Chairman
Governor William Wallace Barron, West Virginia
Governor John H. Chafee, Rhode Island
Governor Frank G. Clement, Tennessee
Governor Archie Gubbrud, South Dakota
Governor Albertis S. Harrison, Jr., Virginia
Governor Frank B. Morrison, Nebraska
Governor George Romney, Michigan
Governor Albert D. Rosellini, Washington
Governor Grant Sawyer, Nevada
Governor J. Millard Tawes, Maryland

Committee on Roads and Highway Safety

Governor Paul Fannin, Arizona—Chairman
Governor Matthew E. Welsh, Indiana—Vice Chairman
Governor Henry Bellmon, Oklahoma
Governor Frank G. Clement, Tennessee
Governor Orval E. Faubus, Arkansas
Governor Archie Gubbrud, South Dakota
Governor Clifford P. Hansen, Wyoming
Governor Philip H. Hoff, Vermont
Governor Frank B. Morrison, Nebraska
Governor Karl F. Rolvaag, Minnesota
Governor J. Millard Tawes, Maryland

Committee on State Planning

Governor Grant Sawyer, Nevada—Chairman
Governor William W. Scranton, Pennsylvania—Vice Chairman
Governor Tim Babcock, Montana
Governor Elbert N. Carvel, Delaware
Governor John M. Dalton, Missouri
Governor William L. Guy, North Dakota
Governor Mark O. Hatfield, Oregon

Governor Otto Kerner, Illinois
Governor John W. Reynolds, Wisconsin
Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller, New York

Interim Study Committee on Cold War Education

Governor Farris Bryant, Florida—Chairman
Governor George D. Clyde, Utah
Governor John B. Connally, Texas
Governor Paul Fannin, Arizona
Governor Otto Kerner, Illinois
Governor John H. Reed, Maine
Governor Terry Sanford, North Carolina
Governor Matthew E. Welsh, Indiana

Interim Study Committee on Federal Aid
to Education

Governor Terry Sanford, North Carolina—Chairman
Governor Henry Bellmon, Oklahoma
Governor John H. Chafee, Rhode Island
Governor Frank B. Morrison, Nebraska
Governor Robert E. Smylie, Idaho

* * *

Governor John Anderson, Jr., Kansas—Chairman of the
Governors' Conference—is an ex-officio member of all
Committees.

ATTENDANCE

George C. Wallace, Governor of Alabama
William A. Egan, Governor of Alaska
H. Rex Lee, Governor of American Samoa
Paul Fannin, Governor of Arizona
Orval E. Faubus, Governor of Arkansas
Edmund G. Brown, Governor of California
John A. Love, Governor of Colorado
John Dempsey, Governor of Connecticut
Elbert N. Carvel, Governor of Delaware
Farris Bryant, Governor of Florida
Carl E. Sanders, Governor of Georgia
Manuel Flores Leon Guerrero, Governor of Guam
John A. Burns, Governor of Hawaii
Robert E. Smylie, Governor of Idaho
Otto Kerner, Governor of Illinois
Matthew E. Welsh, Governor of Indiana
Harold E. Hughes, Governor of Iowa
John Anderson, Jr., Governor of Kansas
Edward T. Breathitt, Governor of Kentucky
John H. Reed, Governor of Maine
J. Millard Tawes, Governor of Maryland
Endicott Peabody, Governor of Massachusetts
George Romney, Governor of Michigan
Karl F. Rolvaag, Governor of Minnesota
Paul B. Johnson, Governor of Mississippi
John M. Dalton, Governor of Missouri
Tim Babcock, Governor of Montana
Frank B. Morrison, Governor of Nebraska
Grant Sawyer, Governor of Nevada
John W. King, Governor of New Hampshire
Richard J. Hughes, Governor of New Jersey
Jack M. Campbell, Governor of New Mexico
Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of New York
Terry Sanford, Governor of North Carolina
William L. Guy, Governor of North Dakota
James A. Rhodes, Governor of Ohio
Henry Bellmon, Governor of Oklahoma
Mark O. Hatfield, Governor of Oregon
William W. Scranton, Governor of Pennsylvania
John H. Chafee, Governor of Rhode Island
Donald S. Russell, Governor of South Carolina
Archie Gubbrud, Governor of South Dakota
John B. Connally, Governor of Texas
George D. Clyde, Governor of Utah

Philip H. Hoff, Governor of Vermont
Albertis S. Harrison, Jr., Governor of Virginia
Ralph M. Paiewonsky, Governor of the Virgin Islands
Albert D. Rosellini, Governor of Washington
William Wallace Barron, Governor of West Virginia
John W. Reynolds, Governor of Wisconsin
Clifford P. Hansen, Governor of Wyoming

GUESTS

The Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, Former President of the
United States
The Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Edu-
cation, and Welfare
The Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State
The Honorable J. Caleb Boggs, United States Senator from Dela-
ware
The Honorable Frank Carlson, United States Senator from Kansas
The Honorable J. Howard Edmondson, United States Senator from
Oklahoma
The Honorable Ernest Gruening, United States Senator from Alaska
The Honorable Len B. Jordan, United States Senator from Idaho
The Honorable Frank J. Lausche, United States Senator from Ohio
The Honorable Milward L. Simpson, United States Senator from
Wyoming

PROGRAM

Saturday, June 6

- 6:30 p.m. Private Reception and Dinner for Governors and their Wives Only, Cleveland Room
- 6:30 p.m. Get Acquainted Reception for Members of Governors' Parties and Press, Grand Ballroom

Sunday, June 7

- 12:00 noon Luncheon Meeting of Governors' Conference Executive Committee, Lewis Room
- 3:00 p.m. Briefing Session for Governors' Aides, Gold Room
- 3:30 p.m. Special Meeting of Governors' Aides, Gold Room
- 6:45 p.m. Reception and Dinner, Grand Ballroom
(Concert by Cleveland Summer Orchestra)

Monday, June 8

- 9:30 a.m. Opening Session. Gold Room
- Address of Welcome: Governor James A. Rhodes
- Remarks of Welcome:
- Ralph S. Locher, Mayor of Cleveland
- Ernest Henderson, Chairman, Sheraton Hotels
- Louis B. Seltzer, President, Cleveland Convention Bureau
- Curtis Lee Smith, President, Cleveland Chamber of Commerce
- Address of Chairman: Governor John Anderson, Jr.
- Consideration of Proposed Rules of Procedure
- Report of Interim Study Committee on Federal Aid to Education: Governor Terry Sanford, Chairman
- Report of Committee on Federal-State Relations: Governor Robert E. Smylie, Chairman

- 12:00 noon Private Luncheon for Governors and United States Senators, Lewis Room
- 12:00 noon For the Ladies. Luncheon and Entertainment, Cleveland Room
- 2:00 p.m. General Session. Gold Room
 "Federal-State Relations—The States and the Congress"
 Presiding: Governor John B. Connally
 Guest Participants:
 Senator J. Caleb Boggs, Delaware
 Senator Frank Carlson, Kansas
 Senator J. Howard Edmondson, Oklahoma
 Senator Ernest Gruening, Alaska
 Senator Len B. Jordan, Idaho
 Senator Frank J. Lausche, Ohio
 Senator Milward L. Simpson, Wyoming
 Discussion by all Governors
- 4:00 p.m. Executive Session. Gold Room
 Informal Meeting with The Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State
- 6:00 p.m. Reception. Mezzanine and Whitehall Room
- 7:00 p.m. Informal Dinner. Grand Ballroom
 Presiding: Governor John Anderson, Jr.
 Address: The Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower

Tuesday, June 9

- 9:00 a.m. Plenary Session. Gold Room
 Presiding: Governor John Anderson, Jr.
- 9:15 a.m. "Civil Rights"
 Three Concurrent Group Meetings:
Education. Gold Room
 Presiding: Governor Richard J. Hughes

Employment. Cleveland Room

Presiding: Governor Matthew E. Welsh

Public Accommodations. Empire Room

Presiding: Governor John A. Love

- 11:30 a.m. Plenary Session. Gold Room
Reports by Chairmen of Concurrent Group Meetings
- 12:30 p.m. Recess for Lunch
- 12:30 p.m. For Governors' Wives. Luncheon and Executive Discussion Session, Lewis Room
Presiding: Mrs. Frank B. Morrison
- 2:00 p.m. General Session. Gold Room
Presiding: Governor William W. Scranton
Address: The Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare
Commentators:
Governor George D. Clyde
Governor John Dempsey
- 3:00 p.m. Executive Session. Gold Room
"Problems of a Governor's Office"
Presiding: Governor John Anderson, Jr.
Discussion by all Governors
- 6:15 p.m. Reception. Mezzanine and Whitehall Room
- 7:15 p.m. State Dinner and Ball. Grand Ballroom
Presiding: Governor John Anderson, Jr.
Remarks: Governor James A. Rhodes
Address: Senator Frank J. Lausche

Wednesday, June 10

- 9:00 a.m. General Session. Gold Room
Presiding: Governor John Anderson, Jr.

Report of Interim Study Committee on Cold War Education: Governor Farris Bryant, Chairman

Report of Advisory Committee on the National Guard: Governor Otto Kerner, Chairman

Report of Committee on Juvenile Delinquency: Governor Edmund G. Brown, Chairman

Report of Committee on Civil Defense and Post-Attack Recovery: Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller, Chairman

Report of Committee on Public Health and Welfare: Governor Richard J. Hughes, Chairman

Report of Committee on Roads and Highway Safety: Governor Paul Fannin, Chairman

Report of Committee on State Planning: Governor Grant Sawyer, Chairman

Business Session

Invitations for site of 1965 Annual Meeting

Consideration of Other Business

Election of Officers

Adjournment

MORNING SESSION—Monday, June 8

Governor John Anderson, Jr.: The Fifty-sixth Annual Meeting of the Governors' Conference will now come to order.

Gentlemen, if you will please rise for the posting of the Colors. (Whereupon the Colors were posted.)

Governor Anderson: If you will please remain standing, we will have the invocation by The Most Reverend Clarence E. Elwell, Auxiliary Bishop of the Catholic Diocese of Cleveland.

Bishop Clarence E. Elwell: O God, in Whom all power rests and from Whom all lawful authority flows, grant to these, Thy servants who have been placed at the head of the sovereign states of these United States of America, with the responsibility of the welfare of so many of Thy human creatures, the strength and the courage, the justice and the mercy, the prudence and the moderation, the faith, hope and charity, which will enable them to serve their people well and to bring this nation and this world to the progress and prosperity and the peace which is Thy holy will. Amen.

Governor Anderson: The members of this Conference will remember that last year at Miami Beach our congenial host told you that he would like to have this Conference in Cleveland and that the entire State of Ohio would very much like to have the Conference here. In talking with men and women, not only here in the hotel but on the streets of Cleveland, and in seeing what has been prepared for us, I am sure we all know that our Host Governor has done a magnificent job, and we are looking forward to the finest Conference that we have ever had.

It is my pleasure to introduce to you your host and my host, the very congenial and hospitable Governor of Ohio, Governor Rhodes.

Governor James A. Rhodes: Chairman Anderson and my distinguished colleagues representing your respective states: In this hour of welcoming you, my mind goes back, if you will permit me to reminisce for just a moment. I have served as Mayor of Ohio's capital city, and on many different occasions I attempted to address every convention coming to our city. I had taken the philosophy of our local Chamber of Commerce and told everyone that we were the third largest convention city in America. On this given day, a group in the psychiatric field wanted to view the city of Columbus. They wanted to see and observe some of the state's institutions. They asked the Mayor, on this particular day, if he would be so kind as to go with them to one of the largest mental institu-

tions in America. I readily agreed and went out there. I became lost and I asked one of the patients how I could get back. He said, "Jump on the bus and it will take you to Broad Street, and there you can catch local transportation." I was sitting in the second row when an orderly jumped on the bus. To find out that everyone on the bus was from the mental institution, his conversation went something like this: "One, two, three, four, five." He looked down at me and said, "Who are you?" I threw my shoulders back and I said, "I am the Mayor of Columbus." He said, "Six, seven, eight, nine."

My remarks on the side of hospitality will be very brief and concise. I think that the people of Cleveland and the people of Ohio have a sincere desire and determination that you shall have the finest convention in the history of the Governors' Conference, and this is no reflection upon any Governor or any state that previously hosted this great Conference. This is a great start for us here in the city of Cleveland. We are trying to become number one in the business of attracting conventions. By your presence here today, you have added strength to the Convention Bureau, to the Chamber of Commerce, to our good Mayor, to the City Council and to the elected officials and all the people of Cuyahoga County and the State of Ohio. You are helping us to build and construct and cultivate the finest convention city in America.

Governor Anderson: Thank you very much, Governor Rhodes. I would like to introduce to you at this time Mr. Curtis Lee Smith, Chairman of the Host State Committee.

Mr. Curtis Lee Smith: Reverend clergy, distinguished Governors and guests: It is my pleasure to present to you three distinguished citizens of Cleveland. The first one is Mayor Ralph Locher of the city of Cleveland. I had a long introduction for him, but I will only make two significant remarks. I think at one time he was Governor Lausche's secretary and administrative assistant. He later ran for Mayor of Cleveland and received 76 per cent of the votes. The next time he ran, there was no candidate against him. I would like to present our very democratic, and I say that with a small "d," as well as a large "M," Mayor, Ralph Locher of Cleveland.

Mayor Ralph Locher: Thank you very much, Curt. Your Excellency Bishop Elwell, Governor Anderson, Governor Rhodes and ladies and gentlemen: It is a very great pleasure for me, as Mayor of the city of Cleveland, to extend to each of you and your families and your staffs a warm and cordial welcome to our city. We welcome you not as strangers but as friends. We are grateful to you for coming and hope that your busy schedule will allow you to visit and enjoy the many places of interest in the city of Cleveland. We especially invite you to visit our new convention center on the mall, which gives Cleveland the largest exhibit center in the United

States. Cleveland is proud of many firsts, including the Community Chest idea, and of the fact that per capita income in Cleveland is the largest in the entire country. We are proud also of the University Circle area where we have the greatest concentration of cultural, educational and scientific institutions of any similar area in the United States. Everything possible, gentlemen, will be done to make your visit a memorable one, so that each of you will return home with a fond and pleasant recollection of what you have seen and done here.

The eyes of the nation are on this important gathering. I hope, therefore, that your deliberations here will strengthen our democratic form of government and our institutions. Have a good time and make plans now, I trust, for a return visit real soon to the city of Cleveland.

Mr. Smith: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. There is one thing you usually say to other conventions and that is, "Please spend a lot of money." But you did not say it this time. Thank you for not saying it.

I now want to introduce Louis B. Seltzer. Mr. Seltzer is also wearing his other hat today as President of the Convention Bureau of the city of Cleveland. He has been Editor of The Cleveland Press since the last—I will not tell you how long because you would not believe it. He has a very fine pen which he uses with great discrimination and he has a lot of fun writing editorials. Get him to write one for you. Louis B. Seltzer.

Mr. Louis B. Seltzer: Mr. Smith, Governor Anderson, our distinguished fellow Ohioan, Governor Rhodes, and perhaps the most distinguished body of Americans that it has been my privilege in a lifetime of journalism to talk before at one time: I say that in spite of the fact that I have been at every Presidential Convention in the United States of America since 1920. The concept of a periodic meeting of the Governors of the fifty states comprising this great nation is a good, sound, constructive and useful instrument for improving and strengthening this nation. In these unpredictable and somewhat chaotic, emotionally charged times, with both the world and our country going through swift sociological, economic, as well as political, transition, this kind of meeting among the foremost leaders of America is more important and significant than ever before. If nothing more were accomplished, and considerably more in fact is accomplished, than having the opportunity of meeting and exchanging information about problems and challenges in the respective states you represent, that, of course, would justify the time, effort and expense involved in coming together.

The city of Cleveland was fortunate to persuade the Conference to hold its Annual Meeting in its midst and, therefore, it becomes much more intimately acquainted with the personalities, the stature, the problems of the Governors of America, respectively

and collectively. In fact it is perhaps the highest honor during the life and career of our time that a host city and state can possibly obtain. Thus, both as President of the Convention Bureau of the city of Cleveland and as Editor of one of the largest papers in this state, I join with my fellow citizens of Ohio and Cleveland, and on behalf of the great band of men and women that comprise the Convention Bureau, in extending to you a most sincere and cordial welcome to Greater Cleveland. It is my hope that this 1964 Governors' Conference, in a presidential election year, will be rewarded by substantial accomplishment and guidance toward resolution of the most challenging problems confronting this generation of human beings in this country and the world.

Finally, if it is possible to break the pattern of rotating this distinguished body of outstanding American leaders from one part of this nation to another, we of Ohio and Greater Cleveland earnestly hope your stay among us will be such as to persuade you to come back to Cleveland, as one of the Presidents of the United States classically said, "again, again and again."

Mr. Smith: Thank you, Mr. Seltzer. In introducing our last speaker, I would like to say that Mr. Ernest Henderson, as Chairman of the Sheraton-Hotel Corporation, has more hotels around the world than any other chain. Mr. Henderson has spent \$5 million to put this hotel in shape, with the addition of the Grand Ballroom and the garage. He has spent over \$400,000 on the Sheraton-Cleveland since we told him this convention would come here. We would like him to say a word of welcome at this time. Mr. Henderson.

Mr. Ernest Henderson: Your Excellency, Governors, Mr. Curtis Smith, who kindly allowed me two minutes on this program, Mr. Seltzer, known as Mr. Cleveland: This is an opportunity that I am most delighted to take advantage of, to greet so many eminent Governors here at one of our Sheraton hotels. May I express to the Governors of the great states, commonwealths and territories of this nation the most cordial of greetings. We are delighted to welcome you to Ohio, to Cleveland and especially to the Sheraton-Cleveland Hotel. We are greatly indebted to our Host Governor, Governor James A. Rhodes, for the superb salesmanship which he displayed in Miami a year ago when he promised to provide accommodations in Cleveland second to none. He promised that the Sheraton-Cleveland Hotel would be transformed into one of the outstanding hotels in the country especially for this illustrious occasion. The Governor was a good psychologist because we eagerly seized the challenge. We went to work to try to make his predictions come true. Since Eighteenth-Century France has symbolized perhaps the greatest age of elegance, we sought help from presently living descendants of the famous cabinetmakers of the great Louis the XIV period. What you see here in the hotel was created for you here in Cleveland—some of the craftsmanship of that period. We hope the

First Ladies of our respective states will enjoy the efforts of these present-day French artisans, some of whom were spurred to added effort on learning of the illustrious occasion when you would all gather here. This craftsmanship was of a period when tact and delicacy in France reached its peak. It was long before the days of Charles de Gaulle. So you see that we are in the debt of your eminent Host Governor and also in the debt of some of the local backers for giving us the mandate to make this hotel measure up to the promises made to you Governors.

Governor Anderson: Thank you very much, Mr. Smith, Mayor Locher, Mr. Seltzer and Mr. Henderson. We appreciate your remarks of welcome and I am sure that each member of this Conference feels very welcome. I would like to say that we are pleased to have so many ladies and gentlemen attending the Conference this morning. We are all pleased with the great turnout that we have with us from the press, perhaps the largest in our history.

It is now my privilege to make a brief Annual Report as Chairman of the Conference.

Certainly, it has been a pleasant experience and a distinct honor to serve as your Chairman. I have enjoyed very much the last three years, working with my fellow Governors, and regret that this will be the last year of my term.

The opportunity to become personally acquainted with the Governors of all these great United States gives me, and I am sure would give anyone, a reassurance in the strength of our system of government. I am confident that each of you has gained this same impression.

At this time I would like to take this opportunity to introduce to the Conference, two new members who have joined the fellowship of our association since last year.

Governor Edward T. Breathitt of Kentucky.

Governor Breathitt, would you stand, please?

Governor Paul B. Johnson of Mississippi.

Governor Johnson!

The year since our last Conference was marred by the tragic assassination of our nation's President.

At the December meeting, your Executive Committee adopted this memorial statement which I feel should be recorded in the permanent records of this Conference.

"The tragic passing of a great American, our President, has grieved the hearts of the people beyond the point that words can express. The Executive Committee of the Governors' Conference joins the whole country in mourning the death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy and in sharing the grief of his family."

This same tragedy touched one of the members of our own association, and it is with a grateful and thankful heart that we welcome back to our Conference table, Governor John Connally of Texas.

At our December 2nd meeting, the meeting held in Miami, President Johnson invited the Executive Committee to the White House for luncheon the next day. The Committee presented the President with the following statement of support:

"At this time of shock and grief throughout the world, the heavy responsibility of national and international leadership has been placed on the shoulders of an outstanding American statesman, Lyndon B. Johnson. The Executive Committee of the Governors' Conference firmly pledges to President Johnson its complete support to him in carrying on with determination and unity the great destiny of our nation."

Your Executive Committee has met on several occasions and has worked diligently to fulfill the expectations of the Conference. The Committee has kept you informed of its work and deliberations throughout the year. I want to express the appreciation of all the members of this Conference for the excellent cooperation of all the Executive Committee members.

I also want to express my appreciation to the Chairmen and members of the Conference standing committees who have diligently pursued their respective areas of concern and whose reports, with the exception of one or two which are on the agenda this morning, will be presented at our general session on Wednesday morning.

You will recall that at our 1963 Annual Meeting in Miami Beach the Conference delegates directed the Executive Committee to thoroughly review the status of the civil rights situation in the several states. Accordingly, your Executive Committee gave priority to your directive and placed this matter at the head of its working agenda at each meeting. I sincerely appreciate the cooperation of each of you in furnishing the materials to the secretariat from which the Executive Committee's report was compiled and which has now been submitted to you.

Civil rights will be the first item on the agenda at tomorrow morning's meeting. We are all aware that the problems of government covered generally by the term "civil rights" are serious problems in each of our states. They will not solve themselves; they will not go away. During each of the three prior meetings of this Conference that I have attended, we devoted much time in discussion, little time in reaching conclusions. Since the Executive Committee was charged with responsibility to consider and report on the entire subject matter, we felt it would be well for the Conference to devote adequate time to open consideration of the varied facets of the problems.

Three concurrent workshops will be held, one on education, with Governor Hughes of New Jersey presiding; one on employment, with Governor Welsh of Indiana presiding; and one on public accommodations, with Governor Love of Colorado presiding. Following

these, we will hear the reports of these Section Chairmen in plenary session.

I would point out that the Executive Committee's report is contained in the packet before you on your desk this morning, should you care to peruse it prior to tomorrow's sessions. If you have not already done so, I am sure you will do this.

In addition to the continued fine work of the standing committees of our Conference, an Interim Study Committee on Federal Aid to Education was appointed by your Executive Committee last December. This committee was appointed at the suggestion of Governor Sanford, who felt that such a study would be both timely and valuable in objectively ascertaining the thoughts of the respective Governors concerning this matter. Your Executive Committee unanimously endorsed Governor Sanford's view that the study could clarify the issues involved, serve to eliminate confusion, and possibly furnish useful information to the Congress as it considers the various legislative proposals now before it.

Governor Sanford will present a report concerning the work of this committee later this morning.

Though I have genuinely enjoyed all aspects of serving as your Chairman, certainly one of the highlights of the past year, at least for me personally, was the visit of members of our Conference to Japan, and the return visit of some eleven Japanese Governors and their wives to the United States this spring.

Governor Rosellini was co-leader of our delegation which consisted, in addition to Governor Rosellini and myself, of Governor Dalton, Governor Clement, Governor Carvel, Governor Bryant, Governor Reynolds, Governor Smylie, and Governor Clyde.

Our tour took us over much of the length and breadth of the country of Japan, and we observed first hand the dynamic reconstruction which has taken place in the past two decades. The tremendous growth of their industry, the solvency of their economy, and the energy and zeal of their people are evident. There is a certain magnetic charm abundantly evident in Japan, where "Westernism" has been superimposed upon the oriental culture, traditions and heritage of past centuries. I am sure I speak for all the members of our group when I say that the charm and warmth of our reception there assured us of the intensity and sincerity of the alliance for freedom which today exists between our two countries.

On their return visit to the United States this past April and May, they visited our sister states of Hawaii, Washington, Idaho, Utah, Kansas, Missouri, Florida, Delaware, and New York. They were received by the First Lady at the White House and by Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Mrs. Rusk in our nation's capitol. Their tour was concluded by a visit to the New York World's Fair. Each of the Governors whom they visited showed them the best of their respective states. Governor Dalton of Missouri, and we in

Kansas, showed them our industry, our agriculture and the genuine hospitality of our people. You will be interested to know that during their visit, Governor Nishizawa's Prefecture of Nagano and Governor Dalton's State of Missouri formally entered into a sister-state relationship which was appropriately solemnized at a ceremony in Kansas City, Missouri, on April 26, 1964. This is another constructive step in cementing relations, not only between these two states, but also between our nations.

I wish to express the appreciation of this Conference to the Department of State and to Brevard Carihfield and his staff, for their excellent assistance in arranging these exchange visits. I sincerely hope that it will be possible for each of you to have an opportunity to participate in this "Operation Good Will." It is an exhilarating and refreshing experience in this tension-filled world and restores one's basic faith that the cause of freedom will never be destroyed so long as individual understanding can be fostered and encouraged by people everywhere. I commend to this Conference the continuation and expansion of this very worthwhile program.

Last year, as you know, the wives held a business session, and it was such a success that they desired to repeat that event again this year. This appears on the program and you will note that Mrs. Morrison, the charming wife of our good friend, Governor Frank Morrison of Nebraska, is Chairwoman for this event.

Your Executive Committee kept in mind the recommendation of our wives at last year's meetings, and independent, free-thinking chief executives took immediate and affirmative action to accede to their wishes!

They expressed a desire to have more opportunity to join us in our business sessions and indicated this preference over teas, fashion shows and other feminine pastimes! We welcome their interest in this respect, and I know that their attendance here at our sessions will add a meaningful dignity, as well as beauty, to our deliberations. To our "First Ladies" we say, a very sincere, "Welcome!"

We have also scheduled a working session for administrative assistants and aides in the Governors' offices. This meeting has already been held and I understand that it was most successful.

We are indeed honored to have an opportunity today to have as our luncheon guests those distinguished United States Senators who are alumni of this Conference. I wish to welcome them to our Conference and to thank them for taking time out of their busy schedules in Washington to come and join us here. We look forward to their participation in this afternoon's program on federal-state relations. Having had first hand experience on both ends of the situation, I know they will contribute immeasurably to that session.

You may not have noticed, but the Conference has a new set of

flags from all of the states, and I want to thank each of you for sending them to our Secretary.

In brief closing remarks, I want to again express my appreciation for having had the opportunity to serve as your Chairman during the past year. It is a rare privilege and one for which I will forever be grateful.

We anticipate a constructive and meaningful Conference—one which will be productive in assisting us to better understand that the problems of the states are not unique, or isolated only within our respective boundaries. Here, we may share the experiences, the programs and the solutions which have been either effective or ineffective in helping to solve the problems of our modern, complex society.

I want to take this opportunity to express our sincere appreciation to Governor Rhodes and our wonderful "Host State" of Ohio for inviting us. We know how much effort is required to synchronize a program such as this and, Jim, we're extremely grateful to you, to the people of Ohio, to Cleveland and to the Sheraton-Cleveland Hotel for having us here!

I would be totally remiss if I failed to convey, not only for myself, but for all of the members of this Conference, our infinite gratitude to our very able Executive Secretary and his staff, without whose tremendous efforts and assistance this meeting just wouldn't "get off the ground." So I say to you, Crihf, my personal thanks to you and to your staff for a magnificent and outstanding job.

Now we will get into the first official business item of the Conference, as shown on your program. This is the consideration of proposed rules of procedure. As you know, the Articles of Organization comprise the only formal document of the Governors' Conference. The Articles contain the basic organizational building blocks, really, of the Conference and they are of paramount force and effect. On the other hand, the Articles of Organization do not attempt to describe the parliamentary rules of procedure which apply at any Annual Meeting. As a matter of fact, we had little or no problem in this regard until only a few years ago because parliamentary struggles had arisen rarely during previous decades of this Conference. But at the 1962 and the 1963 Annual Meetings, as most all of you here know, there was, at least in the opinion of many, a surplus of debate and a surplus of roll-call votes and of parliamentary maneuvers. And for these reasons the Executive Committee, at its first meeting last summer, agreed that it would be wise to develop some written rules of procedure which would be explicit and would be supplementary to the Articles of Organization. The preliminary draft of the proposed rules was considered and revised at two subsequent meetings of the Committee, and a clean draft was submitted to all of you on April 20th with a notice

that the proposed rules would be scheduled for consideration and action at this morning's session.

I think that it might be well for the Conference if these proposed rules of procedure, which will be considered here shortly, were gone over rule by rule, following which we can consider their adoption. At this time I would like to ask Mr. Carihfield to present the preamble and the rules in their order.

Governor Edward T. Breathitt: I have an announcement I would like to make prior to the discussion of the rules. Mr. Chairman, distinguished Governors and guests: A number of the Governors have individually signed the following statement, which I would like to read, Mr. Chairman. It is a statement of principle.

"We reiterate the stand taken last year in Miami Beach in support of equal protection of the laws as a basic guarantee of the United States Constitution. The legislation passed with overwhelming bi-partisan support, in the House of Representatives, now before the Senate, would effectively implement that concept.

"Although proposed by the late President John F. Kennedy on June 11, 1963—and championed by President Lyndon B. Johnson—the issue is still being debated.

"Therefore, to attain the end of equal opportunity, we the undersigned Governors of the United States of America support the bi-partisan passage of effective civil rights legislation and thus demonstrate to the world that the American dream of equal opportunity is a reality for all our citizens."

Over twenty of the Governors have already signed these individual statements. I merely wish to announce to the other Governors who have not had an opportunity to see this statement that I have copies if they desire to sign it. I have supplied Mr. Carihfield with copies for your convenience, if you care to sign one at any time during the course of this Conference.

Governor Tim Babcock: Mr. Chairman, at this time I intend to offer a motion to reestablish the resolutions committee. This type of statement of principle that the Governor just announced, I think, would be properly handled if we had a resolutions committee. I would like to offer this motion. I wonder if it would be proper at this time or wait until we go through the discussion of the proposed rules of procedure?

Governor Anderson: Your motion, Governor Babcock, would go to the Articles of the Conference rather than to the rules.

Governor Babcock: Well, actually, the only thing that I wish to do is to reestablish our resolutions committee. I would like to say this. A Governors' Conference without a resolutions committee loses its means of expression and an essential of its existence. As Governors, we have an obligation to all the people of these United States to demonstrate that our Annual Meeting is more

than a social get-together, that our purposes are serious, and that we seek accomplishment as well as discussion. We can do this only by means of resolutions properly presented and duly acted upon. To be "of record" is both our duty and our privilege if we are to fulfill our responsibilities as chief executives.

With these thoughts in mind, I hereby move that the Chairman of the Governors' Conference again be empowered to appoint a resolutions committee and assign it the duty of presenting resolutions to this body for discussion and vote; this committee to be functional prior to and during the 1965 Conference. I understand that this would require a three-fourths vote, and that it would necessitate making a simple change in paragraph five, Article V of the Articles of Organization, the section entitled "Chairman," to read: "He shall appoint a Nominating Committee and a Resolutions Committee to serve at the Annual Meeting," adding the words "and a Resolutions Committee." I urge your earnest consideration of this motion so that we may again conduct our Conference under normal rules of procedure.

Governor Anderson: Thank you, Governor Babcock. You will recall that the abolition of the resolutions committee at the last Conference in Miami was by amendment to the Articles of the Conference. Governor Babcock's proposal would require amendment of the Articles of Organization, and we will consider the motion here, if there is a second to it and it is the pleasure of the Conference to take up the amendment.

Governor Donald S. Russell: I wish to raise a parliamentary question. I do not think that under Article VIII this motion is in order. I do not think that Article IX, to which you apparently referred, has any reference whatsoever to a motion of this character. I submit, therefore, that this motion is out of order.

Governor Anderson: It is going to be the ruling of the Chair that amendments to the Articles may be taken up by the Conference at any time under Article VIII, which provides for amendments, but which also requires a three-fourths majority vote of the membership of this Conference. Now, is there a second to the motion?

Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller: I would like to second the motion.

Governor Anderson: Is there any discussion?

Governor Grant Sawyer: Mr. Chairman, I move to table the motion.

Governor Russell: I second the motion to table.

Governor Anderson: Motion has been made and seconded. A motion to table takes precedence. I understand that it is not debatable. Do you want a roll call or do you want a standing vote on this? We will have a roll-call vote.

Secretary Brevard Crierfield: The motion is to table the Babcock proposal to amend the Articles of Organization to establish

a resolutions committee. An aye vote will table.

[The roll was called and the Governors of the following states and territories voted in the affirmative:

ALABAMA	KENTUCKY	NORTH CAROLINA
ARKANSAS	MARYLAND	NORTH DAKOTA
CALIFORNIA	MASSACHUSETTS	SOUTH CAROLINA
CONNECTICUT	MINNESOTA	TEXAS
DELAWARE	MISSISSIPPI	VIRGINIA
FLORIDA	MISSOURI	WASHINGTON
HAWAII	NEBRASKA	AMERICAN SAMOA
ILLINOIS	NEVADA	GUAM
INDIANA	NEW HAMPSHIRE	VIRGIN ISLANDS
IOWA	NEW MEXICO	

The Governors of the following states voted in the negative:

ALASKA	MAINE	OREGON
ARIZONA	MONTANA	PENNSYLVANIA
COLORADO	NEW YORK	RHODE ISLAND
IDAHO	OHIO	SOUTH DAKOTA
KANSAS	OKLAHOMA	UTAH
		WYOMING]

Governor Anderson: The result of the roll call is 29 "ayes" and 16 "nays." The "ayes" carry. The motion has been tabled and I think we should move on to the business of consideration of the proposed rules of procedure for the Conference.

I now would like to ask our Secretary, Brevard Crihfield, to present the preamble and the rules in their order, if it is the pleasure of the Conference. If there is to be discussion on these individual rules, I think it might be good order to take up any discussion you might have on an amendment to any proposed rule after each one is presented.

Secretary Crihfield: I will read the preamble and then I will read the rules in their order.

"Preamble

"1. These rules of procedure shall be in specific conformity with the Articles of Organization of the Governors' Conference and, to the extent practicable, shall be consonant with precedents and traditions of the Governors' Conference.

"2. On any issue not covered by these rules of procedure or by the Articles of Organization, Mason's Manual of Legislative Procedure shall be the standard authority, when applicable.

"Rule I - Resolutions

"1. By action of the Governors' Conference at its 1963 Annual Meeting, the Articles of Organization were amended to abolish resolutions and the Resolutions Committee. Hence, the Articles of Organization must be suspended by a three-fourths vote in order to consider a resolution. Under such

suspension, the resolution itself may be adopted by a simple majority vote.

"2. Any member intending to offer a motion for suspension of the Articles of Organization in order to consider a resolution shall give notice of such intention and shall distribute to all other members present a copy of such proposed resolution, at least one session before such motion is put to a vote.

"3. Any proposition of a policy nature that purports to express the view of the Governors' Conference shall be considered and voted upon as though it were a resolution, including any proposition for the creation of a standing committee of the Governors' Conference."

Governor Anderson: Is there any discussion on Rule I?

Governor Russell: May I ask a question? What does this mean: "at least one session before such motion is put to a vote"? What is a session?

Governor Anderson: We have a session this morning. We will have a session this afternoon. I think sessions have been considered by the Conference to be those as designated on the program. You have here a morning session, and then starting this afternoon you have a general session at two o'clock. If you give notice at the morning session, it can be taken up that afternoon.

Governor John A. Love: In connection with this rule, it seems to me that the practice of circulating signed statements and policies is an attempt to do by indirection what this rule prevents your doing directly. I would suggest that we consider an amendment to the rules which would request members not to circulate statements of policies, and directing the Secretary to refuse to accept the filing of such statements that have been circulated.

Governor Anderson: Do you have your proposed amendment worded?

Governor Love: No. In just a moment I will try to work up one.

Governor Anderson: Is there any more discussion on Rule I? If not, we will have a reading of Rule II.

Governor Russell: I would like to move to amend Rule I to read "at least one day" instead of "at least one session."

Governor Karl F. Rolvaag: I wonder if we could have more order. We cannot hear.

Governor Anderson: I think it would be helpful also if the Governors would give their names so the reporter may make the record. Your motion, Governor Russell?

Governor Russell: To strike the words "at least one session" and insert "at least one day."

Governor Anderson: In Section 2 of the rule?

Governor Russell: Right.

Governor Paul Fannin: Will you restate that amendment?

Governor Anderson: I will restate it. Governor Russell moves that the word "session" in the fourth line of Section 2 under Rule I be deleted and the word "day" be inserted in lieu thereof.

Governor Russell: That is right.

Governor Terry Sanford: I second that.

Governor Anderson: There has been a second to the motion. Is there any discussion?

Governor John H. Chafee: What is meant by one day? Is that the day before or would it have to be twenty-four hours?

Governor Anderson: It would be submitted at any time on the day before the proposal would be brought up. It would be taken up at any time on the next day. Is that correct?

Governor Russell: That is correct.

Governor Rockefeller: I would like to speak in opposition to the change. It seems to me that the Executive Committee has given these proposed rules most careful consideration. This Conference now has been so bottled in the way of being able to express the sentiments of minority groups in the organization that further tightening of the rules would make it virtually impossible to perform as a Conference. Therefore, I would oppose the change that has been suggested.

Governor Anderson: Is there further discussion?

The question has been called for. All in favor of the amendment to change the word "session" to "day" and extend the time of notice signify by saying "Aye." All opposed? The "nays" have it and your motion is lost, Governor.

We will now move on to Rule II.

Secretary Carihfield: This is Rule II.

"Rule II - Committee Reports"

"1. A committee chairman or other committee member may offer a motion with respect to a committee report in either of the following forms: (a) that the report be approved; (b) that the report be received and filed. A substitute motion may be offered from the floor to refer the report back to committee for further study. A committee report may include minority or dissenting views. A motion to table is not in order.

"2. If there be separate majority and minority reports from a committee, the following motions shall be in order: (a) a motion to approve the majority report (by a majority member of the committee); (b) a motion to approve the minority report in lieu of the majority report (by a minority member of the committee); (c) a motion to receive and file both reports (by any member from the floor); and (d) a motion to refer both reports back to committee for further study (by any member from the floor). Voting on any of these motions shall be in reverse order of the above. A motion to table is not in order.

"3. No individual amendments to a committee report, a separate majority report, or a separate minority report may be offered from the floor.

"4. Action on the motions described above shall be by a simple majority vote.

"5. Any resolution or excerpted policy statement with respect to the substance of a committee report shall be voted upon as though it were a resolution."

Governor Anderson: Is there any discussion on Rule II?

You can readily see that the rules have been proposed to allow for making a little more concise those parliamentary rules that you are familiar with, I am sure, and to allow for a smooth working procedure for the Conference, we hope.

Is there any discussion on this rule? If not, we will move on to Rule III.

Secretary Carihfield: This is Rule III.

"Rule III - Ordinary Business"

"1. Any proposition of a non-policy nature, but necessary to carry on the business of the Governors' Conference, may be approved by a simple majority vote."

Governor Anderson: Is there any discussion on Rule III?

Secretary Carihfield: This is Rule IV.

"Rule IV - Motions to Amend"

"1. Motions to amend most propositions are in order. An amendment may be amended, but an amendment to an amendment may not be amended because this would lead to undue confusion. Amendments may be adopted by a simple majority vote.

"2. Every amendment proposed must be germane to the subject of the proposition to be amended. To be germane, the amendment is required only to relate to the same subject, and it may entirely change the effect of the proposition. An amendment to an amendment must be germane to the subject of the amendment as well as to the main proposition.

"3. Any amendment must be in writing if the chairman so requests."

Governor Anderson: Is there any discussion on Rule IV?

Governor Mark O. Hatfield: Could I ask a question on that?

Governor Anderson: Yes.

Governor Hatfield: In Section 1 it says: "an amendment to an amendment may not be amended." Do you mean we can amend two ways but we cannot do it three? Is that right?

Governor Anderson: An amendment may be amended. In Section 1 it says: "An amendment may be amended, but an amendment to an amendment may not be amended." In Section 2 it says: "an amendment to an amendment" which is entirely consistent with the first section, but "it must be germane to the subject of the

amendment." In other words, you cannot have an amendment to an amendment that is not germane. That is the way I read it.

Governor Edmund G. Brown: You cannot have an amendment to an amendment?

Governor Anderson: Yes, you can. It says in Section 1: "An amendment may be amended, but an amendment to an amendment may not be amended." Now, I can understand how this may be a bit confusing. But the rules are being proposed to avoid some of that. And I have read it more than once.

If there are no other questions about Rule IV, we will move on to Rule V.

Secretary Carihfield: This is Rule V.

"Rule V - Motions to Table

"1. The purpose of a motion to table is to eliminate further consideration of any pending matter. Such motion is in order on either the entire question or on a pending amendment, and the member offering the motion should identify the breadth of his motion. A motion to table is not debatable. Adoption requires a simple majority vote. Motion may be renewed after progress in debate."

Governor Anderson: Is there any discussion on Rule V?

Rule VI is on the previous question.

Secretary Carihfield: This is Rule VI.

"Rule VI - Previous Question

"1. The purpose of a motion for the previous question is to close debate and vote immediately on either the pending amendment alone, or on all amendments and the main question seriatim. Member offering the motion should identify the breadth of his motion. A motion for the previous question is not debatable. Adoption requires a two-thirds vote. Motion may be renewed after progress in debate."

Governor Anderson: Are there any questions?

Secretary Carihfield: This is Rule VII.

"Rule VII - Postpone Indefinitely

"1. The purpose of a motion to postpone indefinitely is to reject a main proposition without the risk of a direct vote on final passage. It may not be applied to an amendment and may not be renewed. The motion is debatable. Adoption requires a simple majority vote."

Governor Anderson: Is there any discussion on Rule VII?

Secretary Carihfield: This is Rule VIII.

"Rule VIII - Roll Call Votes

"1. A roll call vote may be requested by any member on any pending question. The roll shall be called upon a show of hands by ten members.

"2. Whenever the roll is called, all members present shall be entitled to vote. No proxies shall be permitted.

"3. The proportion of votes required for passage of any proposition or motion, as set forth in these rules of procedure, refers to the number of members present and voting."

Governor Anderson: Is there any discussion on that rule? If not, we will have Rule IX, which is the last rule.

Secretary Carihfield: This is Rule IX.

"Rule IX - Adoption, Amendment and Suspension of Rules

"1. These rules of procedure may be adopted or amended at the first business session of any annual or special meeting of the Governors' Conference by a simple majority vote. Thereafter, for the duration of any such annual or special meeting, amendment or suspension of the rules shall require a three-fourths vote."

Governor Babcock: Mr. Chairman, is not that exactly what I tried to do a moment ago?

Governor Anderson: Governor Babcock, these rules of procedure are proposed. They have not been adopted. We are in the process of considering the rules. I understand that a while ago what you tried to do was amend the Articles and it would have taken a three-fourths vote to amend the Articles.

Governor Babcock: That is correct. I say again that my motion was entirely in order, but we will move on with the business.

Governor Anderson: I agree that your motion was entirely in order—but it was tabled by a roll-call vote of the Conference.

Now, the rules have all been read. Is there any further discussion generally on these before we put the rules up for adoption?

Governor Love: Is it time to present my motion?

Governor Anderson: If you will present it.

Governor Love: I move Rule I be amended by the addition thereto of Subsection 4, which reads as follows: "The Secretary shall be instructed not to receive and file any document not formally acted upon by the Conference."

Governor Anderson: All right. Do you then clearly understand the motion of Governor Love?

Governor Breathitt: I would like to offer a motion to table the motion of Governor Love.

Governor Endicott Peabody: I second it.

Governor Anderson: There has been a motion to table. The motion has been seconded. Shall we put the question? All those in favor of the motion to table signify by saying "Aye." All opposed? I think we will have a show of hands on that, if you will give us the count, Mr. Secretary. All in favor of the motion to table the motion put by Governor Love of Colorado will raise their right hands, please. There are 26 votes to table, which is more than half.

Governor Clifford P. Hansen: I ask that the roll be called.

Governor Anderson: I think we have a vote and the vote has been counted—26 votes in favor of the motion to table, and that is more than half.

Governor Hansen: Am I not correct in insisting that if ten or more desire the roll be called that it be called?

Governor Anderson: All right. We will have a roll-call vote.

Secretary Carihfield: Here is the situation so you will have it entirely. Governor Love proposed that Rule I be amended and a new Subsection be added, which reads as follows: "The Secretary shall be instructed not to receive and file any document not formally acted upon by the Conference." Motion was made to table the Love amendment. An "aye" vote will be to table the Love amendment.

Governor Rockefeller: I wonder if Governor Love could explain what the purpose of his amendment is?

Governor Love: The purpose of the amendment is this. It seems to me that it is useless to say that we will set up a formal procedure for resolutions, setting out how they may be presented to this Conference, and then simply by indirection circulate statements independently from our proceedings here, and then bring them before the Conference with or without signatures and file them. It seems to me that this is attempting to do by indirection what we are prevented from doing directly. I think if we state the policy of this Conference, it should be through our established rules rather than through circulating documents independently which we then bring in and present to the Conference for filing.

Governor Rockefeller: Thank you.

Governor Anderson: I am going to rule that there is no debate on this motion. This is a motion to table. We have an amendment submitted by Governor Love of Colorado. The matter now before the Conference is the question on the motion to table. It has been put and a roll-call vote asked for and we will now proceed with the roll-call vote.

[The roll was called and the Governors of the following states and territories voted in the affirmative:

ALASKA	MARYLAND	NORTH DAKOTA
CALIFORNIA	MASSACHUSETTS	OHIO
CONNECTICUT	MINNESOTA	SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORIDA	MISSOURI	TEXAS
ILLINOIS	NEBRASKA	VERMONT
INDIANA	NEVADA	VIRGINIA
IOWA	NEW HAMPSHIRE	WASHINGTON
KANSAS	NEW MEXICO	GUAM
KENTUCKY	NEW YORK	VIRGIN ISLANDS
MAINE	NORTH CAROLINA	

The Governors of the following states and territories voted in the negative:

ALABAMA	HAWAII	MONTANA
ARKANSAS	IDAHO	OKLAHOMA
COLORADO	MISSISSIPPI	OREGON

PENNSYLVANIA SOUTH DAKOTA WYOMING
RHODE ISLAND UTAH AMERICAN SAMOA]

Secretary Criehtfield: Twenty-nine "aye" votes and 15 "nays."
The motion is tabled.

Governor John Dempsey: I move for adoption of the rules, Mr. Chairman.

Governor Peabody: I second the motion.

Governor Anderson: It has been moved and seconded that the proposed rules of procedure be adopted. All in favor signify by saying "aye." Opposed? I declare the proposed rules of procedure now are the Rules of Procedure of this Conference.

The next order of business, as shown on your program, will be the report of the Interim Study Committee on Federal Aid to Education. It is my pleasure at this time to ask Governor Terry Sanford, Chairman of that study committee, to come forward, please.

Governor Sanford: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I was hoping that maybe the rules would be so changed that I would not have to make this report.

Since the last session of the Governors' Conference, a great many of us have been talking about problems of education and what needs to be done in our respective states. We came to the conclusion that two things could be said about federal participation in education. First, that there was shaping up no definite, all-inclusive policy; that it was difficult to know just what position the federal government would take or, indeed, should take. The second thing we concluded was that the multiplicity of federal programs, far from constituting a general policy, made it very difficult to understand just what was available, what could be used and what could benefit the states. So we suggested to the Executive Committee that an Interim Study Committee be set up to consider federal aid or federal participation in education. Nothing is quite as close to the states as education. Thirty-seven per cent of all state and local funds go to education. If we are to have a national policy or a national program as to what the federal government should do and how it should do it, the best group in America to help shape that policy is the Governors' Conference. Unfortunately, we did not have the time to confer with all of the Governors, and it is my feeling, before we adopt any such far-reaching program, that we should attempt to obtain a consensus, getting the opinions of Governors in all parts of the country as to what they need, if anything, in the way of federal participation.

So what we have attempted to do is prepare for you a preliminary study which the committee now has recommended be presented to you.* This gives, first of all, an outline of the goals and the or-

* The study, prepared by Governor Sanford, is entitled Is Education the Business of the Federal Government? Copies of this 116-

ganization of education in America, admittedly, in a very brief form. Secondly, it outlines all of the present programs of federal participation in education. I am sure, to those of you who have not made a deliberate study of this, you will find a surprisingly broad range of federal participation at present. Next, it outlines all of the past attempts made to pass federal bills that have not come to a vote in Congress. But at the same time I think it gives us a pretty good insight as to what is possible, what has been tried and what has failed. Then we have attempted to outline some of the issues—not all of them, because I am sure you will find many other issues coming to mind, many other things that need to be determined. What we hope is that you will take this report—and additional copies if you would like them for your school people and other members of your administration—and study it very carefully so that we might move on from this base as a Governors' Conference to help shape a national policy as to what the participation should be.

I do not know about education in your individual states, and I make no attempt to appraise it. But I would say, looking across America, that education is only about 50 per cent effective. If you take the number of students graduating, and of those graduating, fully prepared to go on beyond the high school, I think you would have to come to the conclusion that American education at present is not more than about 50 per cent effective. There are many soft spots, and there are many things that need to be done, and there are many improvements that we need to find. So this is not just an academic discussion as to responsibilities on the one hand of state governments and on the other hand of the federal government. Here is a task before America to make this not a 50 per cent effective job but as close as possible to 100 per cent. There are many things to be done regardless of whether the local government does them or the state government does them or the federal government does them. Our purpose is to define the kind of approach that will bring into play all of the resources that should be brought in and utilized.

I am satisfied that every Governor here has spent much time in defining the purposes of education. But for all of our goals and all of our ambitions—state, local and federal—all of these are best achieved by educated people. The educated individual can live a fuller life and contribute more to society and get more out of it. The educated person can help us, and it is the mission of every Governor to develop industry and commerce and economic opportunities. Certainly, an educated citizenry can play a vital part in our survival in a world involved in a Cold War. And surely, beyond that, an educated citizenry can, as no other force, help shape the

page document are on file in the offices of the Governors' Conference.

peace of the world. So this is of primary concern, I think, to our country and to our states and it requires our best attention.

The public schools already are a partnership between local governments and state governments. This varies across the country. Eighty-one per cent of the cost in Delaware is borne by the state; 6 per cent of the cost in Nebraska comes out of the state budget. In between there are all variations of state and local participation. I am sure that we have seen this matter of cooperation and know that it can work. Sometimes, though, we talk about federal aid as if it is something that has not been done at all; that federal participation is something yet to be determined. The truth of the matter is that the federal government has been involved in education since several years prior to the adoption of the Constitution, through its land grants. We moved on to land grants for the establishment of colleges. We have moved on to a position where the federal government has involved itself in many phases of education. In several important fields, the greatest part of the burden is carried by the federal government.

If you will follow through this report, you will find that there have been spurts of great interest by the Congress in public education, and a great many bills supporting education in some specific phase have been adopted. So the history has been, generally, that when aid to education has been considered, Congress has moved to a position of supporting education in a particular category. That is both good and bad. It is good perhaps because it gives us assistance in what Congress decides to be a national goal. The Defense Education Act, for example, supported science teaching and teaching of mathematics, teaching of modern languages, because the federal Congress felt that was important to the nation. But they did not feel it was important to support education generally.

What we need to do, it seems to me, is to determine whether or not the states can do this job alone—this job that somebody has to do. This nation can never maintain its position of dominance and leadership unless all of our people are given the best opportunities in education. Our question is: Can we do it alone or do we want to say that we need a partnership with the tax sources of the federal government? There are a great many questions to be determined. First of all, I think we must agree that Governors have the primary responsibility for upgrading education all across the country. We can do it by encouraging local participation. We can do it by adding our own support and our state budgets. And we can also make a decision in due time and after deliberation as to whether or not the federal government should play a more meaningful role in improving and carrying forward the education of our young people and, therefore, the future of the nation. So our Interim Study Committee, consisting of Governor Morrison, Governor Bellmon,

Governor Smylie and Governor Chafee, says to you that we are not going to attempt to answer these questions today or to suggest the answers. But we have put before you, which in turn you can put before your assistants in your respective states, the background material for making a broad policy decision as to where America should go in improving education and whether or not the federal government should take a greater part. So it is our hope and our recommendation to you that you study this, have your people study it, and allow us to confer with you over the next couple of months to determine whether or not the Governors' Conference can arrive at a decision. And, Mr. Chairman, it will be our recommendation in due time—and I do not think it is necessary nor appropriate that we do it right now—to the Executive Committee that an Interim Committee on Federal Aid to Education be reconstituted and continued until the next Conference, at which time we would hope that a policy position could be presented to the total Conference.

Governor Anderson: Thank you very much, Governor Sanford, for that fine presentation. Appropriate motions will be made at the appropriate time, I take it.

The next order of business, as shown on the program, is the report of the Committee on Federal-State Relations. Governor Robert E. Smylie of Idaho is the Chairman of that committee and I would like to have Governor Smylie come forward now.

Governor Robert E. Smylie: The report of the Committee on Federal-State Relations is before you in its entirety, consisting of approximately ten pages with two pages of attachments. The subject, as all of you know, is neither dramatic nor newsy. It has presented to us all some problems in the past. I think there are two or three points to which I might invite your attention this morning. On page two of the report you will find a recitation of the progress that has been made of a bill, designated as S. 1111, in the field of water resources planning. This bill, I think, is a very interesting example of the manner in which we can work together at the local, state and federal level to come up with a bill that is suitable to most everybody's needs. With respect to that bill I have urged the Congress to adopt it, as Chairman of your committee, and have taken the liberty of saying that I was not then speaking as the Governor of Idaho. I have some reservations with respect to the bill, but I think it will move through the Congress now. I think it is as good a bill as can be devised.

I would also think it proper to invite your attention to the section of the report which deals with taxation of multistate businesses and to urge gubernatorial and legislative attention at the state level at the earliest possible time, because it is getting much later in this field than you think. And I suspect that the forces which strive to have the Congress enact standards will do it in short order. If the states are going to maintain their rights in the field, and

revenue is the important thing, then sooner or later we are going to have to have uniformity in this field of taxation.

I would invite you also to the section on judicial review of administrative decisions under the Public Assistance Titles of the Social Security Act. It looks now as though there will be no progress in this Congress with respect to this matter, although the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has largely adopted the Governors' Conference position in favor of judicial review both of state plans and of administrative regulations of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The rest of the report is fairly self-explanatory.

Your committee will continue to work in this field, subject to your direction. And when we can, we say we speak for the Governors' Conference. Although, as I said last year, now that we do not have a voice, this becomes a little difficult. There are some suggestions about policy recommendations here. As Chairman of the committee, I would have been glad to have heard from you with respect to these questions. I am sure the Chairman of the committee in the future will likewise desire to hear from you.

I would, if I may, at your pleasure, Governor Anderson, move the adoption of the report.

Governor Anderson: There has been a motion to adopt the report of the Committee on Federal-State Relations. Is there a second?

Governor Dempsey: I second that.

Governor Anderson: It has been moved and seconded that the report be adopted. Is there any discussion on this report? If not, all in favor signify by saying "aye." All those opposed? The report has been adopted.*

Governor Anderson: We have moved along quite well this morning and for that, I thank you. We have completed the schedule of items of business on the program, but we have a luncheon scheduled today with the former members of this Conference who are now serving in Congress.

Mr. Carihfield has some announcements to make, which I hope you will give attention to at this time.

(Secretary Carihfield made several announcements.)

Governor Anderson: Thank you.

We will now go to have the group picture taken.

(The meeting was recessed at 11:20 a.m.)

* Text of the report of the Committee on Federal-State Relations will be found in Appendix VII.

AFTERNOON SESSION—Monday, June 8

Governor Anderson: The Conference will now come to order.

Before getting into the scheduled program for the afternoon, I would like to read this announcement. Under the Rules adopted this morning, due notice has been given by Governor Rockefeller on behalf of the Committee on Civil Defense and Post-Attack Recovery and by Governor Kerner on behalf of the Committee on the National Guard that they propose to move for action on resolutions at a subsequent session in the Conference. Copies of these resolutions have been distributed to all Governors and are also available to the press.

Without taking anything, I hope, from Governor Connally, who will preside and who will be introduced in just a moment, I would like to mention that the Senior Senator from Kansas, Frank Carlson, is here. I want to pay him thanks on behalf of myself and all of the members of this Conference, not only for his helpfulness and ideas in bringing this particular session of our Conference into being, but also for helping in seeing that our guests, the United States Senators, are with us today. Frank, I thank you very much. I would tell the members of this Conference that former Governor Carlson was Chairman of the Conference in 1949-1950.

I want now to introduce Governor John Connally of Texas who will preside this afternoon and present the program to you.

Governor John B. Connally: Governor Anderson, fellow Governors, distinguished Senators, ladies and gentlemen: It is my pleasure this afternoon to chair this meeting entitled "Federal-State Relations—The States and the Congress." We have already advised our distinguished guests, who will be individually presented to you here in a few moments, that we are going to ask them to take a few minutes; and by a few minutes I would say to you distinguished Senators—without attempting to imply any limitations on your speeches or provoking cloture—if you could hold your remarks to less than ten minutes, it would facilitate the meeting and give the Governors here an opportunity to ask some questions and discuss several problems with you, which I am sure they want to do. We will be grateful to you.

First, I would like to make a few remarks to open the session, with the hope that if this is going to be a meaningful session this afternoon, I think we are going to have to approach it from the standpoint of being very frank and candid in our discussion of our problems.

There is no greater issue now before us than the existing boundaries and the future of the relationship between the national government and the individual states. In many ways, the once distinct barriers between states have broken down. We are moving toward an economic and social life which tends more and more to obliterate state lines, to obscure the position of the states and increase the power of the federal government.

Yet we are a nation dedicated in our common political philosophy to the principle of self-reliant independence, and to maintaining the integrity of the Union through responsible local self-government. Thus, our problem becomes one of preserving this ideal of the American system in the face of irrevocable and far-reaching change.

The impact of federal aid programs on state and local government is our sternest test. These expenditures have increased from \$200 million per year in the early 1930's to \$10.6 billion for the fiscal year 1965. It is apparent to the political realist that as much as some may decry the very existence of this federal aid, few have ever turned it down. In all frankness, the multitude of federal grants may often be looked upon as the easy way out—the painless path to progress.

Our tendency is to blame the Congress and the federal agencies for interfering in our business, forgetting that our own failures may be the root of the trouble.

At a time when the Congress is required to stay in session virtually twelve months every year, when our national government must concern itself with monumental world problems of every type and scope, it behooves the Governors of the states to examine our own positions on the domestic matters within our jurisdictions. When we fail to meet our responsibilities, we place an undue burden on the Congress to cope not only with foreign affairs and national defense, but to deal with domestic issues which may well vary from state to state and from community to community.

We should not concede that leadership, vision and imagination are human qualities found only on the banks of the Potomac. We should likewise be reminded that funds from the Potomac, no matter how easily come by, do not spring from some buried treasure chest. They emanate from the same taxpayers who supply funds at other levels of government.

An individual is born in a particular community and educated in a local school. The contributions he makes during his lifetime are usually to the community. Whatever problems surround him, from infancy to infirmity, are created in some community in some state, and they may differ immensely from region to region. It seems apparent that these problems which arise locally are best solved locally. The finances required for their solution will most certainly come from the local community, no matter how circuitous the route.

None of us would dispute the vital role of the federal government in many domestic fields—highways, welfare, health, education, conservation. We may differ on degree and application, which we most assuredly will do in this meeting. But I doubt if we would quarrel with the basic philosophy that the federal-state relationship is more than a simple matter of giving and taking unlimited funds to erase all evils and solve all problems.

The state's role in this relationship is primary, not secondary. Federal grants which bypass the states endanger the effectiveness of the relationship. By the same token, our own failures in meeting responsibilities do violence to our constitutional system as surely as the most cynical use of federal authority.

My challenge and yours is to accept our own full measure of the leadership, vision and imagination necessary for responsible government and proper service to our people.

It is now my great pleasure and privilege to present to you the former Governors, former members of this Conference, who have gone on to serve their states, their people and this nation in a different capacity. First, I would like to present them and then come back later and call on each of them for their individual remarks.

Senior among all who have served in this body, I am sure, is Senator Ernest Gruening from the State of Alaska. He was first appointed Governor of Alaska in 1939 and served until 1953. He was elected United States Senator in 1956 and reelected in 1958 and 1962. Senator, while I am introducing your colleagues, we will give you a few moments to let your collect your thoughts, if you need that time.

Our next Senator, Frank Carlson, a former Chairman of this Conference, was elected Governor of Kansas on November 5, 1946, reelected in 1948 and elected Senator in 1950. He was reelected in 1956 and reelected in 1962.

We are in the home state of the next distinguished Senator, a former Governor and former Chairman of this Conference—Senator Frank Lausche. He served as Governor of this state from 1945 for five terms. Senator, please stand up. In 1956 he was elected to the United States Senate. He was reelected in 1962 and serves until 1969. Senator, it is wonderful to have you here.

We have another former Chairman of this Conference, while serving as Governor of his home state, Senator J. Caleb Boggs from the State of Delaware. He was elected Governor of his state for two four-year terms—November, 1952; reelected in 1956. He was Chairman of this body in 1959. He was elected to the United States Senate in 1960 for the term ending 1967. Senator Boggs.

Next is Senator J. Howard Edmondson of Oklahoma. He was elected Governor in 1958 and was the state's youngest chief executive. He is now a United States Senator.

Senator Len Jordan, of the State of Idaho, served from 1951 to 1955 as Governor of his state. Senator Jordan was first appointed to the Senate in 1962 to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Senator Dworshak, but elected in 1963 for the remainder of the term, ending 1967.

Our next Senator is Milward Simpson, of the State of Wyoming, who served his state as Governor from 1955 to 1959. He was elected to the Senate in 1962.

Senators, we are delighted to have you here. We know the tremendous burdens under which you operate in Washington. We are grateful for your presence. We know that you will contribute much to the discussion this afternoon. And now, if we may, in the order in which they were introduced. Senator Gruening, if you will make whatever remarks you prefer to make, we will be most interested in hearing from you.

Senator Ernest Gruening: Fellow Governors, I was rather startled to be accorded the rank of seniority because I happened to become Governor first. Of course, we are very much accustomed to seniority in the Senate. Some of us are critical, especially the younger ones, but as we grow older and accumulate seniority, the system looks better and better. As I studied the history, I found that only one other Governor, a predecessor of Governor Rockefeller, Tom Dewey, served somewhat longer without interruption. The reason I served so long is that I was appointed. I did not have to run for office. That made it relatively simple.

I suggested to my old friends and colleagues with whom I served as Governor in the days when they were kind enough to admit the stepchildren to the Governors' Conference—the stepchildren being then the territory of Alaska and the territory of Hawaii—that it might be a good idea to start the habit of an alumni association. The reason being to find out whether you youngsters, you young Governors, were living up to the high standards that we established as Governors. Just this morning when I met Senator Simpson outside of the Senate, I noticed that he was lacking a piece of equipment which he always carries with him—a little square bag, sort of a suitcase, that customarily contains a bottle of Scotch, a bottle of Bourbon, a bottle of rum and a bottle of Vodka. It is always very helpful when we have to take these trips to the West or the South in pursuance of our committee work. I said, "Where is your bag?" He said, "It will not be necessary. We are going to the Governors' Conference." But, believe it or not, my fear that deterioration had already set in was proven to be a fact because when we got to the room, we found two cases of Coca Cola. And my friend searched the closets assiduously and found nothing. The cupboards were bare. However, you are living in a more ascetic age than we in those good old days. I can understand that. Especially in an election year, you have to be very careful what you do.

I want to say something on a more serious note. Those of us in Alaska—Bill Egan and I—are very grateful to the Governors' Conference which, beginning in 1947, for five successive years adopted a resolution—and in those years they had to be adopted unanimously—that Alaska and Hawaii should be admitted to the Union. That was a great help to us. I very foolishly missed six Governors' Conferences, from 1940 to 1946, because they always took place in June, at a time when everything begins to burgeon in Alaska: the fisheries start, the mining starts, the VIP's come. And it was difficult to get away. I discovered how foolish I had been when I attended my first Conference in Salt Lake City in 1947. But I went there for the purpose of seeing whether we could get a resolution through. Governors are very generous. I had to prove my case for both Alaska and Hawaii before the Resolutions Committee. I felt it was necessary to come back to succeeding Conferences because I did not feel that the resolution was absolutely secure without any repeated effort.

This went along very peacefully until 1951 when we had a meeting in Gatlinburg. Of course, as you know, in those days these resolutions took place on the last day, shortly after luncheon on Wednesday when everybody was anxious to go home. Governor Lausche was presiding at that time and these resolutions rolled through—something for education, something for roads, something else for somebody else. Along came the resolution to admit Alaska and Hawaii to statehood. "All those in favor say 'aye.'" There was a chorus of "ayes." There was one loud "no." Everybody was very much startled. Who was the no? It was Governor Talmadge of Georgia. Governor Lausche said, "The motion is lost." I said, "I wonder whether the able and distinguished Governor could tell us what is the reason for this? This went through at previous Governors' Conferences." Governor Talmadge was very obliging. He said, "The people I represent do not want to admit any more states whose Senators are not likely to take our position on cloture." I rose and addressed Governor Talmadge, using my persuasive argument. I kept on talking. I noticed one of my colleagues whispered something in Governor Talmadge's ear. I kept on talking. Presently another Governor whispered in his ear again. What they were saying was, "Please get off because this fellow is going to keep us here all afternoon." I was opposed to cloture on that occasion. Governor Talmadge very generously got up and withdrew his opposition, pointing out that he was opposed to statehood for Alaska but he would not vote. I have always appreciated that very much. I think we owe him a great debt for what he did. And the same procedure was followed at the next Conference in Houston, when Governor Battle of Virginia and Governor Byrnes of South Carolina took the same gallant position. I can assure you that that helped us very much. I hope, as time passes, there will be no cause for regrets.

I would like to suggest that this visit of the alumni is a wonderful idea. I wish that more of us would come. There are over twenty of us who are alumni of this distinguished body. But some of them have a greater sense of responsibility than the six of us who came and they evidently felt they had to take part in the debate that is taking place today. However, we will be back tomorrow to vote. Thank you very much. It has been a great privilege and pleasure to be back with you.

Governor Connally: Thank you, Senator Gruening. If we may, let us withhold our questions for the distinguished Senators until each has spoken. Then we will start with the question and discussion period. Senator, I might say to you that I am sure the ones who stayed behind had no less or no greater dedication than you to their tasks. Their problems were probably just a little more immediate than yours.

Frank Carlson will be next.

Senator Frank Carlson: Governor Connally, Governor Anderson, distinguished Governors all, and my colleagues in the Senate: I want to assure you that it is a genuine privilege to have the opportunity again to attend and visit a Governors' Conference. There is something about the comradeship that is engendered in a Governors' Conference that stays with you during your entire lifetime. At the suggestion of Senator Gruening, in trying to work out a meeting of former Governors, I want to say how I regret sincerely that we were unable to get additional ones here. I did visit with every one of the members of the United States Senate. In case you do not know it, Governor, there are twenty-one ex-Governors in the United States Senate, over one-fifth of the membership of the Senate. Many of these Governors expressed their sincere regrets that they were unable to be present and attend on this particular occasion for the very reason mentioned. So I say to you fine folks that it is a pleasure to be back. I shall not detain you at great length. I have thought a little bit about this subject we are discussing, and it is a subject that is not new at Governors' Conferences. It is a problem that has been with this nation for years. I remember well a speech that was made by the late President Kennedy just two months before his death. I want to read from it. President Kennedy stated: "The problems of government are becoming more and more complex, and the relationships between the states and the federal government are more interdependent. But the more important point is to remember that we are allies under the Constitution. Too often it is suggested that the federal government and the state governments are competitors. Instead, we must work closely together for the benefit of our country, which we all serve."

I thought that was a very timely statement to read into the record because I think it fits the occasion as we meet here today. The most powerful and persuasive force for stability and continuity in

our system of government behind the Constitution itself is the division of power and jurisdiction between the national government and the states. And I am sure you folks all agree that there is an ever-increasing pressure for the further centralization of power. I think, personally, it is fortunate that we have a number of ex-Governors serving in the legislative body of this nation, because I think all of us get a feeling of states' rights, a feeling of a separation of power. In the decade from 1950 to 1960, excluding non-defense expenditures, our federal government costs increased by the relatively modest sum of \$6.4 billion or a growth of 25 per cent; but state expenditures during that same decade reached the figure of \$19.3 billion from \$13.2 billion in 1950 or a growth of 124 per cent—six times the growth of the federal government. I mention that because of the importance in this nation of strong state governments.

This explosive growth of functions and power of local government is one of the most challenging developments in our nation's history. Federal aid to states has grown primarily since 1911. Over the years Congress has enacted seventy-three such programs. Only fourteen have been terminated; fifty-nine are still on the books. And you folks are wrestling with them, I am sure. Grants-in-aid to the states and local governments in 1964 will cost an estimated \$10 billion, almost a fourfold increase in only a few years. That is one of the dangers, as I see it, confronting this nation, this government within a government, which has great possibilities when you turn these powers over to agencies that work between the federal government and the states. Now, the federal grant-in-aid is and it will continue to be an inescapable and an important mechanism of intergovernmental relations. But, here again, I think there are some problems that we in the federal government and you in state government must try to avoid. One is the ever-increasing control over state programs and local governments by the federal government. This is one of the problems we have to contend with as we write legislation. We who hold responsible positions in the executive and legislative branches of government must continuously guard against what could become a pressing danger and that is a government within a government.

Governor Connally: Thank you, Senator Carlson.

I might make two observations. One, the tremendous increase in the cost of state governments that you recited a moment ago gives us some idea that states are living up more and more to the responsibilities which are theirs. Secondly, I know that you pleased everyone here and heartened all the members of this Conference when you recited that twenty-one members of the United States Senate are former Governors. I am sure that many of them here will agree with the poet who said, "Hope springs eternal in the human breast."

Next we will hear from Senator Boggs.

Senator J. Caleb Boggs: Governor Connally, Governor Anderson, distinguished Governors and guests: I want to join my colleagues in expressing great appreciation for the honor and privilege of visiting with you this afternoon, and for the opportunity to meet new Governors who are here and to renew acquaintances with the many that it was my privilege to serve with. Having the opportunity to serve as Chairman of this Conference in 1959, as well as being a member of this Conference for eight years, was about the most enriching experience, I think, of my life, and one that I shall always remember with great pleasure. The experiences and the discussions which took place around these tables during those eight years, were the best background, I think, I could possibly have had as preparation for serving in the Congress. The experience of being Governor and working day in and day out at the state level and the local level is one of the greatest experiences a person can have. When you can get out every day and get in your car and visit somebody—this private enterprise or this road project or this vocational rehabilitation program or this mental hospital or whatever it is—this is like a tonic, I think. It builds you up and it gives you renewed dedication to the service to which you have been elected.

Carrying this experience to the Senate, I want to make this comment. I know the problems are complicated and difficult. I felt so often last year, and I am beginning to think this year, that it is a shame the Congress has to be in session so many days and the members of the Congress, the House and the Senate, do not have more time to get back to their states and communities. There they can learn firsthand of the various programs that the federal government is participating in and can share the views and comments and receive the inspiration and suggestions of local public officials—and most importantly—citizens. Fortunately, I live close to my state. I am able to get back most every weekend. For example, this past weekend I was back there for Saturday and Sunday, and I was privileged to participate in two or three affairs. It gives you a renewed feeling of hope and confidence about meeting our many problems that sometimes stagger us as we look at these times and as we look ahead.

I want to speak of one just by way of example. I see you have the question of employment on your program and you will discuss it more fully later. But I will speak about it in relation to automation. We all know that automation started slowly, but it is now moving most rapidly; and I think more rapidly than maybe many of us may realize. It is causing a real problem not only with the dislocation of those who may have had ten, fourteen, twenty or thirty years of service, but is making a problem for the young men and women coming along and getting out of school or even dropping out

without really realizing the consequences of their action. I know the public officials charged with this problem at the state level are concerned about it. But it seems to me that the pressure is always on the federal government to take up this problem of unemployment and carry the whole ball, to figure out what we should do to accept the challenges and best serve our society and our country as we move along in this scientific and technological revolution. I personally feel that the greater strength to our nation as a whole and to private enterprise and to our citizens would be in a federal-state approach to this problem. My simple suggestion—and it is not novel at all because it has been tried with youth, education, and aging problems—is the White House Conference approach. I have placed a bill in the Senate, and I do not speak with any particular pride about it because the idea was not new. I saw it work in those cases and it was most helpful. The White House Conference approach on automation and unemployment would start at the local level, as you well know, and work up from the cities and counties to the state level and then come together in Washington as the climax. But the real heart of the thing is at the local and state level. By the time the matter gets to Washington, certainly, the executive department and the legislative department should have a full picture of what the federal government can do to supplement and strengthen all of these local efforts to meet the problem of unemployment caused as a result of this technological revolution. I have a feeling that in Congress we value and appreciate and want the advice and the counsel of those working at every level. I believe that in all of these other cases of various federal-state programs, where the federal government may be taking the initiative many times, there must be this review every four or five years. And whenever the Governors' Conference itself takes up a certain matter of national concern, as you are doing today at this Conference, the views of this Conference are most weighty, I assure you, and appreciated by members of the Congress.

In conclusion, I just want to cite one or two simple things. One is in preserving the strength of our federal-state system. I remember when it was my privilege to serve in the House for that brief two-year term. To be very frank, I thought a fellow was just running for office all of the time. I thought, "Well, wouldn't it be better to have a four-year term? A man could get here and get a little background and make a greater contribution." But over the years, as I thought about this constitutional provision, I came to the conclusion that it was wise. The ultimate power of our government is really in the hands of the people when they control the destiny of our national government every two years through the election of every member of the House of Representatives. The other thing that I think is important is that every Governor of each of our fifty states has the privilege of the floor of both the House and the

Senate. You do not have a vote, as you know, of course. But you have the privilege and you are always welcome to come to the Senate floor, and the distinguished Senators from your state will introduce you around. Your personal views to the members of the Senate are always welcome. That is a privilege and an opportunity that I did not take advantage of at any time during the eight years I was privileged to serve as Governor. We have been honored to have our present Governor, Governor Carvel, visit us and we welcome him. This is a point of personal contact and communication between the state and the Congress that perhaps is not fully taken advantage of on these mutual problems we have in making this federal-state concept of government work. I know that these Governors' Conferences, the history of them during their more than fifty years, have been a constructive effort toward strengthening our federal-state concept. I know I can feel the atmosphere of this very successful Conference; that, as you move along during this Conference, and I am sure in Conferences ahead, it will continue to be a strengthening and wholesome and important factor in our national life.

Governor Connally: Thank you, Senator Boggs.

Now, from the Host State of Ohio, the distinguished Senator, Frank Lausche.

Senator Frank J. Lausche: Governor Anderson, Governor Connally, distinguished Governors of the several states, and my colleagues assembled here this afternoon: I see Governor Rockefeller is here and Governor Scranton and Governor Wallace, and for their benefit and your benefit, especially, I want to tell you that while your ambitions might be high, in the Senate I have observed a number of individuals who are using better English. They are using the soft line. They are very considerate of their colleagues. I could not make out what it meant until one day going through the cloak room with about a half a dozen Republicans there I said, "Mr. President," and all six of them got up. On the other side of the fence, there were Democrats assembled and as I went through I said, "Mr. Vice President," and they got up.

I am deeply pleased by the theme that seems to be emerging from this meeting; that we cannot abandon in our minds the necessity of preserving the integrity of the states and the concept of our federal government as enunciated in the Constitution of the United States. We may destroy the individual states. We may destroy the very concept of our federal government that has brought abundance to the people of our country, but over and above that is the preservation of the integrity and the dignity of the citizen. Governor Connally stated: "Thus, our problem becomes one of preserving this ideal of the American system in the face of irrevocable and far-reaching change." We can destroy this system without knowledge of what we are doing through a constant encroachment by the fed-

eral government without observation by the people. We can spend \$50 billion for defense but while we are doing that, we can unknowingly follow a course that is anathema to the very purpose of the defense expenditures.

Governor Connally further stated: "It is apparent to the political realist that as much as some may decry the very existence of this federal aid, few have ever turned it down." Gentlemen, there is truth in that statement that cannot be rebutted. Federal aid is decried not only by public officials but by private industry until the hour comes when that particular industry is to be the beneficiary of federal aid. In the farm bill of this year, we entered into a new program, one which, I think, forebodes trouble ahead. There are Governors here from states that grow cotton. We have subsidized the sale of cotton in the international markets by providing out of the federal treasury the differential between the price procured in our own land and the world market price. No one complained about that. But this year we went on to adopt authority that will entail the expenditure of \$315 million, at least, to subsidize the processors of cotton goods in our country. And my question to you is: If you subsidize that industry, how will you turn down the bicycle manufacturer, the textile manufacturer and others in the country? You simply will not be able to do it.

Governor Connally further stated: "In all frankness, the multitude of federal grants may often be looked upon as the easy way out—the painless path to progress." I read in the New York Times, coming in on the plane last night, of the great abundance that is ours, and that we possibly will never again have a recession. I cannot subscribe to that thought because we are building up a debt. We are establishing built-in programs of expenditures that will have to be paid. When World War II came to an end, our national debt was \$264 billion. It is now up to \$320 billion. In every war that we were ever engaged in, within a period of twenty years after the end of the war, that war was amortized. It is now, I would say, \$56 billion more than it was in 1946. Federal grants may lood good at the beginning, but, ladies and gentlemen, eventually they will have to be paid. If one studies the status of our gold reserves, he will find evidence of the money markets of the world having doubt about our position, the stability of our position. Government spending may be a temporary sedative for unemployment but it cannot be the cure if we fail to adopt means that reach the cause. There is great discussion about finding employment for our people. I can at least say to you that you are not going to solve that problem by annual federal expenditures. You will solve it if you can keep your prices competitive with the prices of the other nations of the world. We have to find markets outside of our own land. You will not find markets outside of your own land if the President's Advisory Committee on Economics recommends a level of 3.2 per cent of pay in-

crease and then we find ourselves with grants being made and without opposition to pay increases which amount to 30 per cent. And on that score I want to say to you that we are now contemplating raising the salaries of the Congressmen. In 1955 the salary was \$12,500 a year. It was raised to \$22,500 or 80 per cent. And we are now contemplating raising it to \$30,000, another 33-1/3 per cent. How do you reconcile that with the recommendation that the raise should be 3.2 per cent? You simply cannot do it.

If I were to leave one thought with you, it would be: Try to follow a course that will maintain the structures of our government in the light that they were ordained. Preserve your states. Keep the federal government strong so that it can meet this expensive problem of threats of war. That problem itself is a backbreaking one. Finally, if we Congressmen had to levy the taxes to finance the new programs of aid that we are adopting, I say to you, without fear of any challenge, that we would never adopt them. We grant the aid and then pass on to posterity the responsibility of paying the bill. That, in my judgment, is not in accord with what our system of government is.

In closing, ladies and gentlemen, there is the Biblical lesson of Ahab, the king, who wanted the vineyard of Naboth. Ahab, the king, went to Naboth and said, "I want your vineyard added to the grounds of the palace." Naboth said, "I cannot give it to thee." The king said, "I will give you other lands in exchange for your vineyard." And Naboth, the peasant, said to Ahab, the king, "King, this land came to me from my ancestors. The land is my heritage. I cannot give it up."

Governor Connally: Thank you, Seantor Lausche.

Now, from my next door state, Senator Edmondson from the State of Oklahoma.

Senator J. Howard Edmondson: Governor Connally, Governor Anderson, distinguished colleagues, Governors of the fifty states: It is a pleasure, indeed, and somewhat unique for me to have the opportunity to speak to each of you today quite briefly. I emphasize the "quite briefly" because if I speak too long, I think there might be some evidence already exhibited to you as to why we have not solved the civil rights problem in Congress as yet. But it is a pleasure, particularly for me, because after serving as Governor of Oklahoma for four years and then being appointed to the Senate, I hesitate to announce to you that a very disastrous fact took place in Oklahoma last month. I was defeated! But then every constituency is entitled to one error in judgment in a lifetime, and perhaps this one could be rectified in the future. But for the information of those of you with whom I served, I might announce that, insofar as my future plans are concerned, I have decided to accept the suggestion of the distinguished Governor of California and come out there and run. Apparently, there are no residency requirements involved.

I am particularly pleased, also, to listen to the observations of my colleagues in the Senate and more particularly to the observations of the distinguished Governor of Texas. All of you, all of us, have wrestled with the problem of federal grants-in-aid or, as others have described it, this continuing trend toward centralization of government in Washington. I know that the observations of my senior colleagues would be much more judicial and informed than mine. But I would like to suggest, as perhaps others have, that the responsibility in the first instance in practically every case has been held exclusively by the several states before a federal action took place. Whether we trace federal grants-in-aid to highways or the welfare program or agriculture or, more recently, mental health or education, I think history proves that the several states had the opportunity and the responsibility to meet the problem locally before any federal action came about. I know that many of you have, as I have, made trips to Washington while Governor to seek defense installations. Many of us have been successful. But is it not true, as one example, that after we were successful, after we obtained that defense installation, that in all too many instances we got on the plane and went back to Washington and screamed and hollered for help in the form of federal aid to education in defense-impacted areas? Would it not have been better to accept our responsibility to have met that obligation locally when those children came with those employees to that defense installation?

My friends and my former colleagues, I believe, as Governor Connally put it, the responsibility is with us in the states. I believe by the same token, and I believe it most sincerely, that in all too many instances federal action is the direct result of state inaction. I think by the same token we can see the pendulum swing back, hopefully, toward the several states in direct proportion to the acceptance of responsibility on that state level. As is true with every case, there are exceptions. But I would hope that we will seek continued discussion on the subject and also, even more hopefully, fruitful action on that state level.

Governor Connally: Thank you, Senator Edmondson.

It is now my pleasure to present Senator Jordan from the State of Idaho.

Senator Len B. Jordan: Governor Connally, Governor Anderson, distinguished Governors, my colleagues of the Senate: I am proud to come back to a Governors' Conference as an alumnus, because I think this Conference has perhaps meant more to me through the years than any other contact that I have made in government. And I have served in government at all levels. So I am proud to return as an alumnus to this fine organization and to know that you are still discussing some of the same problems that we discussed a decade ago. They are still with us and they will be with

us for some time. I think it is significant that we have twenty-one Governors in the Senate of the United States who stand foursquare and ready at all times to defend the point of view of the states in the halls of Congress. I can assure you that you do have crossing of party lines by twenty-one stalwart defenders of that point of view. I would remind you that there are those in the Congress who have small use for the functions of the states in some particular. We are constantly being faced with the possibility, the suggestion, that certain programs can very well bypass the states and deal directly with political subdivisions of government other than states. I think, as Governor Connally has pointed out, that is a dangerous trend and one that needs to be stopped at its inception. I would like to think, as has been suggested here, that the states and the federal government are cooperators rather than competitors in so many of the areas in which we have joint responsibilities.

As an example, I am thinking particularly of a joint stewardship which the states and the federal government share, and that is with respect to the development of our natural resources—water reserves in particular. The great rivers of the United States are not confined to any one state; they do not recognize state boundaries. We find great interest among the several states that comprise a river basin. And yet the interest of one river basin may be quite separate and different from the interest of another river basin in another part of the country. So this calls for a fine spirit of cooperation between the several states in their several river basins in working out the best programs for full and complete resources development. There are certain advantages and there are certain benefits to accrue from such projects as flood control, navigation and recreation. Of particular interest to those states involved are the by-products of power and, in some instances, reclamation. I suggest to you that our West water resources are of tremendous importance to the arid sections. Water assumes much greater importance in the West than it does here in the East. Above all, in the development of these great natural resources, it is incumbent upon us, as Governors of states and as Representatives in the Congress of the United States, to pass on this joint stewardship of the resources of the nation, pass them on in even better condition to the generations that are to come. That is the thought I should like to leave with you today. I do not regard this as a conflict of interest between the states and the federal government. I think that we should always be cooperators rather than competitors. I think that we should go forward to a full utilization of the great resources of this nation on that basis.

Governor Connally: Thank you, Senator Jordan.

The last of our distinguished guests this afternoon is Senator Milward Simpson of the State of Wyoming.

Senator Milward L. Simpson: Governor Connally, Governor

Anderson, Governor Rhodes of the Host State, and my fellow colleagues in the Senate, and fellow Governors: Your travail is almost ended, which reminds me of a talk that I gave in South Bend, Indiana, recently. It was about 11:30 at night and the toastmaster said, after about some ten speeches, "Senator, when you finish, just turn out the lights and put the key under the mat and we will see you later." If you think it is "coming-up-ness" to go from Governor to the United States Senate, just dismiss that thought from your mind. It isn't! You will find 100 Senators getting on their horses and riding off in 100 different directions.

I want to associate myself with the wonderful remarks of Governor Connally, which should be the focal point of our consideration here this afternoon. I would rather have you bat it around than beat my gums over some of the things that have already been said here. I think there is one point that I would like to stress and it disturbs me very, very much in the United States Senate. We are in a vicious circle with respect to imports, and the interrelations of the states should prompt the Senators to try to resolve this thing by a better understanding of the over-all problem. Now, when you talk to me about citrus and those things, I do not know too much about them. I do know a lemon when I see one. This matter of imports is a very dangerous thing. Take lumber, take wool, take the textile industry in the South and in the North; take the steel industry, the lumber industry and oil industry and you have a situation that, under the guise of contributing to the national interest, we discover that we are giving away our local market, and some of the most peculiar things happen as a result of it. I heard Senator Gruening say that he and Governor Egan were very delighted about the many times that they were endorsed for statehood. I suggested to Governor Egan the other day, when he came before our committee with respect to the recent earthquake episode, that since we give away foreign loans at $3/4$ of 1 per cent interest and give a ten-year moratorium on the repayment of the interest on the loan, and since the best we could do is to give Alaska a loan at $3-3/4$ per cent and a one-year moratorium: I suggested that Alaska secede from the Union so they would get better treatment and get it more quickly because we are better equipped to give it to the foreign nations.

But just one good example with respect to this import problem. It is very important and I hope you will give it your consideration. We find that the imports of beef have built up a serious surplus of beef in the United States of America. So the Agriculture Department allocates some \$34 million to buy beef. They propose to use it in the program for Food for Peace, subsidized by the American taxpayers, and in the same breath we hear that there is a war on poverty. It might be well to consider those things.

Governor Connally: Thank you very much, Senator Simpson.

To all of the distinguished Senators and former members of this Conference, we are honored by your presence and we are grateful for your remarks. I want to point out to all of you that we have approximately thirty minutes now that we have tried to reserve for discussion and for any questions that the Governors might want to propound to any one of these individuals or to all of them. We must clear the room a few moments before four o'clock. The Senators themselves must leave by four o'clock. The room will have to be cleared in order that we might go into executive session. Keep your questions brief and your discussion short, if you will. I will now be pleased to entertain any questions or discussion by the Governors.

Governor Brown: I would like to ask Senator Edmondson a question, Governor Connally. I suggested to the President that a council of Governors be formed. The President of the United States at the present time has a Council of Economic Advisors. They do not have any authority except to sit down with the President and give him advice on the economic condition as they see it. I feel that the Governors, in daily touch with the immediate needs of their particular states, could be most helpful to the President, if there were some way that we could regularly meet with him. We all do it now as much as we possibly can, but he is a busy man and it is difficult to assign the time necessary. You are recently out of the Governor's office. You have been in the Senate, and you know the problems of the states. My suggestion is that this advisory council be formed by the President; that he name on a bipartisan basis three from the majority party and two from the minority party; that they would meet maybe twice a year with the President with an agenda to talk about these things. What do you think about that?

Senator Edmondson: I think it is a very excellent suggestion. And I am glad that you did not press me on my point about coming to California to run for office. I thought perhaps that might be the one thing you were going to ask. But I think it is an excellent suggestion. I think anyone would agree that the more contact the President of the United States has with the Governors of the several states, the more healthy the situation will be in federal-state relationships. I think a committee selected from the Governors' Conference, as you suggested, Governor Brown, or other forms of contact would be extremely helpful and very productive.

Governor Brown: Just one other thing. You are going to come to California. We have a great state out there and you will be a welcome addition to it, Senator. Your people do not appreciate you. We do.

Senator Edmondson: I am also aware of the fact that I have a little bit of an advantage. A great number of Oklahomans went out there in the 1930's and are still there.

Governor Brown: They all voted for me, too.

Governor Connally: Governor Peabody.

Governor Peabody: Thank you, Governor Connally. Speaking as one Governor, I want to thank so much the Senators, our former Governors, for coming here today. I think this session has been most helpful and most informative. It helps to create that partnership which I think is so necessary if we are going to solve these problems together. I would like to add a word, though, and that is about some of these grant-in-aid programs. I do not think that a single Governor here would like to get rid of the federal highway program, the water pollution program, the air pollution program, aid to agriculture, urban renewal, aid to education, job retaining, aid to mental illness and the retarded, the housing program or aid to transportation. If many of these issues were to be solved only on the local level, you would find that one state would either have such a high tax base that it could not compete with another, or that a state was not getting the services necessary to keep our country strong. I do not view with alarm at all the statements in the magazine articles contending that power is going away from the state. It is not. I can tell you from my operation in Massachusetts, working on the Job Redevelopment and Training Act, that we need the federal funds, and it is necessary for the government to subsidize the operation of that program. If it does, it will work. If it does not, it will not work. I am all for the development of this program and many others. So I am hopeful that we will all agree that there is a need for these grants-in-aid and that there is a need for greater cooperation and partnership by the Governors with the federal government. I think that Governor Brown's suggestion is very well taken. But I would like to see legislation passed—take the Job Redevelopment and Training Act—and appoint two Governors to work with that legislation and make reports on it and to improve it as it goes along. I think this partnership, developed in this manner, will strengthen our nation, strengthen our states and will keep the federal government stronger than it ever has been before.

Governor Rockefeller: I think Governor Peabody raises a good point when he says he would like to see the Governors cooperate in this and play an important part in this federal-state operation. He did not mention what seems to me is a very serious trend that is taking place in the grant-in-aid programs and that is the bypassing of the states. Governor Peabody will not be in a position to give the leadership he is talking about if the legislation continues along the lines that have been written in recent years, because the states are excluded by the President's grant-in-aid programs. The program he refers to of poverty excludes state cooperation, and working directly with the local communities throughout the state, I think, is extremely serious. I think it shows a deep lack of understanding of the role of the state by the national administration proposing this legislation. We even had an occasion in New York City where

the Mayor was complaining because the poverty program was going directly to the boroughs without reference to the city administration. I think this is a very dangerous trend. It is going to destroy the structure that we have had in this country, so ably referred to by some of those distinguished Senators here present. I think that this is something which should have sharp and major attention both from the Governors and from the Senators.

Governor Connally: Thank you, Governor Rockefeller.

Governor Henry Bellmon: Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a question to Senator Lausche. I wonder if it would be possible for the Congress, in any future programs that require participation by the state or matching of federal grants with state funds, to require that these programs must be ratified by two-thirds of the states before they become effective. We have now no way of resisting the largess of the federal government. We are criticized if we do not take advantage of it.

Senator Lausche: To answer the last part of your question first, it is thoroughly apparent that when the money is available you undoubtedly will be condemned by your own people unless you take it. The suggestion that there be increased matching requirements, I think, would act as a very powerful deterrent against the pressure that is now applied upon the federal government. Unfortunately, however, in the urban renewal program, my recollection is that the matching requirement was 66-2/3 to 33-1/3. President Eisenhower wanted to increase the amount to be contributed by the local governments and decrease the federal amount. The ultimate result was that President Eisenhower's recommendation was not followed. The amount of participation by the local governments was reduced. In some way there must be devised a means that will operate as a damper upon the increased demands that are being made on the federal government. That damper does not exist where the matching is slight and the contribution of the federal government is large. I do not know whether I covered completely your question. I tried to answer it the best I could.

Governor Connally: Did he answer your question, Governor Bellmon?

Governor Bellmon: Yes.

Governor Connally: Thank you, Senator Lausche.

Are there any other questions?

Governor John M. Dalton: Governor Connally, it seems to me that if the states would furnish the leadership and assume their responsibilities of meeting the needs and concerns of their people, we would not have so much intrusion by the federal government.

Governor Connally: I subscribe to that, as I tried to indicate in my opening remarks. I do want just to point out to the Senators and the Governors, if I may, one thing. You are all familiar with the Educational Facilities Act, which gives me some concern. We

are now in the throes of trying to assess, evaluate and do much more in the field of higher education in my state. I am concerned about the Educational Facilities Act to this extent. Title I requires the universities, colleges and junior colleges to come through a state agency for evaluation of their requests for assistance under this act. However, Title II and Title III of the Educational Facilities Act, dealing with graduate facilities and academic facilities, will be acted on by the United States Commissioner of Education on direct application from the institutions without coming through any state governing board whatsoever. I merely want to point this out, not in the form of a question, but as an observation. This makes it difficult for us in attempting to appropriate funds for institutions of higher learning, in trying to meet their needs and to provide a balance between our junior colleges and our senior colleges. It makes it difficult for us to know when and what will be granted by the Commissioner of Education to one of our institutions, which is not required by law to come through any state agency in applying for this aid.

I did not mean to take time here as Chairman of this afternoon meeting. Are there any other questions? We still have about twenty minutes. I think the value of this discussion will be enhanced greatly by a very frank discussion. You have an opportunity to ask questions of these seven Senators. I am sure they will be delighted to attempt to answer them. If not, please make whatever observations you may have.

Governor Hansen: Governor Connally, your remarks go right to the crux of the problem. I would like to direct a question, if I may, to Senator Lausche. I recall four years ago that the then-candidate for the Vice Presidency of the United States deplored the condition that was existing in this country. At that time 17 million Americans were going to bed hungry. I wonder how much more effort, how much more war on poverty our people can stand? I understand now that nearly 40 million are going to bed hungry. I wonder if it is not time that we give a little consideration to our own economy. I am disturbed and distressed by the fact that on the one hand we deprive some 100,000 textile workers jobs through the subsidization of cotton to foreign mills, and then we turn around and subsidize those industries so they can better compete with the foreign competition that we have built. I would like to know, sir, what your feelings are with regard to the plight of our domestic industries? I come from a state that is dependent upon agriculture. It is dependent upon oil and steel, and each of these industries, in my mind, is getting into very deep trouble. I understand that, since World War II, American dollars have either built or modernized or expanded 178 foreign steel mills. We have contributed \$1,735,000. What are your feelings about attention to our domestic economy as contrasted with further foreign aid?

Senator Lausche: Well, obviously, I feel that our primary responsibility is to strengthen our domestic economy. As we do that, we will strengthen the position of our friends throughout the world. I have constantly taken the position that we should quit giving aid either by way of loans or grants to nations that contemplate using that aid for the establishment of governmentally operated industry. The plant in India is an example of what I speak. India wanted \$1 billion from us to build a steel plant. That plant was to be operated by the Indian government at a time when their present plants, operated privately, are not running at full capacity. In my judgment, number one, we ought to quit giving aid to established socialistic governments around the world.

I do not think there is any question but that the increasing imports of steel and other crude materials and manufactured products are beginning to have an impact upon our domestic economy. When the bill in 1961 was before the Senate revising the tariff clause, I voted for the elimination of what you would call the danger point. And I, on that occasion, did something that I have not done in my whole public career. I believed that the peril point should have been maintained. I came down to the floor of the Senate and there were about 85 votes to eliminate it and 6 votes for it. And I said to myself, "Heck, I will join the majority." I have been sorry ever since. There ought to be reinstated the provision of law that when the peril point is reached and our domestic industry is becoming adversely affected, you have to take a new look at it to insure that we will protect our domestic industry first.

Governor Connally: Thank you, Senator Lausche.

Are there any other questions?

Governor William L. Guy: I would like to address a question to any one of the Senators. It deals once again with federal-state relations. What interest can you conceive of that is superior to the federal interest? What program now carried on by the federal government could be returned to the state?

Senator Lausche: I will try to answer that. In my opinion, when you have a program established and rooted, you simply cannot withdraw from it. My hope is that we could discontinue further advancement in these fields. In 1950 the Governors' Conference created this federal-state research on relationships. We on the state level were supposed to have funds returned to us by the federal government getting out of tax fields. Well, the net result was that the whole thing broke down. We tried to eliminate what was written in the law. You simply cannot do it. If you cannot succeed in stopping this ever-increasing tempo of federal aid controlling the purse—and when the federal government controls the purse, ladies and gentlemen, it controls you—you do not have a chance in the world of getting out of it.

Governor Connally: Are there any other observations from

any of the Senators in reply to that question? Are there any other questions?

Senator Gruening: I would like to express my agreement with the remarks of Governor Peabody. The highway program was conceived in order to have a nationwide program of high standard. It was understood by the Congress way back in 1916, when this was passed, that if we left it to the states, as it had been, you would not have a uniform system of high standard. Certain states that were road-minded or wealthy would give you fine paved highways. And when you passed from that state across to another state where there was a different attitude, what had been a fine paved highway would disintegrate into a mud puddle in wet weather and be dusty when dry. That applies to our rivers. They are not respecters of state borders. If you examine these programs, one by one, the very ones listed by Governor Peabody, you will find that it is a fine theory to get along without federal aid, but it is not desirable and it is not practical. I am in complete agreement with what he said and in complete disagreement with what was said on the other side.

Governor Connally: Thank you, Senator Gruening.
Are there any other questions?

Governor Peabody: I would just like to make one short observation, and that is that as a result of the discussion here this afternoon, I think that it is indicated that there should be closer cooperation in the operation of these programs. And, also, I think it is indicated that if the federal government operates directly with the municipality involved, that the possibility of this being evenly administered is jeopardized. And, conversely, if it is done through the states and through the supervision of the Governor on the scene who has the responsibility of all of the people of the state, to put these into effect on a uniform basis, that these programs will work out much better. I am hopeful that, as a result of this meeting, some concrete recommendations can be made with respect to current legislation on the books and with respect to future legislation that may be passed, so that the state governments can have a direct hand in the coordination of these programs and that the state Governors can be a supervisory body for particular legislation—a screening committee of two or three Governors with regular reports—so if one particular bill bogs down, it can be improved on immediately rather than wait for long-term legislation.

Governor Connally: Thank you.

Senator Boggs: I was very much interested in the remarks by Governor Peabody and, sir, I find myself in complete agreement. What I tried to say in my original statement was that I think in most all of these programs you are going to find more practical ideas by starting out working with the Governors and the state governments in the beginning before you actually draft the legislation.

Then you lay the basis for the continuing, cooperative effort together. I do not care whether it is on the poverty program or any other program.

Senator Lausche: Mr. Chairman, I am in accord with what Governor Rockefeller has said and what Governor Peabody has said. We should operate in these cases through the states; they should not be bypassed.

Governor Connally: Thank you, Senator Lausche. That is one of the reasons I pointed out the difficulties that I think we are going to encounter to a marked degree in the Higher Educational Facilities Act. I am sure each of the states is going to encounter it.

Are there any other questions?

Governor Fannin: Distinguished Senators, we can be very proud of what has been done over the years in the federal-state highway program. Some of the Senators here enacted it, and perhaps some were Governors when it was started and had the responsibility for getting it under way. I just wondered what is being done for it as far as the Senate is concerned in relationship to the continuation or revision of that program after 1972.

Senator Lausche: In my opinion, before 1972, we should re-adopt the law. The burden of maintaining the federal highway should not be imposed upon the local citizenry. The program is financed by a trust fund. The users of the highways contribute toward it. I think it is a program that is extraordinarily sound.

Governor Fannin: I understand that the provision, as it presently stands, is that two cents of every four cents now being taxed for fuel reverts back. If that is not continued, then the maintenance of the highway will, of course, fall completely upon the states and will be a great burden upon the states. I know I can speak for my particular state where costs are increasing for the maintenance and for the patrol of the highways. I am just wondering if it would not be possible for the federal government to work on some program where they would participate in the maintenance of these highways in some of the states? In border states, such as my state, we have about 75 per cent of our land owned or controlled by the federal government. So it is quite a problem.

Senator Edmondson: I would like to make this one comment. We have had a great deal of discussion today about getting away from the idea of new federal programs and about centralization of government. But already I think the problem has come to the forefront—which is obviously money—because here already has come the suggestion of a new federal program, and that is that the federal government participate in the cost of maintenance of highways, which is something the federal government is not doing at present. What it amounts to is: Who is going to put up the money? Back to Governor Guy's question: I think there are a number of these questions that can be turned back to the states if the states are willing

to accept the responsibility and pay the cost of them.

Governor Fannin: I would say that, in this regard, the charge to the public for the gasoline or fuel involved, the extra few cents that would be returned, would be a dividend. It would be a way of handling this problem.

Senator Carlson: I think you can be assured that this federal-state program on the interstate highway system will not only be continued, but that in the future, I think, Congress will soon begin to consider the maintenance of it. That is going to be the problem that is going to confront us. In addition to that, we have many sections of this highway system that are on toll roads. I can speak on that subject because we have one in Kansas. We do not like to charge the people that travel in Kansas a toll to ride on the interstate highway when you can ride free in Missouri. We would like to get that fixed up, too.

Senator Gruening: I would like to point out that a couple of years ago, as a member of the Public Works Committee, I went down to inspect the progress of the Inter-American Highway, which was created by an act of Congress about twenty years ago, in which Uncle Sam would pay two-thirds and the recipient countries would pay one-third. When I arrived down there, I found only one country was paying their one-third out of their own funds, and all the others were paying it out of foreign aid! Now, that program is about to be completed. Legislation has been adopted to continue this program of maintenance of these highways. And I wondered why, after being associated with these countries for twenty years, we could not have taught them to maintain the highways which we largely built. So I would expect that we will adopt this foreign policy that we have maintenance for our own interstate system.

Governor Orval E. Faubus: I just want to observe that I am one Governor who is not asking for any new federal programs or an increase of any present federal programs. I can name you a dozen which we can do without. I know that it is all well and good, that it is intended to be helpful, and that the motives and objects are all commendable. You take the retraining program. In my state we were already building a system of trade schools to retrain our people. Of course, we have to take advantage of the federal program. It has already been remarked that the pressure is on when the funds are there. And every state pays the federal funds. So you have the pressure to participate once it is enacted. I concur with Governor Dalton and the others who said we should bear our responsibilities. We have increased the operating expense of the University of Arkansas 134 per cent since I have been Governor. We increased state aid to the public schools 112 per cent. We have spent more money in the construction of classrooms, laboratories, libraries and such facilities on the campuses of the institutions of higher learning during the years that I have been

Governor than in all of the rest of the history of the state combined. So I think we should meet our responsibilities on the state level. And if we do this, then there would not be such a great need and so much pressure on these gentlemen who go to the Congress. They do not enact anything up there unless we ask them. The requests come from the states and sometimes we are party to them. But if we go ahead and take care of some of these, then the need will not be there and the pressure would not be there.

Governor Babcock: We have been very critical. Now I would like to offer a little commendation. The federal highway system, I think, is properly administered by the federal government because of its interstate nature, and for a change it is a program that pays as you go. I would like to have Senator Simpson for just a moment discuss his opinion upon the soundness of this interstate system.

Senator Simpson: Well, of course, I think it is a great program. Certainly, if we are going to continue the trust fund, then it should be continued along the lines that we presently have it. In our Western States, as you know, we have undertaken a great program of our own. I think Wyoming was one of the first states to take the interstate program and one of the first to complete it on schedule. I am pretty much in accord with the Governors here in respect to the maintenance.

Governor Connally: We are going to have to bring this to a close.

Governor Brown: I am very happy to know that Governor Faubus does not want any more of these federal programs. I would like to say that I might possibly agree with him. But we in the State of California cannot set up our own immigration office so we could keep some of the people from some of the states out of California. We have a great many people that do not like what is going on in some of the other states. We think we have to deal with people, and we do it in the State of California. But when we have 600,000 people a year coming into our state, we have problems. The federal government is taking a substantial portion of the tax base away from us. There is not a single, solitary federal program in the State of California that is not working—our universities, our state colleges, our roads and our pollution control. And we need help in transportation, too. People are leaving some of these other states that are not doing the job that they should be doing.

Governor Faubus: Governor Brown is a Governor of one of the most wonderful states in the Union. And, evidently, he is one of the finest Governors that the state has had. I understand now that the state is not only one of the finest but the most populous. It is my contention that it ought to be one of the finest because it had the best people we had go out there to build it for the last thirty years.

Governor Connally: I hesitate to bring this to a close in the

midst of a very rich and very rewarding discussion here. It has been helpful to everyone. But we are pressed for time.

May I say again to the distinguished Senators who graced us with their presence here that we are indebted to you. Let's give them all a tremendous ovation.

Governor Anderson: There already has been distributed a notice by Governor Rockefeller in regard to a proposal for a resolution tomorrow. I have another from him. Pursuant to paragraph 2 of Rule I of the Rules of Procedures of the Conference, notice has been given that during the plenary session on Tuesday, June 9, 1964, motion will be made for suspension of the Articles of Organization so as to permit the Conference to consider a resolution on civil rights, a copy of which has been distributed.

I want to recognize Governor Dempsey for a moment.

Governor Dempsey: Mr. Chairman, under the rules adopted this morning, I am hereby giving notice to the Conference that I will propose at a subsequent session a resolution on aging. Copies have now been distributed.

Governor Anderson: May I now just say to Governor Connally and to our guests, the Senators, that we all thank them for a very fine and interesting and provocative program this afternoon.

(At 3:55 p.m., the Conference went into executive session.)

EVENING SESSION—Monday, June 8

An informal dinner was held on Monday evening, Governor Anderson presiding as Chairman of the Governors' Conference. Rabbi Armond E. Cohen, Park Synagogue, delivered the invocation.

The dinner speaker was the former President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower. Shown below is the text of General Eisenhower's remarks.

ADDRESS

Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower

As, in periods of contemplation, I reflect over my own lifetime of experiences and those of others, I have grown ever more convinced that the human family rises or falls according to fidelity to a few religious, political and ethical principles which have persisted, and been reaffirmed, in almost every epoch of history.

Stated very simply, they include:

Faith in the Almighty;

Respect for your neighbor;

Men are created equal;

The individual is the most important element in a free society;

Freedom and justice are inseparable;

Responsibility accompanies privilege;

Liberty is man's most valuable possession;

And character is the measure of his worth.

Sure progress toward an ever more satisfying life depends, I believe, upon how well men—and nations, too—can discipline themselves to adhere to such unchanging truths.

Since time unending, it has been such fundamentals of faith and conduct that have kept alive the hopes of the world's multitudes that some day there might be achieved a worldwide reign of peace, of justice, of individual liberty, of satisfaction of human need.

Merely to state this timeless yearning of mankind is to summon to our minds visions of work and effort and partial defeat—and then still more work and still more effort.

To reach the summit of our hopes it is the human lot, regardless of disappointments and fatigue, to disdain the plateaus of ease and the downward slopes of complacency, for we have learned from ages past that these, in spite of their enticing foreground, dead-end, inevitably, in despair and anguish.

Yet, to many among us in these times, the plateaus and slopes seem to have an irresistible appeal.

Viewed in this perspective, the developing posture of our country cannot comfort any thoughtful person, in or out of government.

In pondering the reasons for this modern trend, my mind goes back to almost two centuries ago, when a youthful colonist, destined for immortality, took up his pen to define his concept of the inalienable rights of free men.

In the golden words of Thomas Jefferson, these rights included "Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness."

It is clear, I believe, that he was one who did not equate happiness with affluence, self-indulgence, or idleness, but we wonder, whether in some modern misinterpretation of this revered phrase—known to every generation of Americans from childhood—is to be found the origin of some of our anxieties today.

Had Jefferson foreseen any possibility that "Pursuit of Happiness" might one day be read as justifying selfish and empty purposes, I suspect he would have, at the very least, added a footnote of explanation, if not of caution, for our current benefit.

A famous Frenchman once said, "Liberty is the opportunity for self-discipline."

How right he was—for certain it is that self-discipline, national and personal, is indispensable to the long-term survival of freedom.

But discipline is not necessarily compatible with the short-range pursuit of happiness.

Indeed, in some circumstances, self-discipline requires self-denial and fortitude and a willingness to forego the heart's immediate desire.

But if, in the long view, Jefferson's "Pursuit of Happiness" is to be construed—as he intended—to mean self-control today that there may be stability and progress tomorrow, then the phrase stands as a noble expression of a national aim.

If we let it mean self-indulgence today, at the expense of tomorrow, then the term could well lead us astray.

Now, to me, self-indulgence includes failure to fulfill the recognized responsibilities of citizenship.

It is the worst form of laziness and leads, inevitably, to centralization of power.

That power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely, is wisdom distilled from ages of tragic human experience.

It was in that wisdom that the forefathers built a system to perpetuate the capability of the citizen to govern himself—a system in which the exercise of power would be so dispersed and so counterbalanced that no one person and no one group could dominate others.

The system requires that each citizen, to the utmost of his ability, be an individual of responsibility, and of sturdy self-reliance.

The delicately balanced structure which our forebears so painstakingly contrived was intended to insure us against ourselves—that, in this land, liberty would survive.

And survive it has, for two centuries, an achievement that is today the core of our heritage.

But I repeat my opinion that in the current century we have begun noticeably to breach the barricades, erected with such care nine score years ago in Philadelphia, against the propensity within us to destroy liberty.

The divergence, deliberate or not, from the guidelines laid down by the founding fathers has grown apace, and the end is not in sight.

Twelve years ago I put aside the nation's uniform, worn for forty years, in a pledge to help restore political balance to a system that, in my personal view, was becoming definitely tilted toward one philosophy and one grouping in our society, both leading toward an all-pervasive federal intrusion into our lives.

For eight years thereafter in the presidency, a constant purpose and a constant striving were to fulfill that pledge.

I would like here to recite a few of the directions into which our efforts were channeled during those years, not as self-justification(—and, of course, there were defeats as well as successes—) but to provide a backdrop for a specific proposal I made seven years ago to a body similar to this, and for other proposals I shall suggest today.

Beginning in 1953 the then new administration sought, for example, to reestablish a national respect for the Congress of the United States as an equal partner in the tripartite federal structure. In this there was measurable success.

But balance is essential not only among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government; it is equally necessary for satisfactory relations between the several echelons of government.

Our eight-year program to shore up the structure of liberty included many things—discouragement of direct appeals to Washington by lesser officials than Governors; efforts to restore farming to farmers; better protection of the rights of individual workers; establishment of workable partnerships in power development; and reaching into such things as elimination of various forms of governmental competition with private enterprise, development of cooperative programs to improve health and education, and a myriad of others.

As part of the entire effort we worked to harness federal spending to demonstrated need, and so help protect the value of

the citizen's savings. This effort, though far from the results I had envisioned, resulted promptly in a budgetary surplus, permitting a then unmatched tax reduction with larger revenue sources for the states.

All these measures comprised a package of apparently unrelated items; but all were threaded on one theme—the common sense redirection of citizen interest to his own responsibilities; to his own locality's affairs, his own state's affairs, and limitation of the federal government to its intended role. The specific proposal of seven years ago, to which I adverted earlier and which relates directly to this meeting, was initiated in an address before a Conference of your predecessors in the Capital of Colonial Virginia at Williamsburg.

Time and time again over the earlier years of my administration I had met with state Governors singly and in groups.

Invariably we agreed on the theory of returning more power, more responsibility, more tax revenues to the states.

In practice, however, difficulties—sometimes apparently insuperable—always presented themselves.

Finally at Williamsburg I suggested that the Governors' Conference and the Federal Administration together create a joint committee, charged with three responsibilities:

First, to identify specific functions for the states to assume and finance that were then performed or financed wholly or in part by the federal government;

Second, to recommend federal and state revenue adjustments so that the states could assume such functions; and,

Third, to pinpoint functions and responsibilities likely to require future state or federal attention and to recommend the level of state effort, or federal effort, or both, needed for effective action.

These proposals constituted a concrete and earnest attempt to revert tax revenues to the states to enable them to take back responsibilities previously syphoned off to Washington.

The joint Federal-State Action Committee developed recommendations for reform in numerous fields, but the critical test of the whole undertaking came in a plan to transfer to the states, in return for a portion of the federal telephone tax, the federal vocational education and waste treatment facilities programs.

This, I was convinced, was exactly the sort of program that states' rights proponents had long called for.

For the moment I was fired with hope.

To my regret, however, there was little meaningful state support.

One reason was illustrated by this incident: A group of Governors visited me to say,

"Mr. President, don't eliminate from the federal tax the money you want us to receive.

"Should you do so, we doubt that our legislatures would give us the authority to collect an equal amount.

"Let the federal government collect the money and then give it to us as a grant."

As a result of this attitude, the Congress, feeling no pressure, failed to act.

That failure I deplore still. Perhaps—just perhaps—a step forward here would have inclined the nation away from its continuing drift toward aggregating ever more power and ever more influence in Washington, D.C.

Parenthetically, I remind you that some twenty of the United States Senators today—one-fifth of the Senate membership—were previously state Governors.

By contrast I know of no Governor today who reached his office by way of the United States Senate.

Perhaps, then, I should have opened these remarks with the salutation:

"Greetings, future Senators!"

But, Gentlemen, if one of these offices has to be a stepping stone to the other, I would personally prefer to see the order reversed.

But let us not dwell too long on opportunities lost to enhance the dignity and power of the states, or in decrying the pyramiding of federal authority.

With your indulgence, I suggest that new attempts be made, and I offer some possibilities.

First, our best protection against bigger government in Washington is better government in the states.

I would hope that in each state, where improvements have fallen behind, a major effort could be launched to maximize efficiency and to streamline the governmental structure.

For, as all America knows, and as you know best of all, state governments have expanded enormously, many in Topsy fashion, since the turn of the century.

One state now has 360 state boards, commissions and agencies.

Doubtless others represented here are equally encumbered.

A nationwide, state-by-state, energetically advocated program to prune and update state administrative activities would save considerable state revenue, win widespread citizen approbation, and do much to slow the march on Washington.

Intimately related, of course—perhaps, in some instances, a prerequisite—is constitutional revision.

I am told of one state with 227,000 words in its constitution, with 439 amendments.

The index alone for another constitution takes sixty pages.

It was only three years ago that one state repealed a constitutional clause voiding land grants given by the King of England after October 14, 1775.

Clearly, past solutions for past problems, imbedded in state constitutions, should be allowed no longer to impair the ability of state governments to meet their present needs.

Other possible improvements—often pondered, I am sure, by each Governor present—include reevaluation of the functions of our 7,000 state legislators.

In most instances state responsibilities in these times require more of legislators than thirty- to ninety-day sessions; staff assistance of greater competence and numbers is surely desirable; and the compensation of legislators needs to be increased above today's median of approximately \$4,000 a biennium.

At least two states, I understand, still pay their Representatives \$5.00 a day; another, the equivalent of \$3.00 a day, which works out, younger friends remind me, to something less than babysitters get for an evening's work.

Far too short terms for Governors and prohibitions against more than one term should likewise be studied.

But there is far more to be done than mere improvement of the mechanisms of state government.

Think of some of the glaring problems that clearly fall within the purview of state responsibility.

Strong moral and political leadership is called for if we are to do better in diminishing the erosive influence of juvenile delinquency, of crime, of lack of educational and recreational opportunities, and the annual slaughter by motor vehicles on our highways.

To find better solutions than so far we have, the federal government can assist in many ways.

But in all these things responsibility resides definitely in the states, and leadership in their Governors.

The better the states do their jobs, the better the chance that the federal government will cooperate properly and effectively with them and stop seeking to dominate such programs.

The so-called "War on Poverty" is a case in point.

Just as political power resides in the people and is generated from bottom upward—so should political correction of local problems be initiated normally at the grass roots.

Moving to a different but related field, I remind this body that, collectively, the states possess a national power of monumental significance.

I refer to the constitutional provision, till now unused, that amendments to our basic charter may be proposed by a convention that must be convened by Congress on application of two-thirds of the state legislatures.

The resulting amendments, when ratified by state conventions or legislatures in three-fourths of the states, become an integral part of the Constitution of the United States.

The point I wish to highlight is this: contrary to the popular impression, the collective will of the people of this country can, in important areas, make itself effective through the states themselves, acting in concert.

There is no need for endless waiting on congressional action; there is no need for grovelling before any part of the federal government.

Consider the so-called "item veto," which Presidents, one after another, have urged upon Congress for years on end.

Almost four-fifths of the state Governors hold this power to-day respecting appropriations bills.

And to my southern friends present I offer this reminder—the item veto was first developed in the Confederate Constitution of 1861, and it first flowered in the southern states.

On the national level, the refusal of Congress to grant this power to the President has resulted in blatant abuses.

Yet those states already granting their Governors this authority could by themselves, using constitutional procedures, endow the President of the United States with the same authority, and all America would be the better.

There would be an end to the costly "pork barrels," so beloved by self-serving politicians—an end also, to one of the many devices which centralize power in Washington.

Another constitutional amendment might, with some wisdom, provide, on the one hand, that (except in an emergency declared by Congress) the President must submit to Congress federal budgets which balance at least biennially.

On the other hand, it should provide that Congress can increase items in the President's budgetary recommendations only by a two-thirds vote.

Obviously an amendment of this kind would have to come through state initiative, for the power to spend irresponsibly and to charge the bills to the unborn through deficit financing is a mighty political weapon.

Such an amendment would work miracles for responsibility on the federal level, and would bring to a sudden halt much of the federal trespassing on state preserves.

You are aware, of course, that several of our states have limits upon their legislatures to prevent increases in appropriations recommendations, so the concept I have mentioned is not new to the American system.

Such proposals I mention, however, not so much in a spirit of advocacy but rather as examples whereby the states, acting together, can enforce their will on the national stage.

Amendment to our Constitution is, of course, not to be lightly undertaken. But I am sure that out of your collective knowledge and experience you may well conceive of other proposals worthy of earnest study, particularly if their purpose is to keep government responsible, and keep it closer to the people.

I repeat—this constitutional amending process has never been used.

But once used, those in Washington power centers would never again feel at ease in their restless work to extend the federal reach, or to use tax money to attract votes.

Gentlemen, many among you are personal friends of mine of many years standing.

Some of you have already moved courageously, and coincidentally with burgeoning need, to remedy flaws in state government.

I know that every one of you is dedicated to advancing the well-being of the people of your respective areas, and have a zeal no less burning than mine to do everything in your power to strengthen freedom.

Even more, perhaps, than you yourselves can appreciate, upon you and the forcefulness of your leadership and the efficiency of your state administrations—upon the initiatives which you may take—rests in major degree the arresting of power concentration in this nation.

Thus, in your hands may rest the restoration of the self-discipline and the restraint so essential, now and in the future, to the preservation of individual liberty and the freedom of America.

No cause could be more important; most earnestly do I hope you will adopt it as your own, and most sincerely do I wish you success in its accomplishment.

MORNING SESSION—Tuesday, June 9

Governor Anderson: The meeting will now come to order.

The invocation will be given by Doctor Lewis Raymond of the Old Stone Church, which is on Cleveland's Public Square.

Reverend Lewis Raymond: Our Father, God, we stand before Thee aware of the gift of life and all of the energies that are ours. Therefore, give us something to live for, something to dream about and something to fight for. Bless us so we may live up to the high hopes and expectations of this our beloved land; that we and men of good will might find ourselves to disagree but disagree agreeably. Bless us so we may have human fellowship. Continue to guide us and sustain us. Bless these gentlemen who lead us and those who teach as well as those who are taught. Finally, when our work is done, save us for having known Thee through Christ Jesus, we pray. Amen.

Governor Anderson: I am sure we all remember that at last year's meeting in Miami Beach the Executive Committee was charged with the responsibility of working on the problem of civil rights during the interim and prior to this Annual Meeting. Your Executive Committee was composed of five members from the Democratic Party and four from the Republican Party. The Committee spent a good many hours on this project. The staff spent much time over the past few months in preparing the Background Report on State Activity to Foster Nondiscrimination in Education, Employment, Housing and Public Accommodations. I hope that each of you has taken the opportunity to read and review this report with care. I am sure it must be enlightening, really, to look at this report and to find the extent of activity in the fields of legislation and administration that has taken place and is presently taking place throughout the nation in this area that touches all of the citizens of the United States.

We have three panel sessions that will constitute the program for this morning. On your printed program you will notice that Governor Hughes of New Jersey is to head the section on education; Governor Welsh of Indiana is to head the section on employment and Governor Love of Colorado is to head the section on public accommodations. I hope that you will find your places to work in those sections shortly, when we break into the concurrent panels.

I want to make one or two other announcements at this time with respect to the presentation of notices for the taking up of resolutions under a motion to suspend the Articles of Organization.

Governor Grant Sawyer of Nevada has distributed a notice that a motion would be made to suspend the Articles in connection with a proposal to establish a Committee on Election Laws and Communications. This notice has been distributed. Another resolution has been distributed and notice is given that it will be presented subsequently with regard to livestock and import problems. That constitutes the beginning work for this morning, and the concurrent workshops will be the next order on the program.

Governor Hatfield: I believe that yesterday there was filed with the Conference a notice of intent to present a resolution today under the authority of the Rules of Procedure we adopted yesterday. So at this time, Mr. Chairman, I move suspension of the Articles of Organization for the purpose of introducing a resolution, and I ask for ten persons to join in the request for a roll-call vote.

Governor George Romney: I second the motion.

Governor Smylie: Can we have a standing show of ten Governors, which will be sufficient to support the roll call? I would point out, Governor Anderson, that the notice has been signed by sixteen Governors.

Governor Anderson: We had a motion and a second to the motion. Do you wish to be recognized, Governor?

Governor Russell: I was just wondering what the resolution was.

Governor Anderson: I will try to clarify it.

Governor Russell: I want to ask another question. I understood that this resolution was to come at the session after the workshops.

Governor Anderson: The notice that was furnished to me and that I have in my hand here now is motion for suspension of the Articles of Organization in order to consider a resolution on civil rights. The notice reads: "Pursuant to Paragraph 2 of Rule I of the Rules of Procedure of the Conference, notice is hereby given, on behalf of the undersigned Governors,* of their intention to move, during the Plenary Session on Tuesday, June 9, 1964, for a suspension of the Articles of Organization so as to permit the Conference to consider a resolution on civil rights, a copy of which is attached." It is my understanding that we do not get to the resolution or the contents of it, nor the issue involved in the resolution, until the Articles are suspended.

Governor Romney: As the one who seconded the motion, I would like to make a few comments on the motion. Is that in order?

*Governors Fannin, Arizona; Love, Colorado; Smylie, Idaho; Anderson, Kansas; Reed, Maine; Romney, Michigan; Babcock, Montana; Rockefeller, New York; Rhodes, Ohio; Bellmon, Oklahoma; Hatfield, Oregon; Scranton, Pennsylvania; Chafee, Rhode Island; Gubbrud, South Dakota; Clyde, Utah; and Hansen, Wyoming.

Governor Hatfield: Would you yield, Mr. Governor?

Governor Romney: Yes.

Governor Hatfield: May I get a ruling from the Chair, first of all, as to what I asked for—ten people to join me for a roll call? I will be happy to give the body the contents of my resolution. But I want to make sure that we have the procedure clearly in mind.

Governor Anderson: It is going to be the ruling of the Chair that we now have a motion to suspend the Articles of Organization and that has been seconded. And the next order of business is whether or not we have a show of ten hands. I will ask the Secretary at this time to determine whether or not there is a request for a roll-call vote.

Secretary Carihfield: There are ten hands.

Governor Anderson: We now have a showing of ten hands. I recognize Governor Hatfield.

Governor Hatfield: The purpose of my motion to suspend the Articles is to introduce a resolution that will put this Conference on record at this time in support of the civil rights legislation pending before the Congress of the United States. We believe, those of us who have supported this kind of legislation, that this is the major issue before the country today, and we believe we must step up to this issue and not step aside. That is the purpose of this motion at this time. To reiterate, this is a civil rights resolution to support the legislation pending before the United States Congress. I again urge the Governors to stand up to this issue and not step aside.

Governor John A. Burns: Point of order. This motion is not debatable.

Governor Anderson: I understand and we are not going to debate this motion. We are not going to get into the merits of the resolution. A motion to suspend allows only an explanation of what is in the resolution to be presented. We are not going to debate this resolution.

Governor Romney: I would just like to say, since I seconded the motion, that all this does is to implement the fundamental law of this country as reflected in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

Governor Burns: Point of order.

Governor Anderson: We are not going to debate the civil rights matter until the Articles are suspended, as I understand it.

Governor Hatfield: At this point, I would like to draw attention to the fact that a vote to suspend the Articles would certainly be a vote in support of the resolution.

Governor Anderson: We had a roll-call vote requested and a show of ten hands, and the question will now be put. If the Secretary will call the roll, we will find out whether or not we are going to suspend the Articles. It requires a three-fourths vote of the

membership of this Conference to suspend.

Secretary Criehtfield: This will be a roll-call vote to suspend the Articles for the consideration of a resolution.

[The roll was called and the Governors of the following states voted in the affirmative:

ALASKA	MAINE	OREGON
ARIZONA	MICHIGAN	PENNSYLVANIA
COLORADO	NEW MEXICO	RHODE ISLAND
IDAHO	NEW YORK	SOUTH DAKOTA
IOWA	OHIO	UTAH
KANSAS	OKLAHOMA	WYOMING

The Governors of the following states and territories voted in the negative:

ALABAMA	KENTUCKY	NORTH DAKOTA
ARKANSAS	MARYLAND	SOUTH CAROLINA
CONNECTICUT	MINNESOTA	TEXAS
DELAWARE	MISSISSIPPI	VERMONT
FLORIDA	MISSOURI	VIRGINIA
HAWAII	NEBRASKA	WASHINGTON
ILLINOIS	NEVADA	WISCONSIN
INDIANA	NEW JERSEY	AMERICAN SAMOA
		VIRGIN ISLANDS]

Governor Sawyer: Mr. Chairman, in explaining my vote, I would like to say that the gentlemen who have offered this very resolution on civil rights have a number of ways of which they can avail themselves if they want to get on the record at this Conference.

Governor Smylie: Point of order there, Mr. Chairman.

Governor Anderson: What is the question?

Governor Smylie: Is he debating the motion?

Governor Sawyer: I am just explaining my vote.

Governor Anderson: I think a person is entitled to explain a vote if he does not get to the question involved in the proposed resolution.

Governor Sawyer: It is very hard for me to explain my vote without explaining the issue.

Governor Anderson: Actually, I would observe that from your very first comment there are ways of getting on the record other than doing it this way.

Governor Sawyer: Governor Breathitt explained that very well yesterday. A declaration of principle is available to them with the Secretary and they may sign it at any time. Up until a moment ago they had not signed it. I vote "no."

Governor Hatfield: Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain my vote.

Governor Anderson: Let's be brief about it.

Governor Hatfield: Mr. Chairman, the only way we can bring

the full impact and influence of this Conference to bear on this moral issue is through the suspension of the Articles and the adoption of the resolution. Therefore, I vote "aye."

Governor William W. Scranton: I would like to explain my vote. I could not agree with Governor Hatfield more. I vote "aye."

Governor Smylie: On behalf of the Governor of Montana, who had to leave the Conference because of a disaster at home, I am authorized, if he were present and voting, to vote "aye."

Governor Anderson: I do not think that under the Rules we can record his vote.

Governor Frank B. Morrison: As long as some of these distinguished Governors explained their votes, I would like to explain mine.

Governor Anderson: Under the custom, let's be brief about it.

Governor Morrison: I am in wholehearted agreement with the sentiments of Governor Hatfield's resolution. We have crossed this bridge many times before. We heard the distinguished Former President of the United States outlining this delicate balance in his speech last night. I came here as a Governor. I did not come here to play Congressman.

Governor Anderson: The vote was 18 "ayes" and 25 "nays." The motion to suspend the Articles is lost.

Governor Breathitt: Mr. Chairman, I would like to propose to the distinguished Governor of the State of Oregon, and all of the other distinguished Governors present, that these matters have been disposed of consistent with the actions of the Governors' Conference, during this Conference and preceding Conferences. I apologize to the distinguished Governor of Oregon. I will be delighted to sign his resolution as a statement of principle and request that he sign the one that has been filed by me and twenty-five of our distinguished Governors. Together we will then have an expression from this very fine Conference, statements of principles, which forcefully and effectively represent the strength of the Governors in support of the civil rights legislation now pending in the Congress.

Governor Smylie: Let me say to the Governor of Kentucky, if I may, that in regard to the notice in support of the resolution, bearing the signatures of sixteen members of this Conference, we would be happy to have him join us.

Governor Anderson: I understand, because we have had similar procedure at past Conferences. But now on the regular and formal program for this morning, each and every member of this Conference will be given the opportunity to express his views. But more than just an expression of views, I think we have a forum now in which the problems may be discussed in such a way that it will be helpful to members of the Congress and helpful to the people throughout all of our states.

Unless there is further business before this Conference, we will now go to our respective workshops.

[The plenary session thereupon recessed at 9:45 a.m., and the Governors convened in the following concurrent group meetings on civil rights:

Education

Employment

Public Accommodations

A summary of the concurrent group discussions is contained in State Government, Summer 1964 issue, published by The Council of State Governments.

The plenary session reconvened at 11:40 a.m., and the transcript resumes at this point.]

Governor Anderson: If we may have order now, we will proceed with finishing the business of this session.

Governor George C. Wallace: I want to give notice to offer a motion for the suspension of the Articles of Organization to consider a resolution at the next session. I do now give the Conference such notice and I have distributed copies to the members of the Conference.

Governor Anderson: In the event some of you might not have heard, Governor Wallace has announced that he gives notice of a motion to suspend the Articles for taking up a resolution at tomorrow's session and that notice has been distributed. Is that correct?

Governor Wallace: At this afternoon's session. I believe this is one session.

Governor Anderson: All right. I did not know whether you wanted to present it at the business session tomorrow or this afternoon.

Governor Wallace: I think it would be better to present it this afternoon.

Governor Anderson: All right.

Now, if we may proceed with the reports of the chairmen of the concurrent meetings that were held this morning, I would like to ask at this time if the Honorable Richard Hughes of New Jersey would present the report of the section discussing education on the civil rights program.

Governor Richard J. Hughes: Governor Anderson, we had, I thought, a very productive panel discussion. There were no motions. There were no resolutions. There was no lifting of the Rules or anything of that kind. We had a full and frank discussion of various problems involving this matter of discrimination in the schools, for instance, de facto segregation and its relationship to neighborhood housing patterns. The discussion, however, got far beyond the legal aspects of this problem. We talked about enriched educational programs for the culturally deprived child. Governor Fannin, Governor Kerner, Governor Scranton and several other Governors

gave, I thought, rather important suggestions.

We talked quite a bit about increasing the educational receptivity of the child whose home environment, because of slums or poverty, results in great handicap to learning. This is where, we concluded, the dropout problem begins—before the child even gets to school. I called the attention of the panel members to the experimental projects being conducted by New Jersey's Department of Education to develop ways and means of achieving educational equality for culturally deprived children. One such project is directed at pre-school children in order to eliminate at the very outset the series of handicaps which—the records and facts show—often result in almost certain dropouts following a troublesome school career. This condition is not confined to Negro groups. It involves all the low-income groups, however, the major problem is found among the minority groups.

Among the techniques discussed for meeting our responsibility to provide equal educational opportunity for all children were the special pre-school programs, such as I have just mentioned, special tutoring, aid to the parents of these children so that they might encourage and stimulate the desire for learning in their children, special teacher training, both in-service and summer institutes, for dealing with the culturally deprived child.

Reference also was made of the great potential of the volunteer corps envisaged in the Economic Opportunities Act of 1964 and what it could do in culturally deprived neighborhoods to help these children. We also discussed programs for older youths who were out of school and out of work. There will soon be a million young people of this type. Discussion was had about programs to train these youths for jobs geared to their abilities and to give them intensive counseling and placement services. Many other suggestions were made which I will not take the trouble or your time to discuss now.

Our meeting concluded with this recommendation. We found this mutual discussion, without any overtones of any parliamentary contest or anything of the kind, and this exchange of ideas most valuable. I am looking forward to receiving from several of the Governors on this panel, information concerning their programs which I think would be of assistance to me in New Jersey. They, in turn, asked me to tell them about the special programs which we are developing in New Jersey.

We think, Mr. Chairman, that it would be a good idea for the Governors' Conference to consider, not necessarily a continuation of this panel as such, but some mechanism for a continuation of this dialogue. We think that such an exchange is a primary reason for the existence of the Governors' Conference. This is the real value of the Governors' Conference. We would not like to see this subject forgotten now. We think that there ought to be a constant

exchange of these views for the mutual benefit of all Governors.

At the conclusion of our panel, several of the members came up to comment that it was most valuable and productive. It could be made doubly so if we could arrange to have an executive meeting, such as the executive session at which we discuss housekeeping policies and security problems of the Governor's office. I know that the Governors were very enthusiastic last year over the results of that meeting. And it could be that a similar meeting on the education and civil rights problem, because of the sensitivity of certain aspects of the discussion, would be that much more valuable, if it could be done in an executive session so that every Governor would not be wondering what some newspaper back home is going to say about some comment that he made on the subject. I think that this panel discussion has been most valuable, and I express thanks to all of the members who participated in it.

Governor Anderson: Thank you, Governor Hughes, for that very fine report. I am sure that you had a good working session this morning.

The next report will be presented by the Honorable Matthew Welsh, Governor of Indiana, reporting on the employment section.

Governor Matthew E. Welsh: Thank you very much, Governor Anderson. I would like at the outset to echo Governor Hughes' comment as to the value of this type of a discussion. I know that all who participated felt it was extremely valuable to have a candid and an informal exchange of ideas, views and techniques. And this, I trust, will be continued in future Conferences.

I will just briefly run through the notes that I made on points that appeared to be worth passing on. Paramount in my judgment as to all observations made during this Conference, is the fact that leadership by the Governor and the Governor's office in this whole broad area of opening up employment opportunities for minority groups and for everybody, for that matter, leadership by the Governor's office is the critical factor and must be afforded if real progress is to be made. This can be done by means of executive orders, codes of fair practices, licensing agencies, directives and so on. And, likewise, state government must set the example in its employment practices if it expects private industry to respond in helping resolve this very serious problem.

Underneath all of the discussion was the matter of education, the necessity of educating the people who are seeking employment. And probably at the bottom of the discrepancy in the employment ratio between the minority groups and the white groups is the failure of society to provide proper education for those who now seek employment. But also the point was made that when we talk of education, we should also be reminded that the employer likewise needs to be advised and educated, if you will. The business community wishes to cooperate, and is cooperating very well, indeed.

With proper guidance it can do a great deal more and wants to do more, and here again it is up to the Governor's office to see that this information, this guidance, is afforded to the employer community in the state.

There was repeated reference made by the various Governors to the employment of Negroes, Japanese, Chinese, Indians and Puerto Ricans on state boards and positions of importance in state government. Likewise, that the problem of employment is essentially a local problem and it is very important to see that close liaison is maintained by the state with cities and counties in the resolution of this problem. And the state government agencies must be encouraged to do this and, likewise, the federal government. It was agreed that the civil rights commissions and the human rights commissions have been very effective in the states that have these agencies. That where problems have been reported to these agencies, the problems have been best resolved where persuasion, quiet persuasion, has been the approach rather than publicity.

As to the entire problem of education, every state, every participant in the panel agreed that here probably is the largest problem faced by the states over the nation; namely, how to provide the necessary education for dropouts, for retraining and for the vocational education of the young people that we must have. Many of the interesting programs in the various states were discussed. Governor Sanford's program was one that aroused considerable interest. Some discussion was had of the programs in the State of New York and the State of Mississippi and the State of Alabama. We, I think, can safely say that education is the key to the future in the resolution of this problem and that it will have to be done by providing training opportunities on a community basis to the young people as well as to the adults who seek this type of education.

But to create a desire for education, it is extremely important that motivation be present, a desire on the part of those who must have an ambition if they are to take their place in society. And this can only be done if they have some assurance before they start that employment will result from their effort having been made in obtaining more training. So this gets back to the necessity for legislation of one kind or another which will insure that they do have access to jobs. It was also pointed out that employment should be made on the basis of ability rather than on the basis of membership in a minority group. But education is the only manner in which this can be resolved.

Governor Rhodes also made the very pertinent observation that job opportunities can only exist when the states do their utmost to create the proper environment for the business community and thus create job openings. It was also observed that in addi-

tion to the business community, the unions of our country must also assist in this effort in seeing to it that job openings are made available to membership in our minority groups.

Finally, I believe it was the theme of our panel that great progress is being made; that this problem can be resolved; that it is one essentially of understanding; that working together, we will make continued progress.

Governor Anderson: Thank you, Governor Welsh, for your very fine report.

Next, the report on public accommodations will be presented by Governor John Love of Colorado.

Governor Love: Mr. Chairman and fellow Governors: I would reiterate what the other speakers have just said; that our panel found this to be a most valuable and constructive procedure. We hope that it can be continued.

The discussion on public accommodations, of course, points up what we all know: that there is an area of disagreement. More constructively, it points up that there is an area of agreement. We attempted to approach the problem by asking a series of questions and allowing each Governor present to talk to each question.

I believe that it can be said truthfully that there was full agreement that public accommodations should be available to all people, regardless of race, color, national origin or other classifications.

The disagreement starts from there, of course, in that the definition, of what public accommodations are, is a subject of disagreement. It runs a broad scale. The Governor of one border state reported that in classifying public accommodations they took out not only the so-called Mrs. Murphy's boardinghouse but also swimming pools and barber shops. In the northwest and northern states those presently having state public accommodations laws have their definitions all-inclusive. Some of the southern states talked about further restrictions other than those I reported in the one border state.

Then, the problem of how public accommodations should be dealt with, whether it is an appropriate and proper subject for legislation indicated some disagreement, again from the southern states. And the expression of the Governors of those states was that they believe, in their particular situations, voluntary desegregation is to be preferred. That was not the belief of the large majority there who represent states in other parts of the nation. Those who argued that it should be solved voluntarily point out that it is a problem of the heart and the mind, in essence, and legislation in and of itself will not provide the solution. Again we found the expected disagreement: If there is legislation, should it be federal legislation or should it be limited to the state? Again we see the same geographical division, which, I am sure, comes

as no surprise to any of my fellow Governors.

As to how the laws should be enforced, we found concern pretty well among all of the panel. The Governor of Wyoming, for example, indicated that he felt strongly that, as important as civil rights are, in enforcing these provisions we cannot lose sight of the other great rights, including the right to trial by jury and the other rights guaranteed in the Bill of Rights.

The discussion, of course, included many details of the state laws now in existence. It included the proud history of many states in this area. We believe that, insofar as you can present a consensus, this is an area which needs further attention, not only in the area of legislation but in the continued work of men of good will.

Governor Paul B. Johnson: Mr. Chairman, I speak as one of the new Governors, although I have attended a number of Governors' Conferences in the past as a guest. It had been felt in the last few years that perhaps the Governors' Conference would become absolutely a social event, therefore nonproductive insofar as the real aims of Governors are concerned. I am pleased to see the manner in which these sessions were conducted this morning. I can see a definite good that comes from Governors sitting face to face and without any hypocrisy discussing this important question, and many others that perhaps will be discussed in the future. All of the others on the panel join me in congratulating Governor Love on the excellent manner in which he handled this session that we had and the open discussion that he permitted on the pertinent parts that were accorded or assigned to the committee. I just want to express my appreciation for the manner in which he handled it.

Governor Anderson: Thank you for that expression, Governor Johnson. And I would but briefly add my thanks to the three chairmen of the concurrent workshop panels—Governor Hughes, Governor Welsh and Governor Love—for their good work in this field. And let me thank each of the members of this Conference for their work this morning. In the session that I attended on public accommodations, I would concur in what Governor Johnson has said: that there was free and open expression by each of the members there on the problems before the group, and it was done in the presence of all who saw fit to attend that session this morning. I am sure, and I know it has been said many times, that when reasonable men apply reasonable minds to a problem, a reasonable solution will be arrived at. And I think that the people will appreciate the work of this Conference and its interest in this important problem facing the country today. I know that it is not going to bring a panacea, but we will mark progress as a result of this Conference, I hope.

This concludes the formal work of the Conference this morning. I would like to ask Mr. Carihfield if he has any announcements at this time?

Secretary Carihfield: Regarding resolutions and policy mo-

tions, please remember that under the Rules as adopted your last opportunity to give advance notice for proposed resolutions or policy motions will be at the session this afternoon. You must at that time distribute to every Governor in the room a copy of your proposed motion to suspend the Articles. Tomorrow morning will be too late to begin your action.

(Secretary Carihfield made several more announcements.)

Governor Anderson: Is there any other business to come before the Conference before the noon recess? If not, we will meet back here for the general session this afternoon.

(The meeting was recessed at 12:05 p.m.)

AFTERNOON SESSION—Tuesday, June 9

Governor Anderson: The meeting will now come to order.

I would like at this time to appoint the Nominating Committee, as we look forward to the election of officers at the business meeting tomorrow. The following members will serve on the Nominating Committee: Governor John Dalton of Missouri, as Chairman, Governor Farris Bryant of Florida, Governor Paul Fannin of Arizona, Governor John Reed of Maine and Governor Robert Smylie of Idaho. Their report will be submitted at the meeting tomorrow.

Nor for the general session this afternoon, I am sure we will have a good program. To preside at this meeting, it is my pleasure now to turn this program over to the distinguished Governor from Pennsylvania, the Honorable William W. Scranton.

Governor Scranton: Governor Anderson, Governor Rhodes, fellow Governors and ladies and gentlemen: We have a short program for you but it is an extremely important one. It will be led by a distinguished Cabinet member of the federal government and assisted by two of your colleagues. There is more than one route to Washington. As we were told yesterday, some twenty-one Governors have taken the route of the Senate. But a much more certain one is to be the Mayor of Cleveland. As most of you know, Harold Burton was a Mayor and he became not only a Senator but a Supreme Court Justice. Frank Lausche, as we all know, was a Mayor and became Governor and then Senator. Tom Burke was a Mayor and then was appointed Senator. Anthony Celebrezze, who is here with us today, was Mayor and is now the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. So remember this route and all of you come back to Cleveland and start running.

I remember very well when I was in Washington that an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare told me that the Department should be called the Department of Welfare, Health, Education and Whatnot. He said this would spell it out—w-h-e-w. WHEW, what a Department! And indeed it is. It has everything in it that you can imagine, and nobody knows it better than the man who is with us today. What we want to do is to give him an opportunity to talk to us as long as he desires. I am sure it will be a very splendid speech. It will get our brains to thinking. And after that, Governor Clyde and Governor Dempsey will comment in any way they wish, and then it will be open to questions. The speaker has agreed to answer any questions that he can answer. He asked me to make that very clear. He has had a very distinguished ca-

reer. He engaged in the practice of law in Ohio for fourteen years and then served in the U.S. Navy in World War II. He was elected to the Ohio Senate in 1942. He had four terms as Mayor of the City of Cleveland and was serving his fifth when he was appointed Secretary. In the meantime he has been President of the Conference of Mayors and was appointed by both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy to serve as a member on the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. He took his oath of office on July 31, 1962, as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. If we had this meeting two years ago here, he would have been the one welcoming us. It is a little ridiculous for me to welcome him to Cleveland, but I am delighted to welcome him here to the Governors' Conference. We are very happy and honored, sir, to have you here. May I present to you the Honorable Anthony Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze: Governor Anderson, distinguished Governors, ladies and gentlemen: First, may I thank Governor Scranton for that over-generous introduction. I would like to tell my favorite story, which the people of Cleveland have heard me tell many times. As you distinguished Governors know, one of our great worries in public life is what happens to our children. We do not want them to get the attitude that, because their father is a Governor or a judge or a Mayor, they are better. We have told our children not to mention that they are the son or daughter of Mayor Celebrezze. We lived in a rather professional neighborhood, and one day the children congregated and Jimmy Smith said, "I am Jimmy Smith, the son of Doctor Smith." Barbara Brown said, "I am Barbara Brown, the daughter of Professor Brown." My 14-year-old daughter Susan said, "I am Susan Celebrezze, the daughter of Mayor Celebrezze." Her mother heard her and later said to her, "Your Dad and I have tried to tell you that you just do not go around town saying you are Susan Celebrezze, daughter of Mayor Celebrezze. You are Susan, period. You have to stand on your own two feet." Everything went along fine until one of our neighbors moved out and another neighbor moved in. Susan went to greet the new neighbor and before Susan could say a word, the lady said, "Oh, yes. I know who you are. You are Susan Celebrezze, the daughter of Mayor Celebrezze." Susan looked at her and said, "My Mama says I am not."

I am honored by the privilege of addressing this distinguished gathering of state chief executives.

This Governors' Conference, in which the heads of fifty states find it not only possible but helpful to participate in an exchange of views on shared problems, opportunities, and goals, is both a reflection of and a reason for the strength and vitality of our federal system—a system of government which has not merely survived but has surmounted almost two centuries of the greatest social,

economic, scientific, and cultural upheaval in the history of mankind.

I have had occasion during the past twenty-two months to work with many of you individually on specific state problems related to matters of health, education, and welfare. I welcome this opportunity to talk with you, in broader terms, about our common opportunities in these fields.

I stress opportunities because we have reached a point as a nation where the prospect before us is a life of abundance and realized aspirations for all if we but have the wit, the wisdom, and the will to achieve it.

We have the means—we have the resources. We know the needs to which those resources must be applied if we are to wipe out the remaining barriers of ignorance, poverty, and disease which obstruct the way to the abundant life we seek for all Americans.

The question today is not so much what these needs are but rather how we are meeting them. It is a question of how we are organizing and applying the resources we have at hand. Basically, it is a question of the proper and effective functioning of government.

As a former state legislator and mayor and currently as a member of the President's Cabinet, I have seen our system of government from a variety of perspectives. The American federal system, with its fifty states and over 100,000 local jurisdictions, its multiple levels and branches of government, its built-in checks and balances, its sometimes blurred lines of authority and responsibility—this great union of diversity is probably the most complex and complicated system of government yet invented by man. But I wouldn't exchange it for any other system devised so far, because, while it is the most complex and complicated system, it is also the most successful yet devised. Young as this nation is, it is the oldest and strongest living example of constitutional democracy today.

There is, of course, a direct connection between our strength and our diversity. When every part is working in this great machine of ours, what immense tasks we can then accomplish! And, conversely, when any part fails to function, tasks go unfinished and our powers are impaired.

And there is a direct connection between our strength and our ability not only to meet the stresses of change but to move along with change, to keep pace with change.

We talk at times about the immutability of certain hallowed American institutions: the Constitution, the Congress, the courts, the Presidency. But the truth is that all our political institutions are continually undergoing mutations of one sort or another. They were built to last—yes. But to last, they must change.

Thomas Jefferson understood this well. "Laws and institutions," he said, "must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as

new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also, and keep pace with the times."

Looking back, consider the nature and magnitude of change our durable Republic has witnessed.

- A Union of thirteen states grown to fifty, spanning a continent and extending beyond.

- A population increased from 5 million in 1800 to 191 million today.

- An average life expectancy of 35 more than doubled to over 70.

- A society shifted from the countryside to the city, from the farm to the factory and office.

Less than one-third of our people live today in rural areas, and less than 3 per cent are actually engaged in agricultural production. In Jefferson's day only 4 per cent lived in the cities, and the nation relied on most of the remainder, including women and children, to produce its food and fiber.

This last change—the growth of the cities—has come upon us so recently, so suddenly, that our nerve system, political and social, has not yet properly adjusted to it. The pace of change is so swift that before we can accommodate ourselves to one set of circumstances, other new ones are upon us.

But fortunately our system is adaptable. It has moved to meet the stresses of change.

Looking back over the last thirty or so years and observing the pattern of stress and change, we can see a much more active and responsive central government—a much closer relationship with the states and local communities and with every individual citizen.

There are some who deplore this change—who see in the growing interdependence of national and state and local governments a threat to the well-being of the federal system—an abridgment of local and individual initiative and freedom of choice.

Like so many generalizations, this one has its contradictions. For while the responsibilities of the national government have clearly increased, the responsibilities of the states have not diminished. They, too, have in fact increased. They have increased because social and economic needs have increased—because an industrialized, urban society requires more, not less, from government. The response of the states to these requirements of change can be illustrated by the growth of state expenditures for education and health and welfare services.

In the current debates on federal-state responsibilities, this growth is largely ignored. I regret this very much, because the alternative impression is that the national and state governments are bitter competitors in a contest for power.

This is not the case, and, in the long run, this kind of distorted view can do great disservice to our system of government. For by failing to do justice to the state's active role in the federal system, this view can seriously undermine public confidence in the ability of the states to perform their proper functions. In the end, such a tactic is self-defeating.

Actually, "interdependence" is the best word I know to describe the federal-state relationship, for both the state and the national governments today share vital leadership and supporting responsibilities. And neither can be fully effective without the help of the other.

If we did not have these strong federal-state bonds and if every state had to depend solely on its own resources to provide the public services its citizens need today, there would be chaos within this Union.

As every Governor knows full well, a state's fiscal resources—its tax base and tax rates—have very definite limits, some imposed from within the state, others imposed from without. For example, the stiff competition among states to attract and to hold new industries is a very strong factor in determining their tax structure. States which reach the limits of their tax resources reach limits in the public services they can provide—limits in the schools, libraries, and health facilities they can construct and operate, limits in the amount of care available for dependent children and for the destitute aged, limits that have no relation to and can fall far short of actual needs.

Complete reliance by each state on its own resources would see the rich states getting richer and the poor states getting poorer—and would create, as a consequence, vast disparities in the opportunities for growth and development open to the citizens of the separate states.

I do not believe that this is the kind of "perfect Union" the Founding Fathers had in mind when they drew up our Constitution.

I do not believe that this is the kind of society we want to build for ourselves or our children.

I believe, rather, that the path to the "great society" that President Johnson envisions lies in the direction of the "creative federalism" which he has described as resting not on a massive program in Washington nor solely on strained local resources but on "new concepts of cooperation between the national capital and leaders of local communities."

Our intergovernmental relationships must become far less a jurisdictional joust and far more a joint enterprise in which we work together within the framework of our Constitution for the betterment of our society.

The federal government, with its broad tax base, can help to support those public programs that are vitally needed today if our

society is to continue to grow and prosper. Indeed, in my view, the federal government bears a heavy obligation to help the states and communities meet these needs, for the matters at stake are not just matters of poverty versus wealth, or ignorance versus knowledge. In today's complex world they are matters of national survival.

In the fields of my primary concern—health, education, and welfare—the principal device that the federal government has used to meet these responsibilities is the now-familiar grant-in-aid.

More than 90 per cent of the budget of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—which was \$5.7 billion this year—goes out across the country in the form of grants and loans to the states, communities, institutions, and individuals. (This does not include over \$16 billion in social security payments which come from the insurance contributions of employees, employers, and the self-employed instead of from general revenues.)

Almost \$3 billion went for public assistance alone—substantial grants to every state, distributed on the basis of a statutory formula. More than \$1.7 billion was appropriated for health services and medical research, and another \$700 million for programs of the Office of Education. Our investment in education will more than double next year as a result of the recent education legislation.

May I add, at this point, the significant fact that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's expenditures for the administration of its numerous grant programs average only 2 per cent of the grant payments to the states.

Reasonable men have differing views on the value and effectiveness of the grants-in-aid mechanism. For almost ten years—since the Kestnbaum report in 1955—we have examined it from many angles. The permanent Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, on which I have been privileged to serve since its establishment in 1959—this commission, as well as the responsible committees of the Senate and House, led by Senator Muskie and Congressman Fountain, have given the subject of federal grants the most thoughtful and critical attention.

The object of all this attention is to increase the effectiveness of the federal system—not to permit it to wither away. In order to preserve their vital position within the federal structure, the states must meet their expanding responsibilities. Where their resources are inadequate to meet these needs, the federal government can come to their aid. This does not weaken the states' position. On the contrary, it serves to strengthen it.

Any failure on the part of any sector of government to meet its full share of responsibility results, of course, in an imbalance in the federal-state-local system. Where this imbalance is temporary, we have little cause for concern. But where it persists, there

is potential trouble, for the central purpose of government is to serve the needs of the people, and in a democracy these needs cannot be long ignored.

We have too long ignored the needs of the great cities of America. The expansion of urban areas has outstripped the ability of local government alone to provide needed services and to cope with new problems. In many cases these mushrooming urban centers have overflowed old political boundaries—further compounding the problems of government.

What is happening, as you know, is that the Mayors of large cities are coming not only to their state capitals but also to Washington for help. They have problems of education and health and delinquency and crime, of housing and sanitation and transportation and employment—problems that cannot wait, problems that passing time will compound rather than cure.

The Mayors, city planners, and city engineers, heads of health and welfare departments, and superintendents of education—they come to you and they come to us, seeking grants and loans and technical assistance.

Our response must be to meet these needs wherever possible with programs

- that encompass all relevant agencies—national, state, and local, public and private;
- that encourage planning and coordination among all levels and agencies;
- that stimulate local leadership, innovation, and experimentation.

Our response must be a creative federalism—a cooperative federalism—a government that can meet the needs of a changing society and at the same time preserve individual freedom and responsibility.

Where the normal working relationship was once between the federal agencies and their state counterparts, now agencies on both the state and local levels must be brought in as effective members of the team. Our planning and coordinating efforts must include city, county, intercounty, metropolitan, and interstate agencies, and the voluntary councils and agencies and private interests in the metropolitan community.

Consider the problems of air and water pollution as examples. These problems are neither contained in any one place nor solved at any one level. They require the joint efforts of all concerned.

Consider the problems of people—their need for education and social services. Not only does every state share the same needs for skilled workers and an educated citizenry, but it shares the same problems when individuals are handicapped by illness or disability, by a poor education, or an inadequate income. For individuals and families are free to move—and do move—from state to

state at the rate of one out of five families each year. Those who are disadvantaged carry their handicaps with them, transporting their problems from one state to another.

Over the years we have developed means for cooperation—for lending each other a helping hand. However, throughout the evolution of the federal-state partnership, the weight of responsibility for acting to meet our various social needs has rested most heavily upon the states and local communities. This situation is unchanged today. The federal government may help to provide the resources and create opportunities for action. But at the point of impact, it is local initiative, local responsibility, and local action that is required.

It might be useful for each of you, if you have not already done so, to make a careful evaluation of the many cooperative state-federal programs already in operation, to see if your state is taking full advantage, to the extent of your needs and resources, of all these opportunities to build a better life for the people of your state.

I would urge you particularly to take a look at those programs that are designed to help people help themselves—to prevent dependency and to rehabilitate many of those now receiving welfare assistance. The 1962 public welfare amendments offer broad opportunities for constructive social services that too often are still lacking in communities today.

Federal funds to help meet the basic needs of hungry children and the medical care needs of the destitute aged are not being fully utilized by many states. We need to take full advantage of these very basic programs.

At the same time, we have an opportunity to demonstrate anew the vitality of our federal system in working together to carry forward such new federal-state programs authorized by the Eighty-eighth Congress as those designed

- to combat and prevent mental retardation;
- to help provide for new approaches to the treatment of mental illness through community mental health centers;
- to assist the nation's institutions of higher learning to construct needed facilities;
- to improve and expand vocational education and manpower development and training;
- to do a more effective job in controlling air pollution; and
- to expand library services throughout the nation.

In addition to these programs, the legislation needed to carry forward the war on poverty and the proposed program for hospital insurance for the aged under social security, which will assist in preventing dependency and destitution of our older citizens, are among pending measures which will enable us to carry forward even more effectively the joint enterprise in helping meet human

need in which you and I are engaged.

We have accomplished much together, but there is still so much to be done!

It is highly important that the states maintain their strength and continue to exercise leadership in our common effort to promote the general welfare.

It is highly important that the states, as they are able to do so with or without federal participation, take the lead in devising new ways to meet the challenges of change—that they try new methods, test new programs, set new goals.

Once better ways are found to deal with the social and economic problems of our society, we must take action to apply them to those problems. Too often, in the past, we have known what needed to be done—and then failed to do it.

President Johnson has said within the past few days that "we face towering tests of our imagination and ingenuity, our leadership and our labor."

You as Governors and those of us in the federal government who are privileged to work with you in our mutual quest for a greater America face such towering tests now and will continue to do so for some time to come.

I am confident that, if we concentrate on the jobs to be done and seek ways to get those jobs done in mutual good faith and understanding and with a common faith in America and its future, we will meet whatever tests the future brings.

May we recommit ourselves to be a United States—united in our determination to erase from this land the last vestige of injustice, ignorance, want, and needless suffering—united in our resolve to build together an America of lasting greatness.

Governor Scranton: We thank you, Mr. Secretary, very much indeed for that excellent appraisal of many of our problems and your forthright thinking about what we can do. This comes at a very appropriate time for us because it follows immediately upon the meeting we had yesterday on federal-state relations, which you emphasized in your speech.

His department, as you all know, covers a tremendous number of programs and they are vital to all of us—federal aid to education, care for the aged, social security, mental health and mental retardation, just to mention a few of them. We have two of our members who will comment on these matters and who will give us their own thinking with regard to them. Then we will open it up for questions.

At this time it is my privilege to introduce one of our colleagues, our friend, Governor George Clyde of Utah.

Governor George D. Clyde: Fellow Governors, Mr. Secretary, ladies and gentlemen: First, I would like to commend you for that very learned presentation and the clarity with which you have ex-

pressed to us a very vital and important question. You see, health, education and welfare cover our entire life's span, and are made more important by the exploding population and the challenges of the future. The objective, of course, of this program, as Mr. Secretary has said, is to help people to help themselves.

I am pleased to report that I have checked with Utah's Director of Public Health, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the Chairman of our State Welfare Commission and have received from all three reports that most of our relations with the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are excellent. Our personal relations at the state level, Mr. Secretary, have been unusually good.

In the brief time allotted to me, I shall concentrate on some of the comparatively few problems that do exist, as I believe the purpose of this discussion is to examine such problems and seek ways of solving them. However, I do want to make it clear at the outset that there are far more areas of good relations than there are problem areas.

I shall present the specific problems in the respective areas of health, education and welfare, as they have been brought to my attention by those directly responsible for these three areas of government in my state.

First, public health. Utah, like other states, has been the recipient of federal health grants of both the "formula" and the "project" type. Generally, results have been beneficial, but there have been some problems connected with the extensive planning descriptions, budget and expenditure detail that have been required. It is readily recognized that good administration requires that federal agencies have sufficient information for justifying approval of both "formula" and "project" grants, and we in Utah will continue to make every effort to supply the necessary information. At the same time, federal agencies should recognize that the type of program and its detail of operation should be the responsibility of the state. Utah, with a comparatively small population and vast territory, faces special problems in attempting to use project grants to benefit sparsely populated areas when forced to operate under restrictions which might be quite easily met in larger population areas, including those of our own state. Keep in mind, if you please, that the State of Utah is about a quarter of a state. Some 73 per cent of its area is still in federal ownership. So we have to operate on a quarter of a state instead of a full state. Time does not permit going into detail, but we hope that some of these special problems can be recognized, and appropriate adjustments made.

We feel a serious problem exists in the need for recognized public health standards on radiation fallout. The Utah State Board of Health has formally adopted the Federal Radiation Council's standards as applicable to the human population in Utah, even

though the board is aware that the Federal Radiation Council itself has officially stated that these standards are not applicable to such a situation. The problem is that no other standards have been established by any recognized authority, and we in Utah have not felt competent to develop our own standards. In a recent conference with the Surgeon General, a request was made that applicable standards be developed and promulgated as soon as possible, and I renew the urging that such action be taken at the earliest possible time.

Next, education. Operations under the National Defense Education Act are felt in Utah to be a "gray area" between maximum respect for local autonomy and what we consider too much interference and too much government red tape. Let me say that the difficulty appears to lie in the legislation itself, and that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is doing the best it can to administer a complex law. Rules governing federal monies for research projects under NDEA are especially perplexing to us. We feel that the great need to improve school practices is in the area of action, or applied, research. The Washington view is too often, to our way of thinking, tightly oriented to "pure," or theoretical, research. We should like to see more pilot programs, with the states given maximum leeway to adapt such studies to their particular situations and needs.

Another problem lies largely in the future rather than in the present, but the drafts we have seen of bills for so-called "Anti-Poverty" Programs, concern us a great deal. We seriously question whether various agencies whose normal activities are in other fields, should get into the business of education. This might produce serious conflicts and a decrease in efficiency and effectiveness at a time when they can be ill-afforded.

Finally, welfare. Utah feels that the July 1, 1967, deadline to meet staffing-pattern requirements of no more than sixty cases per worker and one supervisor for each caseworker, in order to qualify for maximum federal participation under the 1962 amendments to the Social Security Act, is too early and would require an acceleration rate in expanding the personnel force that is more rapid than we could reasonably reach. The economy of our state, and I believe it is true of many other states, will not readily absorb too-rapid expansion of staff. Also, local community reaction in many places is adverse to heavy increases in welfare personnel, and time should be allowed for an effective educational program before drastic—or at least what local communities may consider drastic—action programs are put into effect.

Many federal programs require what appears to be an unreasonable amount of paper work. We are willing to supply needed information, but much of the information for which we are asked appears to bear little or no relation to the programs in question.

When we have asked for an explanation, we have too often been told by Washington that "We may need this information sometime." Some of the paper-work effort appears to be needlessly wasteful.

Some federal auditing practices also appear definitely wasteful. We have had as many as four different sets of federal auditors check the same books. Needless duplication should be eliminated.

I want to say in closing, again, that we have enjoyed excellent relationships with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. We think the program is moving along very well in our state. And we look forward to continuing cooperation, Mr. Secretary.

Governor Scranton: Thank you, Governor Clyde.

We will now have Governor John Dempsey of Connecticut. I remind you that if Ohio is benefiting from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare now, the state which benefited most and knew most about it previously was Connecticut because Former Governor Ribicoff was then the head of the Department. John is an expert. Come ahead.

Governor Dempsey: Mr. Chairman, I might say to you when I took Governor Ribicoff's place, when the late President asked him to come to Washington, I want you to know that every time I would meet my fellow Governors in the City of Washington, they would say, "Well, here comes Connecticut again. They have a boy up there at HEW and I suppose everything is going to Connecticut."

May I say to you, Mr. Secretary, that I am very grateful to you for the very fine presentation that you made here today to the people that this presentation should be made to—the Chief Executives of the States of the United States. I say to them for you that your remarks today were in the form, first of all, of an appeal. I would say you made an appeal to the Governors for greater understanding of your program. We must understand that in order for you to administer this program, it is necessary for you to appear before the Congress of the United States and explain to that body what your needs are. Somehow I know that you would welcome the help of any Governor in the United States to help you present a program of HEW which could be termed "Y-O-U." Because these programs, gentlemen, whether you like it or not, are programs for the young and the elderly, programs for the well and the sick, programs for those employed and those unemployed; programs that touch every one of you, whether in our states or in our communities, whether in the United States or all over the world.

Yes, Mr. Secretary, I think you put your finger right on the very problem when you asked this Conference to accept the word "growth." There is the key, gentlemen, that the Secretary has pointed out to us. All of our states are growing. And with that growth we have growing pains. Certainly, the problems of relationships between our states and the federal government are recognized by his department. Yes, he is asking you for a closer rela-

tionship with your state, with your community, and with your individual citizens.

Then he asked you to accept the word "interdependence," because he said it was the best word to describe federal-state relations. He said to you that neither can be fully effective without the help of the other. Gentlemen, if in his talk today he could leave one important thought with you, I think it is in that statement. Yes, Mr. Secretary, you said to us that working together and cooperating together, unity of action and unity of purpose for the sick and the elderly, for the programs on mental retardation, for the programs on the mentally ill—you said to us that this does not weaken the position of the states; you said, on the contrary, it strengthens it. Mr. Secretary, coming from a state that has pilot programs, that recognizes that we must look at these programs not only with our eyes but with our heart, I concur with you 100 per cent. Yes, you said to us that our response must be together. We must recognize that we do live in a changing society and at the same time we must recognize that all of us must work together to preserve the individual freedom and the responsibility that we talk about so often, that we make speeches about so often. But sometimes we forget that word "responsibility." Yes, Mr. Secretary, you have given to this Conference a real challenge. I hope that, because of the outstanding work your department is called upon to give to the people of this country, your presence here today will remind each and every one of us of our responsibility, of our obligation, to work with you and not stand on the sidelines and criticize those who are doing their best to make it a little bit easier for our people to live—the unfortunate people who cannot speak for themselves, the young and the old, as I have said, the sick and mentally retarded, the mentally ill. I hope, Mr. Secretary, that you will call upon the Governors of the states to help you with these vital programs, to help you with the pilot programs that are so necessary. If we in our states are going to talk about this growth, if we are going to talk about the pilot programs for our people, then it is time, gentlemen, that we took up such a challenge as you have heard here today and go back to our states and say to our people that we will work with the agency that the Congress has given us to work with to make not only our state but our nation a little bit better place in which to live.

Governor Scranton: Thank you very much, Governor Dempsey.

We now have a few minutes for questions on subjects which are clearly important to all of us. I assume there are a lot of questions. Who has the first one, particularly for the Secretary, but also for the panelists? There are no problems in any state with health, education or welfare? You all do this perfectly?

Governor Philip H. Hoff: Mr. Celebrezze, this deadline of

1967, in terms of the caseload work, is there any chance of that being extended?

Secretary Celebrezze: Are you talking about the caseload in public assistance?

Governor Hoff: Yes.

Secretary Celebrezze: There is a possibility, if undue hardship is being worked in any state after reasonable effort on the part of the state. You must bear in mind that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has to comply with what Congress wants, too. As you will recall, we reorganized our procedures at the request of Congress because there were too many complaints regarding these welfare programs, and we came up with a program to audit them more carefully. That is why we asked that additional trained personnel be put on. Let me say this to you. In the two years that I have been there, I have dealt with many Governors, and I appreciate the problems that a public official has, having been a Mayor of a city five times. You will find us most cooperative unless the Congress of the United States gives us no alternative. If in 1967 you are up against it, I am sure we can work something out that will be mutually satisfactory. That is, providing I am around in 1967.

Governor Scranton: Are there any other questions? Is Vermont the only state that has any problems with health, education and welfare?

Well, Mr. Secretary, you have done such a wonderful job that nobody can think of anything to ask you. We do appreciate your coming all of the way from Washington to be with us, back in your native city. I am sure if they have any questions, they will get in touch with you afterward. I want to thank Governor Clyde and Governor Dempsey. Governor Anderson, it is yours.

Governor Anderson: Thank you, Governor Scranton.

I want to thank the members of the panel. Secretary Celebrezze, I am pleased that you have been with us today.

The next formal item on the program is an executive session on the subject of "Problems of a Governor's Office." Each Governor may keep two administrative assistants in the room with him. Otherwise, we would like to have everyone else clear the room, please.

(The meeting recessed at 3:05 p.m.)

EVENING SESSION—Tuesday, June 9

THE STATE DINNER

The Annual State Dinner was held on Tuesday evening, Governor Anderson presiding as Chairman of the Governors' Conference. The Governors and their wives were introduced, couple by couple, as they entered the Grand Ballroom to the tunes of their official state songs. Reverend John Bruere, Calvary Presbyterian Church, delivered the invocation.

During the course of the evening, Governor Anderson spoke briefly and introduced the gracious host, Governor Rhodes of Ohio. Governor Rhodes expressed his appreciation to the visiting Governors and their parties for their presence in Cleveland and then introduced the distinguished guest speaker.

The State Dinner speaker was the Honorable Frank J. Lausche, Senior United States Senator from Ohio, a Former Governor and Former Chairman of the Governors' Conference. Following his remarks, all members of the Conference participated in a gala grand ball.

Shown below is the text of Senator Lausche's remarks.

ADDRESS

Senator Frank J. Lausche

Governor Rhodes, distinguished Governors of the states of our nation, your dear wives, ladies and gentlemen: At the very beginning I want to commend the Governor of Ohio for the excellence of the work that he has done in making this convention the great success that it is. He has said some kind words about me. But I want to say to you that my experience as Governor frequently has belied the loftiness of the praise that he has given me. I am quite certain that the Governors assembled here have had experiences similar to mine.

While I was Governor, Jim, I went to the Ohio State University Hospital to visit a judge of Cleveland who was injured in an accident. I went to the receptionist for an admittance card and she said, "Governor, you do not need a card. Everybody knows you." I went to the elevator and the operator said, "Where is your visiting card?" I said, "The receptionist said that I did not need one." She said, "Who are you?" I said, "The receptionist said I did not

need a visiting card." She said, "Are you a patient?" I said, "No." She said, "Are you a doctor?" I said, "No." Finally, she said, "Who are you?" I said, "I am the Governor of Ohio." She said, "You are sure a sick person." And she closed the elevator and up we went.

Down in Steubenville, Ohio, in the campaign, the Lieutenant Governor and I decided to take a train back to Columbus instead of going back in the car. I suggested going to the restaurant across the street from the station. We went over there, and there was not a soul in the place except the man behind the counter in his white apron. And the Lieutenant Governor said, "What is your name?" The man said, "Gus Pepcus." Then the Lieutenant Governor said, "Mr. Pepcus, I want you to meet the Governor of Ohio." And Mr. Pepcus' eyes bulged. Then I said, "Mr. Pepcus, I want you to meet the Lieutenant Governor of Ohio." His eyes pretty near jumped out. He said, "Isn't this wonderful that the three of us should meet at the same place and at the same time." This was not all. He said, "Think of it. You have the Governor of Ohio and the Lieutenant Governor of Ohio and I, Gus Pepcus, the President of the United States!"

I am sure that the Governors assembled here have had similar experiences. But, ladies and gentlemen, I ponder the significance of my participation in this meeting tonight. I recognize that there are probably fifty Governors here of states, territories and commonwealths. But there finally dawns upon me the realization that these men are symbolic of the states; figuratively, we have in our midst the soul and the spirit of the people of the states of our country meeting in communion, attempting to evolve methods and plans that will be for the betterment of the people of our nation. One cannot help but feel that there is genuine purpose upon the part of all to work out plans that will make possible the bequest of this rich country in the same strength as we received it from our ancestors.

Member Governors, I cannot adequately express my appreciation to you for allowing me to be the speaker of the night. I am proud of it and I am deeply inspired. The longing for attainment of objectives that will be in the interest of our nation abides equally with each of us, regardless of the political party to which we belong, with the exception that it is not a possession of either the Communists of our country or the Communists of the world. We desire peace, the promotion of the welfare of our people and the preservation of our country. In the hopes of achieving these objectives, I want tonight to outline five principles that ought to guide us.

1. We should prepare the nation fully and adequately in our military strength.
2. We should quit helping our enemies and punishing our friends.

3. We should maintain the economic stability of our government.

4. Insure the availability of equal justice to all in the maintenance of the supremacy of law and order.

5. Strive constantly to promote the national economy for the welfare of our people, having in mind at all times the physical limitations and what we are realistically able to do.

Our country is militarily in a position fully to preserve our security. The Communists know this. Our military strength has been a powerful deterrent against any contemplated outbreak of hostilities by our enemies against us. We, of course, have had trouble internationally and have suffered reverses. The fact, however, remains that when we compare our difficulties with those of Red Russia, ours, while bad, are not of the gravity of those confronting the Communists. Red Russia and China are in disagreement. Red Russia has on its borders the satellite and captive nations. These people are waiting eagerly for the opportunity to achieve independence and freedom. The collectivization of farms has not produced the agricultural products needed for the people in these captured countries. The program of Red Russia in "Russifying" the people of the captive countries is failing and with increasing vigor being rebuked. In Cleveland we have many of these people from the captive nations. You have them in Pennsylvania and in Michigan and in Illinois and in practically every state in the nation. No one who has mingled with them can ever be convinced that they have not the same yearning for freedom and independence that we have within this country. Militarily we are strong, but we should not fall into the belief that the ultimate objective of Communist Russia has changed and that our country can live in peaceful co-existence with her. Red Russia has only changed its tactics regarding the achievement of the ultimate goal of a Communist world. Russia is acting in strict conformity with the precepts of Marx and Lenin; that objectives must remain unchanged while tactics have to be adopted to best assure the ultimate communization of all governments, both in the Western and Eastern Hemispheres. Red Russia is direly in need of time, and knows that Red China is looking avidly toward the Siberian flatlands. Khrushchev is back-peddling for the opportunity to again make his advancement. He will do so just as soon as he becomes convinced that the circumstances make an advance justifiable. And while I am on that subject, if Khrushchev is becoming soft, may I put the question to you: What will be the situation when the successor of Khrushchev comes in? What will be our position if, because of being lulled into a state of security, we find ourselves suddenly facing an enemy that is prepared to strike? It is argued that we should take Khrushchev's word.

Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to enumerate to you the

series of broken promises made to our people and to the people of other nations by Red Russia and broken without hesitation when the time demanded it. Poland was promised by Red Russia that she would be permitted to live in peace and security. Germany was promised by Red Russia that there would be friendship between them. Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, Czechoslovakia—all of them—one by one, suffered the same experience of broken commitments. In 1933 we recognized Red Russia. Litvinov wrote a letter to President Roosevelt telling him how that recognition would build bonds of friendship between our countries. We have witnessed the bonds of friendship. You do not hear a single speech made by any leading Red Russian without epithets being heaped upon us. Those facts should not be forgotten. I said, "Quit helping our enemies and quit punishing our friends." The plight in which our country finds itself, ladies and gentlemen, denies us the luxury of choosing our allies to fight the ever-growing menace of Communism. We need the friendship of people and governments unwilling to live side by side with the Communist machine of Moscow. Too often there has been repetition of the statement that the purpose of the Communists is to destroy our nation and participate in its burial. I, of course, disbelieve in dictatorships. However, I say to you that if a foreign people are to have a dictatorship, I would want that dictatorship friendly to the West, not allied to the Communists.

I get sick and tired of hearing the argument that Franco is a dictator and, therefore, he must go; that Salazar is a dictator in Portugal and, therefore, he must go. To me it seems that there are many who would prefer to have Communist governments supposedly chosen by the people than to have dictatorships made up of leaders that are friendly to our nation. As for Cuba, we should not be laboring with the idea that Castro, our enemy, should be removed not by a friendly right-wing dictatorship but only by a democratic form of government favorable to our cause. The latter situation, of course, would be the preferable one. If that is not obtainable, it would be to our advantage to have a government, whatever its form, that is hostile to the Communists and friendly to the West in power in Cuba.

I spoke about maintaining the economic stability of our government. The federal government, I think, regrettably—and I know there are Governors who will not agree with me when I say this—is increasing old subsidies and creating new ones, taking on new functions that traditionally have belonged to state and local governments; and also taking on functions that have always been executed by private enterprise and never by government. Fiscal responsibility should not be a forgotten virtue; budgetary imbalance should not become accepted habit. We should, in periods of prosperity, avoid the accumulation of debt. In times of peace it is indispensable that we make strenuous efforts to reduce the amount of the indebtedness

caused by unavoidable war. In this field, the responsibility lies primarily with the legislative and the executive branches of the government. My own conviction is deep. The problem confronting us can be solved if those of us who occupy positions in the Congress and in the executive branch set our eyes primarily upon serving our country rather than the course of conduct that is going to elect us.

I have also spoken about the need for equal justice to all in the maintenance of the supremacy of law and order. Over the portals of the Supreme Court there is written the precept: "Equal justice under law." That principle is the cornerstone of our governmental structure. Pull it down and all our proclamations of virtue become a shambles. Thomas Jefferson, in his first Inaugural Address, said: "Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political. . . ." Those words to the student of American government are of grave consequence. My own belief is that we are breaching them all too frequently.

Ladies and gentlemen, presently we are debating in the Senate the civil rights bill. The bill, as it came before that body, had no provision in it for the granting of jury trials in criminal contempt cases as distinguished from civil contempt. An amendment was offered to make jury trials available in criminal contempt cases. That amendment came up for a vote about four weeks ago and it was defeated, as I recall, by a vote of 43 to 41. The significant phase of the controversy resides in the fact that we now have on the statute books three laws dealing with disobedience of labor leaders to court injunctions. In each one of those laws jury trials are allowed in criminal contempt cases. In 1959, in the Landrum-Griffin Bill, which is a substitute for the Taft-Hartley Bill, we wrote into the act jury trials in criminal contempt cases for labor leaders. As I said to you, three weeks ago we voted down the right of jury trials to the offender of the civil rights bill. I ask you on what grounds of rationalization or good conscience can you say that the labor leader shall have the jury trial but the violator of the civil rights act should not? Senators who in 1959 voted for jury trials in criminal contempt cases voted against them in this session. To repeat my earlier comment, we should make certain that there shall be equality of justice to all under the law.

I have said something about the law being supreme, the government being supreme. I would like to discuss the subject at length, but I do not have the time. But I would like to point out what has happened in the Maritime Union. The United States government built a nuclear-propelled ship at a cost of \$70 million. They tried to sail it on the high seas. They could not because of a labor dispute. They had to put the ship up in port. The U.S.S. America, with 1,600 passengers, last September was ready to leave the Port of New York when two labor unions got into a dis-

pute on jurisdictional grounds. Passengers were waiting for the ship to announce the departure when word came that the ship would not leave. The 1,600 passengers had to go back to their homes or find other means of getting to their destination across the seas. Now, I have difficulty in making myself believe that there is any segment of our economy that should be permitted to have greater power than the government itself.

I want to move to an end. You probably begin to wonder what will be the ultimate destiny of our country. I have pondered that subject. I have come to definite conclusions, and my conclusions are predicated upon a deep belief that in the ways of our lives, in the ways of the government, there are unyielding and unchanging laws. They are eternal and inalienable. They act upon the individual and upon governments equally. No nation, no combination of nations, can destroy us from without. If we are to fail, it will be because of the weaknesses of our domestic mismanagement and the unwillingness of our people to recognize external realities. Our enemies are in trouble because they advocate a system of politics, economics and social relations which are incompatible with the aspirations of mankind. The collectivized farms of Russia have failed and so have they everywhere, because within man there is a natural force inducing him to work, provided that the creation of his work shall have some semblance of belonging to him. He must be given the pride and dignity to be able to say, "This is my creation made with my mind and with my hands. It belongs to me." Man will not tolerate the indolent dividing rewards with the energetic. The writer and the artist and the sculptor cannot be compelled by a centralized Communist dictation to write and paint and carve in conformity with the aspirations of the Communist dictators, with complete disregard of spiritual inspiration. Our system of government has provided abundance for its people because of the great opportunities that it provides economically, culturally, spiritually and otherwise. One of the Senators who was with you yesterday afternoon has said—and it is worth remembering—that he would rather be among the poorest citizens of this country than among the richest in an autocratic dictatorship.

Ladies and gentlemen, we can survive, providing we have the will to do so. There was a great military general by the name of Clausewitz. He was a member of Western Civilization. He argued that war was not to destroy the cities and the civilization of the enemy. The objective of war, he said, is to destroy the enemy's will to resist. I want to pause at this juncture and ask you to engage in a moment of introspection. There are those who say, "I would rather be Red than dead." Let us, however, remember, ladies and gentlemen, that in every emergency and challenge which have arisen confronting the people of our country, no sacrifice has been too great; consolidation of efforts became uniform; we were

a united people, north and south, east and west, giving equally of the lives and the possessions of the people within the states. Emerson in his essay on "Compensation" made the observation that things refuse to be mismanaged long. Though no checks to a new evil appear, the checks exist and will appear. If the government is cruel, the governor's life is not safe. If you tax too high, the revenue will yield nothing, because the people will not pay. If you make the criminal code sanguinary, juries will not convict. Nothing arbitrary, nothing artificial can endure. Every secret is told, every crime is punished, every virtue rewarded, every wrong redressed. What we call retribution is the universal necessity by which the whole appears wherever a part appears. The history of persecution, and that is what you have in the Communist nations, is a history of endeavors to cheat nature, to make water run uphill, to twist a rope of sand. It makes no difference whether the actors be many or one, a tyrant or a mob. Thus I paraphrase Emerson and in my thinking, this law of retribution is now operating upon the Communists.

I will close by quoting a statement by Theodore Roosevelt. "Our country calls not for the life of ease, but for the life of strenuous endeavor. The Twentieth Century looms before us big with the faith of many nations. If we stand idly by, if we seek merely swollen slothfulness and ignoble peace, if we slink from the hard contest where men must win, sometimes at the hazard of their lives and at the risk of all that we hold dear," Roosevelt concludes, "then the bolder and the stronger people will pass us by and will win for themselves the domination of the world."

President Kennedy, our martyred hero, made the statement: "Let us not ask what our country can do for us but what we can do for our country." Those words are with us.

MORNING SESSION—Wednesday, June 10

Governor Anderson: If the members of the Conference will now be seated, we will have the invocation, which will be given by the Reverend Lewis Raymond of the Old Stone Church on Cleveland's Public Square.

Reverend Raymond: Our Father, God, we give Thee humble thanks for this new day. We bless Thee for the great gifts of life, liberty and happiness and work to do, for the sense of being needed and wanted and for the leadership which we trust we may give. So bless unto us more than a memory of what this country was, but bless unto us the high hopes of what this country may be. Bless these gentlemen, keep them and their families and their loved ones and their friends, we pray in Thy most precious name. Amen.

Governor Anderson: Since we have a rather full schedule of committee reports, along with a number of proposed resolutions, I think we will move along with the business of the session and hear the first report of the Committee on Cold War Education by the Honorable Farris Bryant of the State of Florida.

Governor Farris Bryant: Mr. Chairman and members of the Conference: the Report of the Committee on Cold War Education is before you. I hope you will take the time to review it. I shall not attempt to do so, but it is worth carrying with you on the plane to read when you have a chance. You established a Committee on Cold War Education in 1962 and defined Cold War Education as "the development of knowledge essential to the understanding of America's heritage of freedom, and of the nature of the attacks upon that freedom, open and covert, by the followers of International Communism." It established as its purpose the affirmative effort to provide for people knowledge of the foundations of American freedom, knowledge of the Communist assault to that freedom and the methods whereby the various elements of a free society can contribute to defeat the Communist assault.

We recognize very fully that this must be a voluntary effort; that, as we press forward in the field of Cold War Education, it is essential that the job be done not by direction but by stimulation. Towards that end the committee recommends that, upon acceptance of this report by the Conference, we establish with the President a liaison which will make available to him the talents and the facilities of the Governors in their individual capacities. We should also make available to him the abilities which are ours and the particular knowledge which we have, by reason of our close association

with the people, in respect to meeting the challenge and the assault of Communism. It is becoming increasingly apparent that civil defense, indeed, any defense, depends not only upon the material things which are available, but also upon the mental attitudes of the people. We are having problems in Laos today, and it is not because we are not providing them with the tools but because there has not been developed the attitude required for the defense of their country.

We have suggested that there be initiated a program for broadening civil defense to make carefully controlled Cold War Education activities available, under the auspices of civil defense agencies, in those periods between crises when civil defense agencies are having such difficulty in fighting apathy and finding effective ways of reaching the people. We could be using their resources and their manpower and their talents in bringing home to the people an understanding of the need for establishment of attitudes that are required to meet the problems that we face. One of the things that the Committee on Cold War Education has done, and done most effectively, has been the preparation of materials for the information of persons in our public school system with responsibility to teach about Communism and about the fundamental strength of America. In virtually all of the states formal efforts are now being made to educate our children about Communism; and yet among the teachers who have this responsibility, there is not always the knowledge available to do this in the fashion that they would like to do it. There is a fine line sometimes between teaching Communism and teaching about Communism. So the Committee on Cold War Education has been active in securing and preparing materials to enable this better to be done. Doctor Gerhart Niemeyer of Notre Dame and Dean Ewing Shahan of Vanderbilt University have taken on the responsibility of preparing materials for a meaningful television course. Fifty-six half-hour video tapes will be completed shortly; and these will be available, if desired, to all of the states of the nation for training teachers on the dangers of Communism and the defenses against it. In addition to that, in the State of Florida, and I mention this to you as a suggestion for possible utilization in your state, we are using the refugees from Cuba to translate these fifty-six half-hour video tapes into useful tools for the governments of South America to the extent that they want to make use of them. It occurs to me that in Texas, which has a unique relationship with Argentina, and in other states which have a special relationship with Latin American countries, there could be a special cooperative effort to make these courses available to those countries and to explain to their people what the dangers of Communism are and give them the tools for fighting this problem.

We have also been very fortunate in having the services of a famous illustrator who has developed, at his own initiative, some

twelve educational posters which the State of Florida has reproduced and made available in schools, in libraries, in offices and wherever people gather. These posters carry a message of stimulation. They do not suggest to people what the answers are, but they do recall the dangers and they tend to stimulate the minds of people who look into this particular problem. In the folder before each of you is a supply of all twelve of these posters. They are available in quantity at a very reasonable price.

I now come to what we consider to be the crux of our report. The report of last year pointed out that be he Republican or Democrat, liberal or conservative, the Governor of a state bears an obligation to provide leadership for the enhancement of liberty under law. But I have found in my experience, as have all the Governors on the committee, and, indeed, all Governors to whom I have spoken, that we frequently lack the talents or the knowledge or the time personally to undertake the necessary leadership in this particular area—an area which on the one hand can be so easily misunderstood or on the other hand so readily abused if not properly directed. Therefore, we thought that the committee could render the Governors no greater service than by providing for them a seminar to which they might send an aide who could come back from it armed with the materials that would permit him, as a right arm of the Governor, to advise the Governor on programs which might give the people of his state a better understanding of the dangers they face and a better understanding of the tools they have available to fight those dangers. So we propose to establish a seminar for gubernatorial aides to which you may send your aide in the two-week period between November 22nd and December 5th. He will be instructed by Doctor Stefan Possony, Director of the International Studies Program, Hoover Institute, Stanford University, and by Doctor James D. Atkinson, Associate Professor of Government at Georgetown University and President of the American Military Institute. These and numerous other authorities will present a curriculum on the methods that can best be used by a Governor's office, if the Governor desires it, to further the aims of cold war education, to fight Communism, and to enlighten the people. This has been financed in part by the Lilly Endowment Fund, in part by Sears, Roebuck and Company, and in part by contributions from the Florida Center for Cold War Education. We hope to secure support in some other ways, as will be suggested to you soon. I recognize, as do we all, that this effort of the Governors' Conference is probably not going to change the course of history or bring peace to the world tomorrow. But we are firmly convinced, if we can assist the Governors of the states to have aides who are armed with the knowledge and experience and the methods best usable in translating into effective citizenship action the desires we all have to serve our democracy, that we are doing

more than we can do in any other way. This is the kind of voluntary leadership that we hope will be effective. I hope it does carry the promise that no ideological battle will be defaulted to the Communists by reason of our ignorance. If the Governors of these states do not have the capacity to lead our people to a national consensus on rejection of the assault of Communism, we are indeed in a bad way. I am convinced that this is not the case, and I hope you will see fit to look with favor upon the recommendations of the report.

Governor John H. Reed: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that our fellow Governors are appreciative of Governor Farris Bryant's report and of the immense amount of leadership that he has brought to the committee. As he pointed out, the most important recommendation that we have for you today is this seminar for gubernatorial aides, and I would like to explain to you about the budget for the seminar. The total amount needed for this project is \$45,000. Now available to underwrite this project is a grant from the Lilly Endowment Fund of \$18,500; from the Sears, Roebuck Foundation, a grant of \$6,000; and from the Florida Center for Cold War Education, \$5,000; making a total available of almost \$30,000. We still need \$15,000 to make this project possible. In a moment I will outline to you the proposal of your committee to make certain that the work of this committee gets off the ground and has a lasting impact.

I am sure all of us recognize the need for such a seminar and the need for such information to be disseminated throughout our entire country. The Fourth of July is coming up, and we emphasize in our individual states the importance of patriotism, love of country and the great traditions that we must preserve here in the United States of America. I say to you that here is our opportunity to translate some of our praise and some of our speeches into effective action. The amount needed now to make this possible is very slight. I have suggested to the committee this morning that since we only need \$15,000, that each of our states take the responsibility of providing \$300 on an equal basis which will assure the implementation of the seminar. I am certain there is not one Governor around this table who cannot, through official funds from his state or by raising it from public-spirited individuals in his home state, raise this small amount of money. I think this is the least we can do to further the interest and the mission of this committee. Governor Bryant, unfortunately, is leaving the Conference this year. And I can think of no greater tribute to a real leader, a man who has made a great contribution to this Conference and to this country, than to go on record endorsing the proposal of the Committee on Cold War Education.

So I would at this time move that the Conference adopt the report as offered by the committee with the recommendation for a seminar for gubernatorial aides, and with the further recommen-

dation that each state shall send a representative to the seminar and shall underwrite the tuition of \$300. Governor Bryant will administer these funds, and I am certain that the project can make a real contribution toward fostering the ideals of our great country. Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of this motion.

Governor Anderson: You have heard the motion that the report be adopted together with the recommendation that each state send a representative to the seminar and pay its share of the cost. Is there a second to that motion?

Governor Hughes (New Jersey): I second it.

Governor Anderson: All in favor signify by saying "Aye." Opposed? The motion is carried.*

I would like to add my personal thanks to Governor Bryant and each member of the committee for their very, very fine work in compiling this report. This committee has for two years now assembled a great wealth of information on the cold war subject.

If there is no further business in connection with this committee's report, I would like now to ask Governor Otto Kerner to give the Report of the Advisory Committee on the National Guard.

Governor Kerner: Mr. Chairman and my fellow Governors: You have on your desks a full report and I wish to spend some time reviewing certain phases of it.

[At this point Governor Kerner read excerpts from the report of the Advisory Committee on the National Guard, full text of which will be found in Appendix IX. Governor Kerner also interpolated the additional statement shown below.]

At this point, I should like to depart briefly from the formal printed report to elaborate a bit. It is possible that some have seen the recent story in the Army Times dated June 3, 1964, indicating that Secretary of Defense McNamara has issued a memorandum to Secretary of the Army Ailes directing the Army to concentrate its support on the Active Army and those elements of the Army National Guard and Army Reserve that are classified in a priority status as a part of the 22nd Division Force Structure.

This move was not completely unexpected by those of us who have been associated with National Guard matters. It is in no way reflected in the proposed budget for fiscal year 1965 and requires no immediate change in the fiscal year 1965 program. The combat equipment in the hands of the Army National Guard nationwide is now earmarked in time of emergency or war for the use of priority units whose immediate mobilization and possible deployment as a part of the 22nd Division Force is planned.

However, as I have already indicated in my formal report, this expressed trend illustrates a matter of grave concern to the states. The National Guard Association of the United States, acutely aware

* Text of the report as adopted will be found in Appendix VIII.

of the increased concentration on priority forces to the detriment of the reinforcing reserve forces, has established a high level Special Committee on Roles and Missions supported by a competent professional staff, which is making a detailed and extensive study of this problem.

As you know, the Army National Guard has within the past year completed a major reorganization and realignment of its troop structure at the request, and under the direction of the Department of the Army. We were assured at that time that the units which we accepted were required to support the over-all mission and plans of the army in a general mobilization. We have not been otherwise advised.

Nonetheless, your committee considers it vital that this Conference unanimously adopt the resolution to be presented, expressing its grave concern about any planned, announced or unannounced, reduction in support of the nonpriority forces in the Army National Guard, and once again invite the attention of the Pentagon to the vested and vital interest that the Chief Executives of our states have in any programs which affect the National Guard.

Governor Russell: Mr. Chairman, I regret to interrupt the speaker, but there is someone over there with a television camera arranging papers and taking pictures of a Governor's desk. I wonder if that is permitted? It seems to me that the Governor's desk ought to be privileged and not viewed by a television camera.

Governor Anderson: I am inclined to think so myself. We do not have any rule on that except the rule of proper order and decorum in a conference room. I think the desk of a Governor should be maintained only by the Governor himself. That is my own idea about it. But you have no motion or anything other than calling it to the attention of the Conference?

Governor Russell: That is right.

Governor Anderson: Thank you.

Governor Kerner: Mr. Chairman, I now move adoption of the report of the Advisory Committee on the National Guard.

Governor Anderson: Motion has been made for adoption of the Report of the Advisory Committee on the National Guard. Do I hear a second?

Governor Brown: I second the motion.

Governor Anderson: There is a motion and a second to adopt the report. All in favor signify by saying "Aye." Opposed? The Secretary will record the adoption of the Report of the Advisory Committee.* We will now proceed with further business in connection with this report.

Governor Kerner: Mr. Chairman, I request suspension of the Articles of Organization for the purpose of presenting a resolution

* Text of the report as adopted will be found in Appendix IX.

concerning any reduction in federal support for the National Guard. You have received, unfortunately, three different resolutions. The one with the date June 9th in the upper righthand corner is the one which I have in mind.

Governor Anderson: Motion has been made to suspend the Articles for the purpose of considering a resolution, and notice of this motion was given two days ago. You have a copy of the resolution together with the notice. Do I now hear a second to this motion to suspend?

Governor Bryant: I second the motion.

Governor Anderson: All in favor signify by saying "Aye." All opposed, like sign. The resolution will now be placed before the Conference. Is there any request to discuss the resolution or explain it?

Governor Burns: Is there any reason why "Army National Guard" was used rather than "National Guard"?

Governor Kerner: Actually, that is where we made a correction. The draft of June 9th refers to the National Guard. We have stricken the word "Army" where it previously had application to the entire National Guard.

Mr. Chairman, I move now the adoption of the resolution on the National Guard.

Governor Anderson: Do I hear a second to that motion?

Governor Hughes (New Jersey): I second it.

Governor Anderson: Are you ready for the question? All in favor of the adoption of the resolution on the National Guard signify by saying "Aye." Opposed? The resolution is unanimously adopted.* Is there any further business on this subject?

Governor Kerner: None, except to say thank you for listening to me. We must continue to be alert as to what is happening in the Pentagon at the present time. The removal of logistical support from our units will make them completely ineffective. As Governors, we must defend against this.

Governor Anderson: I am sure the action of the Conference speaks for itself in expressing appreciation for the work of Governor Kerner and the members of the Committee on the National Guard. This Conference has been seriously concerned with these problems now for a number of years. This resolution, we hope, will have its desired effect when it is forwarded.

The next business of the Conference is the Report of the Committee on Juvenile Delinquency. It is my pleasure to ask the Chairman of that Committee, the Honorable Edmund G. Brown, Governor of California, to come forward.

Governor Brown: Mr. Chairman, my fellow Governors, ladies and gentlemen: The 1964 report of the Committee on Juvenile

*Text of resolution will be found in Appendix XV.

Delinquency is before you. It is a valuable report, although it breaks no new ground and holds out no new hope for quick and easy ways to curb young offenders. It is a technical report, written for the Governors of the states so they can judge the progress their states are making. It talks of summer camps, job counseling, remedial tutoring, increasing community orientation of programs. It advocates intensified programs to control sales of firearms to minors and tone down violence on television; talks of the relationship of pornography to delinquency; and advocates mandatory installation of tamperproof locks on automobile doors and ignitions. It is, in short, a conventional progress report—brief, thorough and useful in the way a navigator's position report in degrees and minutes is useful. It tells you where you are, but doesn't tell much about the scenery.

I would like to spend the next few minutes this morning on the scenery—the background—of our fight against juvenile delinquency in this country.

American delinquency is the shadow cast by American family life and it should be understood from the outset that it is only the shadow we are talking about. Of millions of youngsters under the age of 18, only a few hundred-thousand went before judges last year. Most of our young people are in good shape. So the story of the delinquent no more tells us about American youth than do the stories of the "Mods" and "Rockers" tell us about British youth. But delinquency is on the rise. And the rise should make us look at least as hard at the causes as we do at the symptoms.

Why, for example, will more than one-fourth of the 26 million young people who will enter the labor market in the rest of this decade fail to finish high school. Why does the richest nation in the history of mankind deprive one-quarter of its youth of a chance to get along in this space age, let alone get ahead in it? Why has the rate of illegitimate births gone up 300 per cent in the past twenty-five years? In 1929 about one-third of all college girls had sexual experience before marriage. Today the figure is considerably more than half. Why is the median age of those who commit serious crimes getting lower all the time? In the 1920's the median age of serious offenders was 23. Today more than half of all serious crimes are committed by youngsters 18 and under.

I think we should never lose sight of the fact that the root causes of juvenile delinquency never change—poverty, racial discrimination and indifference to moral standards. As long as we fail to deal with these causes, we will fail to deal with delinquency except in a most superficial way.

The beating of whites by blacks and blacks by whites in New York in recent weeks is shocking but it is not surprising. These are teen-agers whose elders have passed on to them a legacy of bigotry and who live these days in a turbulent, now-or-never air

of racial relations. As for violence, they have only to switch on their television sets to find the pattern for that. I do not have to repeat for you the countless surveys showing the numbers of murders, beatings, robberies and bombings a child can see in a single sitting. Color television originally came to us in black and blue and it hasn't changed. As long as we have racial tensions among adults in this country, they shall exist among juveniles. And so a large part of the fight against juvenile delinquency is wrapped up today in the civil rights bill and the other weapons in our war on bigotry.

President Johnson, in his poverty message, said "the young man or woman who grows up without a decent education, in a broken home, in a hostile and squalid environment, in ill health or in the face of racial injustice" is often "trapped in a life of poverty."

The profile of the delinquent which our juvenile courts have drawn in California fits that description exactly. Nearly two-thirds of the youngsters in California institutions came from homes where the parents were unmarried or homes broken by divorce, separation or death. The so-called typical delinquent has lived at his present address less than five years. His home is squalid, overcrowded, lacking in privacy, depressing. From these same homes come the 730,000 young men and women between the ages of 16 and 21 who were out of work in October of last year. From those homes will come the million-and-a-half who will be out of work five years from now.

The link between poverty and delinquency is fundamental and direct. The youngsters from these homes go astray because of hopelessness and apathy, not because of bad habits they learn from comic books. They discover their failure by the standards of their society in school, not on television. And the only attack that can have meaning on delinquency in this area is the attack on poverty which President Johnson has begun and which we must be prepared to support with large sums of money over long periods of time.

Not all delinquency occurs in the slums. There is sin in the suburbs as well, but the causes are different there. How, for example, can a teen-ager separate right and wrong, sense and nonsense when he sees on the one hand the Surgeon General saying smoking causes cancer and on the other his parents smoking more and more. Report after report shows us that sexual standards among young people from the safe suburban home is changing. Young people are living by a different set of values than the generation preceding them. Sex has become more freely talked about and widely experienced for its own sake than fifteen and twenty years ago.

There has been a decline in the impact and effectiveness of church training and religious training. Young people demand logi-

cal reasons for everything these days, and it is not enough to speak to them in terms of some kind of natural moral law or about a feeling of what is right or wrong. Feelings of guilt or a fear of eternal damnation simply do not have the kind of inhibiting and restricting effect on adolescents now that they did a generation ago. At the same time, parents and teachers continually relax prohibitions—become increasingly more permissive. I am told that at one college, a rule was put into effect permitting girls an unlimited number of overnight sign-outs, despite pleas from many of these girls that the curfew was their most effective protection.

Religion and law have the same purpose in a democracy. Our best hope is that the former will set standards higher than those required by the latter. Where poverty or bigotry are not involved, delinquency will be curbed only if parents care enough to work a little harder at their job, because they are the first line of society's defense against decadence and barbarism. The family must draw the line for teen-agers between liberty and license. No teenager should be expected to draw that line for himself.

Most of all, the parent must concentrate on letting our youngsters know that in the last analysis, it is individual discipline that makes a civilized society. And it is individual responsibility that creates discipline.

Now, gentlemen, for seven years I was District Attorney of the City of and County of San Francisco. I worked with people that got into trouble. I have asked juries personally to send people to the gas chamber. As Attorney General, I worked in the same direction. And now, as Governor—and I have been doing it for a period of five years and three months—I get a little bit discouraged and frustrated at the fact that the statistics and the figures in this report show that we are not making much progress. I do believe this committee that we have started, that we have had for the past two years, with the exchange of ideas, has done some good. I really feel that we should not stop doing everything we can merely because tangible results are difficult to accomplish.

I would move the report itself, which sets forth some figures and suggests that the Committee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Governors' Conference be continued. There were no other specific recommendations in the report itself. I would like to move the adoption of the Report of the Committee on Juvenile Delinquency.

Governor Dempsey: I second the motion.

Governor Anderson: Motion for adoption of the report has been made and seconded. All in favor signify by saying "Aye." Opposed? The motion is carried.* And I thank you, Governor Brown, and the members of your committee. Sometimes I think the work of this type of a committee, although it may not be as colorful as

* Text of the report as adopted will be found in Appendix X.

some of the other things that go into a Conference, may be really the most important work that we can do.

The next report to be received will be that of the Committee on Civil Defense and Post-Attack Recovery. I understand that Governor Rockefeller is not present this morning. I wonder if Governor Farris Bryant of Florida would present that report.

Governor Bryant: Thank you, Governor Anderson. Governor Rockefeller asked me to pinch-hit for him and to express his regrets for not making the report himself. You now have the report before you for your consideration. I do not propose to go through it in detail. But first and most important, I find it highly encouraging to know that thirty-seven Governors report a more understanding and favorable attitude toward civil defense than they did a year ago. Several things led us to this conclusion. One is the steady progress in the federal marking and shelter program. Seventy-four thousand buildings and over fifty-seven million shelter spaces are now marked and twenty million of these spaces are stocked. The interest generated in all states by the federal program, utilizing state and land-grant colleges for the establishment of training courses for civil defense, has been a very encouraging development. Finally, the Governors have been very, very active and effective in the construction of emergency operating centers. Thirty-nine states now report that such centers are available as compared with twenty-four last year. So you certainly ought to be commended for having done a remarkable job in this respect.

There have been disappointments. Chief among these is the failure of the Congress to act firmly in support of a reasonable civil defense program. H.R. 8200, providing for shelter in federal buildings and for modest financial assistance to states and to non-profit institutions, though passed by the House, has been deferred by the Senate Armed Services Committee. And we are particularly going to ask you to be active in securing favorable consideration by the Senate of H.R. 8200 because it is basic to our entire program.

On the whole, however, your program and progress in civil defense and post-attack recovery planning has been substantial. I believe that this Conference has nowhere been more active and effective than in this particular program. A great deal still remains to be done. Your committee, therefore, has appended to the report a group of resolutions. These resolutions, if they are adopted, gentlemen, will once again place the Conference on record in support of the President's shelter program. It will urge the Senate to reconsider its deferred action on H.R. 8200. It will urge the Congress to extend the expiring matching-fund provisions of the federal Civil Defense Act. It will urge continued effort by all states to improve their civil defense posture. It will express the appre-

ciation of the Conference to Steuart Pittman, who recently resigned as Assistant Secretary of Defense, and to Edward McDermott, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, who plans shortly to return to private life, for their services to this Committee. Their cooperation with us has been a very fine experience for us all.

Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the notice of intention filed with the Secretary on June 8th, it is my intention, following discussion of this report, to move for suspension of the Articles to permit the Conference to act favorably on each of these resolutions.

I would add that at our meeting on Sunday, your committee met with the Secretary of the Army, with Mr. McDermott and with Mr. Durkee, recently appointed Director of Civil Defense. The Secretary pointed out that the recent transfer of civil defense functions from the Office of the Secretary of Defense to the Department of the Army, while it gave us all cause for concern, was done because the program is now largely operational and, therefore, it rightfully belongs in one of the departments and not in the Secretary's Office. The Secretary's Office is not designed or staffed for operational functions. Secondly, the Department of the Army with its resources is far better equipped to handle the program. Civil defense under the Department of the Army will remain in civilian hands. It will receive valuable support from the military but will not be absorbed by the uniformed services.

Mr. Durkee told us of plans to continue to expand and improve the marking and stocking program in which you play such a large part in your state, to improve the warning system, to augment the college training program and to improve the coordination, planning and control of the National Guard and reserve units in support of civil defense. We envisage many, many instances where there may be a crisis in international relationships which will not necessarily call for utilization of the National Guard. And in such a period of crisis it is wise, whether the National Guard be pinned down because of nuclear fallout or whatever, that they be given mobilization assignments prior to any military utilization.

Mr. McDermott spoke of progress in emergency planning. He informed us that all fifty states now have emergency planning directors; that forty-five states have working committees, and that in a number of states planning is far advanced. He spoke also of encouraging progress in continuance of government planning and operation. He concluded by referring to the role played by civil defense in the Alaskan disaster and he gave the following damage estimate, which I think is of tremendous interest and is shocking. The damage in Alaska to public facilities amounted to \$316 million; to private, \$219 million, for a total of over a half a billion dollars in damages. I have asked Governor Egan to comment to you a little bit upon the significant, indeed, the vital and indispensable role of the civil defense machinery and the part it played in Alaska in

meeting this tragedy and helping Alaska to recover from it.

I should be happy to try to answer any questions you may have about the resolutions, Mr. Chairman.

Governor Anderson: Are there any questions about the report or the resolutions?

Governor Bryant: If there are none, I shall move now to suspend the Articles of Organization, in accordance with the rule, in order to permit consideration by the Conference of the resolutions appended to this report. At the appropriate time I would like to be recognized to move adoption of the resolutions.

Governor Anderson: There has been a motion to suspend the Articles so that we may consider the adoption of the resolutions that are appended to the report. Do I hear a second?

Governor Dempsey: I second it.

Governor Anderson: Question? All in favor signify by saying "Aye." Opposed? The motion carries and we will now move to the resolutions.

Governor Bryant: Resolution No. 1, in summary, is that the report be adopted and transmitted by the Chairman to the President of the United States and to the Chairmen of the Armed Services Committees and the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate of the United States.

Resolution No. 2 is that the Governors' Conference recommend that the Congress give the President's civil defense program, built around the fallout shelter, a firm and high priority as an integral part of the national security effort.

Resolution No. 3 is that the Governors' Conference commend Steuart Pittman and Edward McDermott for their significant contributions over the past two years in the development of sound and effective programs for civil defense, and record its appreciation for the energy, competence and character of which they both gave so generously in the public service.

Resolution No. 4 is that the Governors' Conference urge the Senate Armed Services Committee to reconsider its postponement of action on H.R. 8200. A fallout shelter program will contribute far more to the saving of lives per dollar spent than any other active defense program. Indeed, defense against nuclear attack without a fallout shelter program is almost an inconsistency.

Resolution No. 5 is that the Conference recommend as imperative the enactment before June 30, 1964, by the Congress of H.R. 10314, which extends the expiring matching-fund provisions of the federal Civil Defense Act.

Resolution No. 6 is that the federal financial assistance program for resources management be continued and an additional \$1.5 million be appropriated by the Congress for this purpose. Mr. McDermott felt that this was an essential for expansion and a continuation of their services.

Resolution No. 7 is that each state take action to require the incorporation of fallout shelter space, meeting criteria established by the Department of Defense, in new construction of public buildings under its jurisdiction, and that local governments be encouraged to take corresponding steps.

Resolution No. 8 is that each state emphasize in the coming year the licensing, marking and stocking of shelters identified by the National Shelter Survey, the training for special civil defense skills, the development of shelter allocating plans, and the establishment of protected emergency operating centers to assure the continuity of state and local governments.

Resolution No. 9 is that the Chairman and the Vice Chairman of the Committee on Civil Defense and Post-Attack Recovery be authorized in their joint discretion and on behalf of the Governors' Conference, to appear and testify before any of the appropriate committees of the Congress of the United States so as personally to convey to the Congress the convictions of the Governors, demonstrated at each Conference for the past six years, as to the crucial significance of an adequate civil defense program and especially as to the importance of a nationwide system of fallout protection, the soundness of the proposed Federal Shelter Development Program, outlined in H.R. 8200, and the need for better understanding and affirmative leadership with respect to the nation's capability for survival and recovery in the event of nuclear attack.

Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of each of the resolutions.

Governor Hughes (New Jersey): I second the motion.

Governor Anderson: Motion has been made for the adoption of these resolutions and it has been seconded. Are we ready for the question? All in favor signify by saying "Aye." Opposed? The resolutions, which include a resolution for the adoption of the report as presented, have been adopted.*

Governor Bryant has mentioned it, and I think it would be appropriate at this time if Governor Egan of Alaska would come forward and briefly give the Conference a few remarks concerning the Alaskan disaster.

Governor William A. Egan: Mr. Chairman and fellow Governors: As the Committee on Civil Defense and Post-Attack Recovery has stated, the capability of civil defense to perform under disaster conditions was critically tested by the earthquake in Alaska in March. The civil defense organization in Alaska passed this test with flying colors. It coordinated the rescue and relief activities and acted as a center for liaison with military forces and civil defense heads. Communications and other equipment purchased with federal financial assistance provided the vital link be-

*Text of the report will be found in Appendix XI. Text of the resolutions will be found in Appendix XV.

tween state and local governments and the disaster areas in need. From the very moment this disaster hit Alaska, the state civil defense organization plus all of the voluntary units in the various affected communities and other communities of Alaska, the voluntary units working in conjunction and in total coordination and cooperation with the state agencies, performed a magnificent job, indeed.

Of course, in Alaska we have a defense command, a unified defense command, that was very, very helpful to the state in the first trying days, particularly following the earthquake and the seismic sea waves of the evening of March 27th. But the major work of getting the show on the road and instilling confidence and determination in the people of Alaska that Alaska would rebuild and that we would come out of it was in the hands of the state and local units of civil defense. They worked together in such a manner that they commanded the respect of all Alaskans, who I am certain will always hold a fond regard for the good work that was accomplished by the civil defense units in Alaska.

Each year that I have been Governor, the civil defense organization has accomplished great work in natural disasters, particularly each spring when we have huge floods in the breakup period on our major rivers. But these efforts were not dramatic enough and the destruction was not dramatic enough to bring home to all of the people in Alaska the vital necessity for strong civil defense organization, nor of the necessity that scores and even hundreds of people throughout the state should become active workers in civil defense. That is not the case today. In Alaska, all over our great state, there is full realization that we must have an ever-increasing effort by our citizens to participate individually in the civil defense effort. I can only hope that, because of the magnitude of the disaster in Alaska, people all over these United States now recognize the need for a strong civil defense organization that, God forbid, may some day be called upon to face the results of natural disaster.

I am firmly convinced, and I know there are several other Governors who sensed this prior to the time of the Alaskan disaster, that there has been a great psychological mistake in the name of the organization—the federal organization and the organizations in the many states of the Union. I feel that if the name of the organization were titled "State Civil Disaster Agency" or some such title, rather than "State Civil Defense Agency" or "National Civil Defense Agency," the apathy of the American public, as has been so evident down through these years, would not have been so prevalent. In Alaska we are going to change the name of our agency so that it will reflect the need for this kind of a functioning organization.

All of the United States is earthquake country. Certain fault

areas, of course, are more likely to have earthquakes of great violence. But I think that the disaster in Alaska points out the need more than ever before for a strong civil defense organization all over these great United States of ours to meet natural disasters. Then if a holocaust ever comes where nuclear weapons are involved, we will be much, much better able to cope with the results of such a disaster, which we all hope will never be, through the kind of civil defense organization that is vitally necessary. I think it behooves all citizens of the United States to take a few days and become active in their local civil defense organizations where they reside so that they will have some working understanding of what their duties might be if a natural disaster or other disaster ever befalls them.

In Alaska, though our organization functioned very well, we noticed many things that can and will be improved. The ham operators did a tremendous job as did other persons who took over security details when the National Guard went back to inactive status; and in many other ways people were helpful in their working relationship with civil defense. But there were hundreds of people who came in to offer their services, who had never attended a civil defense meeting in their local community, and who had no idea whatsoever as to how they could be helpful. Consequently, many of the offers by sincere people had to be turned down. These people had to be turned away because of the fact that they had never participated in activities of this nature. We in the state government, in all the state agencies, had many meetings over the past two years preparing for some great eventuality that might occur. And these people did a very fine job. But we never did get the support in the civilian community that was necessary and will be necessary if a future disaster strikes. I agree fully with the report of the Committee on Civil Defense and Post-Attack Recovery and I hope that the Congress of the United States has become much more aware of the needs for an all-out civil defense organizational drive all over the United States of America.

In closing, I want to say that the Office of Emergency Planning, Mr. Edward McDermott, the Director of that office, and all of his staff, the regional directors from many of the regions of the United States, and many of the people of your own state civil defense organizations came to Alaska to be of help, and did a magnificent job for us. Alaskans are grateful, indeed, for the strong support, both moral and material, that came to us in these past two months from all of the citizens of the several states. It gave me a heartwarming feeling, and it gave the people of Alaska a stronger determination and spirit to rebuild and make a better Alaska than existed prior to the earthquake and tidal waves of March 27, 1964. Finally, it made me more proud than ever to be a Governor of one of the great states of the American Union and to be an American.

Governor Brown: I would like to ask Governor Egan a question. Have you given any thought—I know you have because I spoke with you about it—about some form of disaster insurance that we might write on a national basis to take care of a situation like that? There is no insurance, no private insurance, that could be written on a disaster such as you experienced in Alaska. I know the Governors would be interested in your comments on that.

Governor Egan: I am firmly convinced that the intensity and the magnitude of the Alaskan earthquake has proven beyond any question that the time has arrived when the government of the United States must seriously consider setting up some kind of a natural disaster funding program. Now, it is not as likely that you would have a violent earthquake in the centrally located part of the United States, a highly industrialized area. But it is possible, and history shows very clearly that there have been earthquakes of tremendous violence, one in particular in the 1800's where the center was in South Carolina and it extended up into New York State. If the industrial centers and the population that now exist in those areas had been there then, you would probably have had many thousands of fatalities. And it could be, if an earthquake of that intensity should strike such an area, you would run into a situation of a \$100 to \$200 billion economic loss in the destruction of industries and businesses. So I think that now is the time to work on planning and recommendations to the Congress for some sort of long-range funding for natural disasters. Otherwise, we could find ourselves one of these days in a situation where the industrial areas would be damaged to a degree beyond repair.

Governor Anderson: Thank you, Governor Egan. I am sure that you, more than any member of this Conference, by your experience in being close to the facts and circumstances, know the real need for civil defense.

The next order of business is the report of the Committee on Public Health and Welfare. I have the pleasure of presenting Governor Richard Hughes of New Jersey who will give that report.

Governor Hughes (New Jersey): Mr. Chairman and Governors: This report has been distributed to the desk of every Governor. My reference to it will be very brief for two reasons. One, I know that you have quite a volume of business. Second, the report by contrast with the situation last year has the unanimous support of all members of the Committee who were present at this Conference. Governor Clement, as you know, one of our members, has not been present.

The report of the committee deals with four principal topics: health insurance for the aged, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, certain proposed legislation pending in Congress now with reference to the support of dependents, and resettlement of Cuban refugees. These subjects came to the attention of the committee

in various ways and possibly some of them will need further treatment. With respect to health insurance for the aged, this committee heard testimony in early 1963 regarding this problem. We have considered the report of the study group headed by Arthur S. Flemming, who was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under President Eisenhower and who is now the distinguished President of the University of Oregon. And the committee considered many other materials. The section in the report dealing with this subject recounts the problem in detail, and I shall not burden you by reading it. You all know the medical problems of the aged, be they ill or injured. The gist of the Committee's recommendations in this area may be summarized as follows:

- a. The Kerr-Mills system of medical assistance should be adopted as soon as possible by those states which do not now have it.

- b. Those states which do have Kerr-Mills should act to work toward uniformity of the benefits being paid in order to insure the equality of treatment for the aging under this program.

- c. The adequacy of the Kerr-Mills is under continuing scrutiny and criticism. The scope and urgency of the medical needs of the aging require government action at all levels so that an adequate program of health protection can be provided the aging of America.

We think these recommendations are supported, certainly, by the conclusions expressed in Secretary Flemming's National Committee on Health Care for the Aged Report, from which I quote: "The nation is confronted with a continuing problem, calling for long-term provision—a solution that will meet the needs of this generation and will keep the next generation from being faced with the problem that now confronts us."

With respect to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Conference should know that I was requested by our Chairman, Governor Anderson, to poll informally the members of the Committee on Public Health and Welfare. I did that by telephone. By talking to most of the members, I obtained a consensus. On the basis of that, I appeared before a Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor and testified for the general concept of this bill, making sure to say, however, that I had no authorization, formally or informally, from the Governors' Conference itself but was testifying as an individual Governor. The report is before you concerning the bill and the problem. Again, these things are so familiar to all of you that I think we would waste time by going into the details. The final paragraph shows the Committee's unanimous recommendation on this subject as follows: "While many methods exist for meeting this problem, including that of school dropouts, at the state and local level, the Committee is in agreement with

the principal objectives of the proposed programs in the pending legislation in that they implement a nationwide attack on the causes of poverty. However, the Committee recognizes the necessity of insuring a measure of control by the states over the programs. The Committee concurs, therefore, in the resolution on this bill adopted by the Western Governors' Conference on May 6, 1964, which endorsed 'the broad objectives of the program, subject, however, to maximum use of appropriate existing agencies and to proper checks and balances at all levels of government.'

The next subject has to do with proposed federal legislation on support of dependents. This involves two bills pending in Congress: one which makes it a federal offense to travel in interstate commerce for the purpose of avoiding a family support order; and another bill which includes the same provision, but which would also provide that federal courts would have concurrent authority with state courts to hear support actions brought by citizens of other states and to register and enforce existing support orders. The committee felt that this legislation should not have its approval. All of the states and territories have now enacted Reciprocal Support Laws. The states, in short, can do this job themselves, and statistical references here indicate that the states are doing a good job on this subject. We could do better. You know the procedure of the Reciprocal Support Act. We have some statistics here showing the rather large sums of money collected in various states and areas, with which I shall not burden you.

We do feel that there can be some federal assistance which might not require legislation. There ought to be a uniform policy of access to records for the purpose of locating persons—deserting fathers, for instance, who leave a state, leaving a family behind. We ought to be able to get some access to the records of the Veterans Administration, the Social Security Administration and the Internal Revenue Service. All of these organizations furnish some officially requested information, but each has a different policy. We think there should be uniformity. And if it is your judgment to accept this report, I take it that this committee should continue to make some arrangements to bring that about.

The states can intensify their efforts in this area. Those which have designated information agencies under the Reciprocal Support Law ought to give these agencies real authority. We ought to make sure that a suffering family in one state is not made to continue to suffer because of any slipshod administration of the laws. Regulations with regard to aid to dependent children of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare require states to set up location services in cases involving persons receiving ADC funds. We think that this regulation might be expanded for us in all aspects of family support. In New Jersey we have established a staff position to concentrate on this activity and it will make avail-

able our Motor Vehicle Division records, our Employment Security records, and records from our tax bureaus and correction agencies. With implementation on the state level, we think in this case we do not need federal legislation. The states could and should do this important job themselves.

Finally, the report deals with the Cuban refugees problem. You will remember, realizing the enormous number of these people who were concentrated in the Miami, Florida, area and which caused concern to the distinguished Governor of Florida, Farris Bryant, that each state was asked to take steps to assist in the relocation and resettlement of these refugees. The report contains, Mr. Chairman, some statistics with regard to what has been done and what has occurred. The committee requests the states to continue to assist in this effort within their states.

The report was reviewed and approved by all members of the committee except Governor Clement, who was absent. He, I know, is generally in favor of the general concepts of the report. I respectfully, Mr. Chairman, move for approval of this report under Rule II.

Governor Anderson: Thank you, Governor Hughes. There is a motion for approval.

Governor Hatfield: I second the motion.

Governor Anderson: And it has been seconded.

All in favor of the approval of the report signify by saying "Aye." Opposed? The report is approved.* On behalf of the Conference, I express the appreciation of all the members for the work of Governor Hughes and his committee on this report. I know this is one of the important committees and the work of the committee touches the interests, really, of all the people of the United States.

The next report will be delivered by Governor Paul Fannin of Arizona, who is Chairman of the Committee on Roads and Highway Safety.

Governor Fannin: Mr. Chairman and Governors: Since the report is rather lengthy, I would just touch on the highlights. I appreciate very much this opportunity to make this report and to express my thanks to the members of the Committee and to Charlie Schwan, Director of the Washington office of the Council of State Governments, for his excellent work throughout the year. Also at this meeting we have had Mr. Russell Brown, President of the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, and James K. Williams, Director of Highway Safety of the Bureau of Public Roads. They have helped considerably in the formulation of this report.

The report has been devoted largely to the posing of questions. It has sought to cover all phases of highway transportation and has

* Text of the report as adopted will be found in Appendix XII.

alluded at least to other forms of transportation. This has been deliberate. A highway engineered, marked and policed to effectuate the rapid movement of goods is a safe highway for the movement of people. Similarly one method of transportation must complement another if the highest ends of society are to be served. The individual Governors and the Governors' Conference have long been concerned with safe, efficient and economical highway transportation. I might illustrate by referring to a few examples of the last decade in which the Governors' Conference has acted in the spirit of that concern.

In 1954, the Conference made a report to the President urging a "cooperative program for highway construction." This report was helpful in pointing out the need for a greatly expanded highway construction program and in leading the way toward enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956.

Turning to traffic accident prevention, the Governors' Conference Committee on Highway Safety in 1956 developed a comprehensive report based on recognized standards. Widely distributed, it served as a useful guide.

In 1959 the Conference authorized the establishment of a Standing Committee on Roads and Highway Safety "to concern itself with keeping under continuous scrutiny the various problems relating to highways and highway safety." Beginning in 1961 the Conference has taken a sympathetic interest in and helped to develop the Driver License Compact and the Vehicle Equipment Safety Compact. Thirteen states are now party to the former: thirty to the latter. Last year the Committee developed "A Guide for Highway Safety," many thousand copies of which have been distributed. In the briefest possible compass, the "Guide" seeks to come to grips with the many-faceted problem of traffic safety.

The full report submitted to you aims to build on what has been done by the Governors' Conference and others to make tomorrow's system of highway transportation capable of moving more persons and goods more safely, more rapidly and more economically than today's. The continuation of programs previously adopted are covered in the report with an explanation of others now in progress.

By whatever measure one cares to employ, it is clear that the problem of providing safe, dependable and rapid highway transportation is growing in size and complexity. At the same time, the capabilities of government to manage the highway transportation system seem not to be keeping pace. To cite the most critical measure of all, despite what may have seemed to be heroic efforts, last year the number of persons killed on our roads and streets reached a new high. Nor is this a time to despair. Some of the answers to our problem are apparent. These we must apply. Others are not so evident. These we must search for. And it will be nec-

essary both in the application of and the search for answers that we have the cooperation of all levels of government as well as those interested groups outside government.

One of the most significant matters discussed and considered by the committee is related to highway financing. Under the current federal-state program, we can expect the Interstate System to be completed by the target year of 1972. As you know, this is largely financed through the federal highway trust fund, which is also scheduled to expire in 1972. When this tremendous undertaking is finished, safe, fast, comfortable motor vehicle travel between major metropolitan centers will be a reality.

What we must begin to look ahead to now—and it is not a day too soon—is a realistic evaluation of what kind of balanced, well-integrated, total system of roads and streets will be required to serve the traffic needs twenty years hence. It is generally conceded that the Interstate System will satisfy the demands for which it was originally intended. Attention should now be directed toward other levels of transportation requirements, both urban and non-urban, including federal, state, city and county, and the financing which will be needed after 1972.

It is particularly vital to states which are fortunate enough to be enjoying a dynamic growth pattern, that they integrate their long-range transportation planning with their community and economic planning. This will allow them to avoid mistakes which have occurred in states and areas where growth has reached a mature stage, or has leveled off to a steady but unspectacular rate. Several states have already shown the foresight to undertake such planning through the medium of what are generically called state-wide highway needs studies. These projects are usually accomplished through the combined efforts of the State Highway Department, through its planning and research program, working in conjunction with the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads and, when possible, with sponsorship of the state legislature.

As you are all aware, the functioning of continuing, comprehensive, coordinated transportation planning in all urban areas of 50,000 population or more by July 1, 1965, is a matter of federal law. A strong incentive to comply with this law is stated in an edict specifying that failure to do so will result in the withholding of approval of federal highway projects within the urbanized area.

The need for planning the balanced highway transportation system cannot, in all good reason, be ignored. To proceed on a piecemeal program, improvising from year to year, would be a tragic and costly misapplication of public funds. This would hold true not only in its effect on the motor user, but on the entire economic and social structure of any state or region. An old axiom of a pioneer in highway planning noted that "We are paying for good highways whether we are getting them or not." Good highways save

lives. Rex M. Whitton, Federal Highway Administrator, says that a recently completed study of the safety record of the nearly 17,000 miles of Interstate Highway system now open shows a death rate of 2.8 fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles, compared with 9.75 on the older highways. The national average for all streets and highways in the nation is 5.4.

Another very cogent reason for applying the benefits to be evolved from advance planning emanates from the federal policy-making level. (I refer to my earlier remark concerning the 1972 forecast completion date for the Interstate System.) It is most important to be aware that as a corollary factor, the Federal Highway Trust Fund is scheduled to go out of business at the same time. By then, again according to Federal Highway Administrator Rex M. Whitton, "There will have been a steady flow of federal-aid interstate money for fifteen years, averaging \$2.5 billion a year, available to the states at a highly favorable matching ratio."

After 1972 that tremendous flow of money, under the current laws, will cease. Highway user taxes now earmarked for the fund would revert to their former rates and the income from them would again become a part of the general funds of the Treasury. It is realized by the Administrator that the ending of the Interstate Program could cause some drastic dislocations in the economy. For that reason alone, some will call for a continuation of the program. However, this has been described as a negative form of reasoning. The positive requirement is to understand and plan for highway needs of the future. To be more specific in the point of the Federal Gasoline Tax, a brief review of its more recent history seems in order. Prior to the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, the federal tax stood at 2 cents per gallon. The 1956 act increased it to 3 cents, to be reduced to 1-1/2 cents in 1972. However, in 1959 the tax was increased to 4 cents, with a stipulation that it would revert back to 3 cents in July, 1961. When this time came Congress extended the 4-cent rate to 1972, at the expiration of the trust fund.

If, then, the tax goes back to the original 2-cent rate, to be placed in the general Treasury Fund, it will constitute loss of an extremely important source of income currently available to the states. The loss of the extra 2 cents would be severe in itself, and even more so if the remaining 2 cents reverts to the general fund, and the congressional highway apportionments are taken from there. The gas tax money in the General Fund rather than in a specifically allocated highway fund would be particularly vulnerable to diversion for purposes other than highways. We should therefore strongly recommend that the 4-cent tax and the trust fund continue as a specific source of revenue, available to the states for some recommended highway purpose. This could be in the form of another type of highway program, possibly some toward maintenance costs on the Interstate System, which will be an extremely high-

priced operation. This could be accomplished on a reverting of collected funds on a road-mileage formula.

Studies made in Arizona indicate that by 1972, maintenance costs will have nearly doubled. Where we are currently expending \$6 to \$7 million per year on maintenance, the rate of an additional \$600,000 per year projects to \$6 million extra in ten years. I am sure you have a similar experience in your states. These increased costs are due to the addition of mileage to the system, the extra mileage resulting from dual-roadway interstate facilities and frontage roads and the influence of signs, markings, landscaping and general maintenance.

The federal funds are collected from motor vehicle users and consequently should be utilized on our highway system. Another possible use for some federal financing could accrue to the states for administration and policing of the Interstate System by the Highway Patrol organizations. If Arizona is any example, patrol costs could double soon. Estimates of our patrol program for the next ten years go from the current \$3 to \$4 million up to \$8 million in 1972. Although the needs study might not necessarily include the patrol costs, it could be a proper point to remember. We have hopes of obtaining legislative sponsorship of a needs study during the 1965 Session.

Your various State Highway Departments are very much aware of what needs to be done and undoubtedly have the capability to face this challenge. Your U.S. Bureau of Public Roads and its regional and division offices are equipped to cooperate from both the financial and technical advisory levels. We would therefore strongly urge that this most important type of planning be initiated for the general good of the transportation effort, and on the strong probability that after 1972 we will see some kind of a change in the federal road program that will have an effect on all of us.

Your committee, aware of the magnitude of the jurisdiction you have given it, is reconstituting its advisory committee. Every facet—engineering, administration, policing, courts, education, laws—will be represented. Each level of government will be represented. Members will be named who can relate highways to other forms of transportation and to the economy in general. In short, it is our aim to be able to assist in finding the answers we need and to give this Conference and the states the most thoughtful advice possible.

In closing I wish to remind all Governors that the proposed list of state actions is still our goal. A reminder copy of this list will be mailed to your offices next week. Mr. Chairman, I now move for adoption of the report.

Governor Dempsey: I second it.

Governor Anderson: Motion has been made for adoption of the report and it has been seconded. Are you ready for the ques-

tion? All in favor signify by saying "Aye." Opposed? The report is adopted and we thank you.* The last report of our standing committees will be the report of the Committee on State Planning. It is my pleasure to introduce Governor Grant Sawyer to present this report.

Governor Sawyer: Mr. Chairman and fellow Governors: I would like to thank the members of the Committee on State Planning, who are Governor Scranton, Governor Babcock, Governor Carvel, Governor Dalton, Governor Guy, Governor Hatfield, Governor Kerner, Governor Reynolds and Governor Rockefeller. You have before you the report of this committee. I am not going to read it because it is self-explanatory. I might, however, tell you briefly what the committee is and what we have done, and then advise you as to our recommendations. We have been working since 1961 principally with the White House, members of the Cabinet and members of the Budget Bureau relative to matters concerning state planning but more particularly on communication with the White House and with members of the Cabinet. We have had negotiations with respect to the problem of communication between the White House, the Cabinet, the executive branch generally, and the Governors. Most Governors, I am sure, feel that there is a good deal to be done relative to our relationship with the federal government in this field. In 1961, President Kennedy issued a memorandum to all members of his Cabinet and the principal executive agencies of the federal government, requesting that they make every effort to keep the Governors advised.

We have been working in the meantime on a joint staff paper with the White House. This staff paper, as has been developed, is included in the report. I will just mention a couple of things about it that I think might be of interest to you. The executive office of the White House and your committee suggest, among other things, that the federal agencies notify the Governor when any public announcement has been made concerning action taken on any federal or federally assisted physical development project in his state; that the Governors' Conference Committee on State Planning, the White House staff and the Bureau of the Budget cooperate with the federal agencies in perfecting arrangements for transmitting the types of information referred to in this recommendation. The joint staff paper goes on to recommend that we continue to discuss with them the possibility, among other things, of including arrangements for establishing in the executive branch a contact point for Governors.

The state planning function of this Committee has been reported upon to you three times previously. We gradually have phased out that particular function and have concentrated more specifically

* Text of the report as adopted will be found in Appendix XIII.

in the last year on the question of communication. We feel that in the area of state planning the committee has done about all that it can do. But a good deal is left to be done in the area of communication with the executive branch of the federal government. The executive branch feels the same way, as is indicated in the joint staff paper, and recommends that this Conference continue to work with it in establishing a better relationship. Therefore, your Committee would recommend to this Conference that the Committee on State Planning, as it is now constituted, be dissolved. Further, that a committee, advisory to the Executive Committee, be established, and that it be entitled the Advisory Committee on Executive Communication and Coordination.

It is further recommended that, in order to minimize conflict, duplication or overlapping of activities, the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee on Federal-State Relations be ex-officio members of the proposed advisory committee. This committee would concern itself exclusively with the matters described in its title. It would be anticipated that such a committee would actively work with the President of the United States, his Cabinet officers and executive agencies toward the end that more effective communication could be established with the Governors of the respective states.

Mr. Chairman, I would move approval and adoption of the report of the Committee on State Planning.

Governor Elbert N. Carvel: I second the motion.

Governor Anderson: You have heard the motion for approval and adoption of the report of the Committee on State Planning, and Governor Carvel has seconded the motion. Is there any further discussion of this report? All in favor signify by saying "Aye." Are there any opposed? The report is adopted.*

I want to thank you, Governor Sawyer and members of your Committee.

Gentlemen, that completes the reports of the standing committees.

The next order of business, I think, will be to take up any motions for suspension of the Articles of Organization in order that we may then consider resolutions, if any are to be considered. I will at this time ask if any member of the Conference wishes to offer a motion to suspend the Articles of Organization in order to consider resolutions which have been distributed during the sessions prior to this business session?

Governor Sawyer: This is not a motion to suspend for the purpose of a resolution. I do, however, make a motion to suspend the Articles for another purpose, which is self-explanatory.

Recent years have witnessed dramatic breakthroughs by the

*Text of the report as adopted will be found in Appendix XIV.

communications media in fast and comprehensive reporting of the news, notably in election returns. The use of electronic computers, coupled with man's ingenuity, now make it possible to predict the winner of an election even before some of the polls have closed.

These developments have given the American public nearly instantaneous information on public affairs and a clearer understanding of the events which are shaping the world around them. Never in our history has the communications industry of the United States done such a thorough and rapid job of reporting as it is doing today, for which the public should be thankful.

However, the marriage of the technological revolution to the business of reporting the news, which in the case of elections coverage allows amazingly accurate predictions, can dangerously influence the course of voting in the United States.

Victory statements based on early and fragmentary returns before all polls have closed, although based on tried and proven formulas, can, through their effect on the electorate, who have not voted, actually influence the results of an election.

This is especially true in a presidential election. Because of the time differential between East and West, the verdict of an electronic computer—hours before millions of Americans have expressed their choice—can have an undue effect on the course of the nation. The danger would be especially acute in close elections such as that of 1960, when results in the West differed sharply from those in the East.

In pursuing a possible solution to this problem, I have learned that many Governors and newsmen alike share concern for this and many other aspects of coverage of election news. The problems of mutual interest, I have found, go far beyond the question of election predictions—though I feel this to be one of the most vital. They concern also the handicaps imposed upon newsmen in the fast and accurate gathering of returns and, in some cases, antiquated election laws which interfere with the public's right to know.

The press shares with the Governors and all other public officials a historic responsibility to the public interest.

From discussions with newsmen and fellow Governors has come the suggestion for creation of a committee of the Governors' Conference to work toward solution of these problems. Representatives of the communications industry with whom I have talked have indicated a desire to meet with such a group.

Therefore, at this time, Mr. Chairman, I move for suspension of the Articles of Organization to permit the Conference to consider a motion for creation of a Committee on Election Laws and Communications, to be appointed by the Chairman for a period of one year.

Governor Archie Gubbrud: I second the motion.

Governor Brown: I would like to second the motion, and I

would like to address myself to it for just a minute. During the recent election in California, where we had the Republican contest for the presidential delegates, within thirty minutes the news media announced the results of the election, and declared that Goldwater had carried the State of California. They made that announcement shortly after seven in the evening, when the polls in Los Angeles closed. In San Francisco and in one or two other places, they do not close until 8:00 o'clock. And the effect, of course, is something that I am not able to measure. People might have been listening to it in their automobiles going home from work or watching it on television at home, preparing to vote after dinner; and a great many of them might not go out to vote after hearing the news. The same thing, of course, is true to a lesser extent in every national election by reason of the three-hour difference in time between the eastern states and California. I do not have any answer to this. I do not even know whether it poses a real problem or whether we can do anything about it. But I do think that Governor Sawyer's suggestion that a committee be appointed to sit down and discuss it is a good one. Because anything that would influence free elections in our country is something that we should at least look into. So I would like to second the motion of Governor Grant Sawyer and ask that a special committee be appointed to discuss this subject.

Governor Anderson: All right. There has been a motion to suspend and it has been seconded. You have heard the explanation. In substance, as the Chair understands it, it is a motion to suspend the Articles for the purpose of establishing a committee of this Conference. It will be treated for consideration by the Conference as though it were a policy matter similar to a resolution. So with that motion and second, with the explanation, I will now put the question. All in favor of the motion signify by saying "Aye." Are there any opposed? The Articles are suspended. You may now, Governor Sawyer, present your motion.

Governor Sawyer: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I hereby move that the Chairman of the National Governors' Conference appoint a Committee on Election Laws and Communications for the purpose of meeting forthwith and thereafter as may be proper with representatives of the national news media to explore ways and means of furthering the public interest in the handling and reporting of election results. Such committee should explore the responsibilities of the respective states with regard to election laws and procedures as well as the over-all responsibility of the news media in the handling of returns in such a manner that the public interest will best be served. Such committee to be appointed for a period of one year.

Governor Burns: I second the motion.

Governor Anderson: Are you ready for the question? Do you

want any discussion? All in favor signify by saying "Aye." Opposed? The motion is carried.

Governor Hatfield: Mr. Chairman, now that we have opened the subject of the standing committee system, and this new committee that we have thus created, I would like to offer at this time two amendments to our Articles of Organization. These amendments are presented for the purpose of perhaps reorganizing and redesigning our present standing committees' topics and present standing committees' assignments. I shall read the amendments to the two different articles. I would like to explain them very briefly. I would propose that we amend Article IV so as to authorize and empower the Executive Committee to create standing, special project, or study committees of the Governors' Conference and to assign and reassign to such committees the studies authorized by the Conference. Then Article V, under the appointment power of the Chairman of the Conference, would be amended to give him the power to appoint the members of standing, special project, or study committees created by the Conference or by the Executive Committee.

Now, Mr. Chairman and my fellow Governors, some of us who have been attending many Conferences realize that we have done little to change the structure of our standing committees. We have had a committee on the National Guard year after year. We have had a standing committee on fallout and civil defense. And yet, on the other hand, we have probably not been able to undertake some studies of important issues because our standing committee system has been rather haphazard. I would suggest that possibly the Executive Committee would want to undertake a study such as we did in the Western Governors' Conference. In the Western Governors' Conference we created four basic committees—committees on human resources, economic resources, natural resources, and transportation and public safety. So that any subject that would come up would be placed under one of the existing standing committees. I am not proposing here that these be the standing committees for our National Conference. But I think the Executive Committee ought to be empowered to look over our present standing committees' assignments and topics and reorganize and redesign the structure. That is what these two proposed amendments would do. Since we must have a three-fourths vote in order to amend our Articles, I so move at this time, Mr. Chairman, that Article IV and Article V of our Articles of Organization be amended according to the language that I have read and presented to you.

Governor Brown: I second the motion.

Governor Anderson: Let me ask you, Governor Hatfield, have you furnished a copy of this in writing to the members of the Conference?

Governor Hatfield: No, Mr. Chairman. That is not required

to amend the Articles of Organization.

Governor Anderson: I understand that. The notice of amendment to the Articles is not required to be given. However, it will require a three-fourths vote of the Conference to amend the Articles. I think it might be well, so that all will be informed, to have the Secretary read the Articles as they are now constituted and then the amendments to the Articles. If that is all right with Governor Hatfield, we will proceed in that manner.

Secretary Criehtfield: The first amendment is an amendment to Article IV of the Articles of Organization, which covers operations of the Executive Committee. This would be an additional paragraph at the end of Article IV, reading as follows: "The Executive Committee is empowered to authorize the creation of standing, special project or study committees of the Governors' Conference, and to assign and reassign to such committees the studies authorized by the Conference." That is all new language, no deletions.

Then in Article V, the fifth paragraph, which now covers the authority of the Chairman to name committees, this amendment would strike the last three lines of that paragraph and insert new language so that the paragraph will read: "He shall appoint a Nominating Committee to serve at the Annual Meeting, and he shall appoint the members of standing, special project or study committees created by the Conference or by the Executive Committee."

Governor Anderson: Is there any discussion on this motion?

Governor Sawyer: I would like to speak in favor of the motion. We discussed this at great length at the Western Governors' Conference, and our procedure there was quite similar to the procedure that we are following here. We found that we get into a rut sometimes and the Executive Committee has no discretion. This morning I recommended to the Conference that the committee I am a member of be abolished. Actually, this committee has been working under a misnomer for two or three years. I had not been fulfilling a function that was originally prescribed for us. We elect an Executive Committee here, and I think that its members should have enough flexibility to conform to the activities of our Conference and to the changing needs and times. I would be very much in favor of Governor Hatfield's motion.

Governor Anderson: Are you ready for the question? All in favor of the motion submitted by Governor Hatfield for amending the Articles of Organization of the Conference signify by saying "Aye." Are there any opposed? The motion is carried and the Articles are amended.

At this time is there any member of the Conference that wishes to offer a motion for suspension of the Articles in order to present any of the resolutions that have been distributed?

Governor Bellmon: Mr. Chairman, yesterday I passed out

copies of a motion for consideration of a proposal for standardization of reporting procedures.

As services offered by state governments grow steadily more comprehensive and more complex, it becomes increasingly important for states to be able to record, define and evaluate the various types of governmental functions. The availability of information is valuable not only for current operations of these programs, but is of even greater significance in future planning to meet the needs of our citizens.

The accumulation of certain statistical data and other basic information is essential to the development of long-range programs. It is vital, moreover, in better equipping the states to fulfill their primary obligation to provide these services without complete dependence on assistance from the federal government.

Generally speaking, each of our individual states acquires such information as may be necessary for the determination of expenditures of public funds for these services and for the drafting of related legislation.

However, there is frequently a need for an individual state to apply a yardstick to its programs to see if they measure up to programs being offered to citizens as a whole, to ascertain how a state compares to other states and to national norms.

It is difficult, and virtually impossible in some instances, to obtain comparative data with any degree of accuracy for the reason that states follow widely varying procedures in recording and publishing such data. Many studies which are conducted on a state level are seriously limited in perspective because of the inability of researchers to obtain comparable information about conditions in other states.

There are many examples of these variations. For instance, in Oklahoma at the present time we have under way a comprehensive study of higher education. This study is yielding valuable information that is proving to be helpful in appraising problems of our colleges and universities and in planning future courses of action. This study, however, is seriously limited because at the present time there simply is no way to make meaningful comparisons.

A good example can be found in the annual state legislative appropriations for higher education. In Oklahoma we consider only moneys appropriated from the state general fund to be state funds. Income from student fees or tuition is allocated by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, rather than the legislature, and these funds are not considered as state appropriations. In other states, such as our neighboring state of Colorado, income from student fees is appropriated annually by the state legislature in the same manner as state tax-fund moneys. A comparison of costs of higher education between these two states thus may be quite misleading unless these variations are taken into consideration.

Another example is per-student costs of higher education. In 1961-62 we calculated the per-student expenditure at the two universities in Oklahoma at \$861. Figures reported by the University of Arizona for the same year were \$1,164 and for the University of Nebraska \$2,763. Our study has disclosed that, in Arizona, funds spent for agricultural extension and agricultural experimental programs were considered to be higher education costs. In Nebraska, not only the experimental and extension programs were included, but also the costs of Nebraska's medical school and hospitals, dental school and conservation program. In Oklahoma these activities are all separate budget agencies and expenditures are not considered to be a part of the per-student costs of higher education.

There are at least four different terms being used in regard to the number of college students enrolled. These include head count, full-time, part-time, and full-time-equivalent enrollments. Among the states using the full-time-equivalent method, there are many variations. In Oklahoma, enrollment is calculated by dividing the total student credit hours produced in a semester by 15, which is presumed to be a full student load. In Arizona, the undergraduate student credit hours are divided by 15, but graduate student credit hours by 10. New Mexico uses 16. States such as Colorado, Kansas and Iowa use 15, but with a different figure for graduate student credit hours. Arkansas uses a head-count enrollment.

To cite another situation, an economics professor at Oklahoma State University is engaged in a study for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. He has encountered some of the same types of problems in preparing an analysis of economic conditions in Oklahoma as compared with other states.

Increasing use of data processing equipment emphasizes the need for standardizing reporting methods. Also, much valuable information is now being handled and lost which could be stored for future use if standard procedures were adopted in all states and territories.

An extensive research program, supported principally by a grant from the U.S. Office of Education, is currently under way at the University of Michigan. This study has as its principal objective the development of national standards for analysis of financial and other data reflecting the operations of colleges and universities.

Each of our states should give active support and cooperation to this study, both in its preparation and in implementing its results, because it will provide a better method of relating each state's efforts in this important field to the achievements of other states.

But we should not overlook other fields in which our statistical standards vary widely. Uniform standards and definitions in such programs as welfare, mental health, highway construction,

state personnel and other areas of service generally would be equally as important and valuable, and we should make every effort to establish them.

These areas are the logical concern of the budget officers or their counterparts in the various states. The National Association of State Budget Officers has a research arm which might very well be utilized to consider and investigate the standardization of statistical data.

For these reasons, I hereby move for a suspension of the Articles of Organization to permit the Conference to consider the following proposal:

That the Governor's Conference, through its Executive Committee, make appropriate investigation and recommendations to the states for the standardization of statistical data in reporting, analyzing and evaluating governmental services.

Governor Burns: I second the motion.

Governor Anderson: All in favor signify by saying "Aye." Are there any opposed? The Articles have been suspended. You may now make your motion, Governor Bellmon.

Governor Bellmon: I would move that the Governors' Conference, through its Executive Committee, make appropriate investigation and recommendations to the states for the standardization of statistical data in reporting, analyzing and evaluating governmental services, and that the results of this investigation and recommendation be made at the next Annual Governors' Conference.

Governor Carvel: I second the motion.

Governor Anderson: Is there any discussion on the motion? All in favor signify by saying "Aye." Are there any opposed? The motion is carried.

Perhaps many of you already know it, but I just received word that the Senate voted cloture a few minutes ago.

Governor Welsh: Mr. Chairman and fellow Governors: I would like to move for suspension of the Articles for the purpose of passing two resolutions. The first is a resolution of appreciation to our hosts. Mr. Chairman, I move for suspension in order that this resolution of appreciation might be acted upon by this body.

Governor Hughes (New Jersey): I second the motion.

Governor Anderson: All in favor signify by saying "Aye." The Articles are suspended.

Governor Welsh: Mr. Chairman, I now move the adoption of this resolution—appreciation of the Governors' Conference to our host state and our host city and those others participating in making this a most successful convention.

Governor Dempsey: I second the motion.

Governor Anderson: This motion has been made and seconded. I know it expresses the sentiments of every member here. All

in favor signify by saying "Aye." The resolution is adopted.*

Governor Welsh: I think it is time for an acknowledgment, Jim.

Governor Rhodes: Matt and my colleagues: Mayor Locher is here. Curt Smith is here. And I have been here some ten days. I want to assure you that this is the longest time I have spent in one city in the past two years. I want to express my appreciation and gratitude to each and every one of you, and again, as I said last night, this was made possible by the attitude of the people here in this great city and the participating industrial leaders and the other civic and community leaders of Cleveland. This was a great Conference and we look forward to having you back one of these days. I do not want the Mayor and Mr. Smith to fall off their chairs! You have been great guests and we look forward to the 1965 Conference. Anything that we can do to help the Conference in 1965, anything that we have accomplished here, we will be glad to turn everything over to you and help you to have a greater Conference in 1965.

Governor Welsh: Mr. Chairman, I now move for suspension of the Articles in order that a resolution on guest speakers might be acted upon.

Governor Hughes (New Jersey): I second it.

Governor Anderson: All in favor signify by saying "Aye." The Articles have been suspended, and you may present the motion for adoption of the proposed resolution.

Governor Welsh: Mr. Chairman, I now move for passage of this resolution, expressing the appreciation of this Conference to the guest speakers.

Governor Dempsey: Mr. Chairman, I would like to propose an amendment to the resolution on guest speakers, which would conclude by saying, "We wish to extend special thanks to our retiring Chairman, and to the other members of the Executive Committee for their untiring efforts to make this the successful meeting that it has been, and for their energetic leadership throughout the year." Mr. Chairman, I move for the amendment to the resolution.

Governor Anderson: You embarrass me by the motion, Governor Dempsey. But is there a second to that motion?

Governor Carvel: I second the motion.

Governor Anderson: The motion to amend has been seconded. All in favor signify by saying "Aye." The amendment is adopted. On the motion for the adoption of the resolution as amended, all in favor signify by saying "Aye." The motion is carried.†

*For the text of resolution, see Appendix XV.

†For the text of resolution, see Appendix XV.

I know that all of the wives and the assistants and everyone else in attendance at this Conference feel just as we do and more, too, about the fine work of Governor Rhodes and all of the people of Cleveland and Ohio.

Governor Romney: Would it be out of order to make a comment?

Governor Anderson: No; Governor Romney of Michigan.

Governor Romney: I would like to make this brief comment. I hope at this Conference we have reached a turning point. It seems to me this year, as a result of focusing more on matters of common concern to all of us and less on controversial national issues, and finding a bipartisan approach to the issue that has plagued this Conference for several years, that we may well now be in a position to devote ourselves to that concert of action among the states that really is so badly needed in this country. I do hope that this is an indication of what we can do in the years ahead.

Governor Anderson: Thank you, Governor Romney. My personal viewpoint is that the work of the members of the Conference during the last three days would indicate that your belief may be in the process of being carried out.

We are still under the same order of business. There were a number of motions and resolutions submitted. I do not want to preclude anyone here. Do we have another motion to suspend the Articles?

Governor Dempsey: Mr. Chairman, I gave notice on the first day that I would ask you to approve today a resolution on aging. A copy of this resolution has been distributed to each Governor's desk. All this does is to permit our elderly to live in decency and in dignity. Mr. Chairman, I would move for the suspension of the Articles.

Governor Anderson: Governor Dempsey has moved for suspension of the Articles in connection with the notice and the resolution which were distributed at an earlier session.

Governor Reed: I second the motion.

Governor Anderson: All in favor signify by saying "Aye." Is there any vote opposed to this motion? The Articles are suspended.

Governor Dempsey: I would move for the adoption of the resolution.

Governor Bellmon: Could we have the resolution read?

Governor Anderson: The Secretary will read the resolution.

Secretary Carihfield: This is the resolution:

Whereas the 18 million Americans over age 65 comprise approximately 10 per cent of the total population and continue to increase by 1,000 every day;

Whereas the increase in life expectancy results in such special problems as generally low incomes, unsuitable housing, un-

employment, ill health, widowhood and loneliness, which require special attention;

Whereas the states and the nation could benefit greatly from better utilization of the skills and experience of America's senior citizens;

Whereas the Governors' Conference has devoted extensive discussion to the problems and opportunities of the aged, including a special report prepared by the Council of State Governments in 1955;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Governors' Conference meeting in Cleveland, Ohio, June 6-10, 1964, recommend that each state undertake an assessment of the problems of its older citizens, the accomplishments of the past decade and make recommendations for effective state organization and action in this field.

Be it further resolved that the Governors' Conference recommend enactment of pending federal legislation for community programs of research, planning, training and demonstrations in utilizing the abilities of older persons and for the construction of senior activity centers and suitable housing for the elderly at rentals which they can afford.

Be it further resolved that the Council of State Governments be requested to coordinate the studies and regional conferences undertaken as a result of this resolution.

Governor Anderson: The resolution has been read.

Is there any discussion?

Governor Hansen: I object to the next to the last paragraph of this resolution. I think here is an area where the states have assumed leadership. This is true in my State of Wyoming. I think that we are all too prone to turn in every instance to the federal government for help and support for programs that ought to be resolved at the state level. I think, as well, that it becomes the part of individuals to assume responsibility for the care and for the activities of older people. I do not think we should turn to the federal government for everything. I object to the next to the last paragraph. I think the one just above it is fine. It is being implemented in the West. I think that is the way in which it should be implemented.

Governor Romney: I would like to offer an amendment to the motion. The amendment which I would offer is that the resolution be referred to the Public Health and Welfare Committee. I agree and subscribe to what the Governor of Wyoming said. In Michigan we have undertaken to implement action in the aging field in a very extensive manner. But it does seem to me that a resolution of this breadth, covering an area that one of our regular Conference committees is responsible for, should be referred to that committee for consideration and not be brought up here for action at this time. I, therefore, move that it be referred to that commit-

tee for consideration and for the purpose of a report.

Governor Hansen: I second the motion of the Governor of Michigan.

Governor Anderson: Governor Dempsey presented the motion and submitted this resolution. He has indicated to the Chair that there is no objection to the reference of this resolution to the Welfare Committee of this Conference for the interim period until the next annual meeting. I think though, for the record, that the motion to refer should be submitted, and I will ask whether there is any objection on the part of the members of the Conference for referral of this to the Welfare Committee? It will be so referred.

Are there any other resolutions?

Governor Brown: I gave notice of intention to move for suspension of the Articles with respect to my proposal for a Governors' Advisory Council. I am now advised by the Secretary that the Executive Committee has plenary authority to establish study committees under our amendment to the Articles. So it will be unnecessary for this resolution to come before the Conference. I do hope that this suggestion of a bipartisan Governors' Advisory Council to the President of the United States will be seriously undertaken by the Executive Committee. I will address a letter to them to that effect and they will make their own judgment on it.

Governor Anderson: Thank you, Governor Brown.

I have two other notices that were given and Governor Hansen has indicated to me that he would like to speak to one of them.

Governor Hansen: As many of you know, there have been circulated here in the last two days two statements of position to be directed to the proper officials of this country. Calling attention, first, to the very serious situation confronting the livestock industry, I would like to report to the Governors here this morning that some thirty-seven Governors have signed a statement calling attention to the disastrous effects that imports are having upon the livestock economy, and asking that such steps be taken as may be needed to bring about a more healthy economic picture in the livestock community.

The second statement of position has to do with public lands. As a great many of you Governors know, we have some very antiquated public-land laws on our books. And, as a consequence, it seems now is the time to bring about a revision and an updating which will make these public-land laws more responsive to present day needs. Some forty-one Governors signed that statement of position.

These statements will be referred to the proper officials. They are not submitted to the Conference for consideration and plenary action. I make these observations only as a point of information.

Governor Anderson: Thank you, Governor Hansen. We are moving along.

Is that the last or are there any other motions to suspend the Articles?

Secretary Carihfield: That covers all the notices submitted to us.

Governor Anderson: If there are no more motions to suspend the Articles in connection with the notices that were given, then we have reached the place on the program where I would like to ask if there is anyone that wishes to submit an invitation to host the 1965 Annual Meeting?

Governor Rolvaag: All of you have received letters of invitation to hold the next National Governors' Conference in Minnesota. You have received invitations from the Mayor of Minneapolis, the Governor of the state and the Governor's wife. I can assure you that if you decide to come to Minnesota, you will be royally treated. You will be entertained well. We have many facilities, including the new Tyrone Guthrie Theater, the great complex around our University of Minnesota and a host of recreational facilities. I would seriously invite you all to come to Minnesota for the next Conference.

Governor Anderson: Thank you, Governor Rolvaag.

Governor Romney: Mr. Chairman, I would like to extend to the Governors' Conference an invitation to hold the 1965 Annual Meeting at the famed Mackinac Island in Michigan, situated at the junction point of three of the Great Lakes and one of the most beautiful areas in the country. It has been preserved essentially as it was many years ago. They have facilities which lend themselves to a very pleasant and productive Conference.

Governor Anderson: Thank you, Governor.

Governor Hughes (New Jersey): In deference to my two colleagues, I point out by way of an invitation, not formalized, indeed, but sincerely intended, to a great convention city—Atlantic City in New Jersey for the 1965 Conference.

Governor Anderson: Thank you, Governor Hughes.

I know the members of the Conference appreciate the invitations by Governor Rolvaag, Governor Romney and Governor Hughes of New Jersey. This matter will be submitted to the Executive Committee, as I understand the procedure, Mr. Carihfield.

Is there any other business to come before the Conference before we ask for the report of the Nominating Committee?

Governor Carvel: Mr. Chairman and members of the Conference: This is my final meeting with the Governors' Conference. Probably some of you do not realize that I am the elder statesman here from the standpoint of original election. I was elected in 1948. I served with such giants in the Governors' Conference as James Byrnes, Frank Carlson, Tom Dewey, Frank Lausche, Adlai Stevenson, Herman Talmadge, Bill Tuck, Earl Warren, Mennen Williams and I worked very closely with Frank Bane during those

many years. It is a great pleasure and privilege to be a member of this distinguished group. Because Delaware has a law very much like the United States which says that no Governor may serve for a third term, I am, therefore, precluded from continuing. But I want to express my warm thanks and appreciation to all of you, my colleagues, during these past four years. I take note of what President Eisenhower said the other night, that the Senate should provide the field for the Governors, not vice versa. However, I am afraid I must disagree with the illustrious President on this occasion because in my little state I am looking in the other direction. This is not a campaign announcement, believe me!

However, I do wish to leave one thought, one very important thought, with this Governors' Conference. If the United States does not educate future generations efficiently and effectively, then in another generation we could become a second-rate nation. We have available to us a great tool of communication. I hope that this Governors' Conference will move ahead fast in recommending to their states and considering at the Conference the opportunity for the utilization of educational television as a tool for communicating in the field of education. When we were in Japan, I observed that 75 per cent of the students in Japan were receiving educational television; and that Japan was making greater nationwide utilization of this important medium than we are here in America. We are doing it on a state basis in many areas, but not enough. We have an opportunity to step up to a program of excellence by utilizing leaders in the field of television to communicate a program which can be unmatched throughout the world today. I hope that you will give attention to this in the future—and I am talking to you as your senior Governor. There is no Governor sitting here today who sat in the Conference when I became Governor in 1948. I am passing along to you this challenge and hope that you will carry on for the future of America and assure that we continue to move ahead as a strong and great nation.

May I thank all of you for your kind cooperation and support. May I say that this Conference in Cleveland has been one of the finest I have ever attended. I have never seen people more enthusiastic, more hospitable than the people of Ohio. And I shall long remember this wonderful occasion.

Governor Anderson: Thank you, Governor Carvel.

Is there any other business before we have the report of the Nominating Committee? If not, I would like to call upon Governor John Dalton, who is Chairman of that committee, at this time.

Governor Dalton: Governor Anderson and colleagues: The Nominating Committee offers as its nominee for the office of Secretary-Treasurer the name of Brevard Carihfield. The Nominating Committee offers as its nominees for the eight members on the Executive Committee the names of: Governor John Anderson, Jr.,

of Kansas, Governor Tim Babcock of Montana, Governor Henry Bellmon of Oklahoma, Governor Edward T. Breathitt of Kentucky, Governor John H. Chafee of Rhode Island, Governor Richard J. Hughes of New Jersey, Governor George Romney of Michigan and Governor Carl E. Sanders of Georgia. The Nominating Committee offers as its nominee for the Chairmanship of the Governors' Conference the name of Governor Grant Sawyer of Nevada.

Gentlemen, I would like to move the adoption of this report which has been submitted by your Nominating Committee: John M. Dalton, John H. Reed, Farris Bryant, Robert E. Smylie and Paul Fannin.

Governor Dempsey: I second the motion.

Governor Anderson: The motion has been made and seconded. Are there any other nominations? If not, the motion to adopt the report of the Nominating Committee will be put to the Conference. All in favor signify by saying "Aye." Are there any opposed? The report is adopted and the officers are elected.

I will take but a moment more of your time, as I do want to say a word or two. During the last year and particularly during the few days before coming here to Cleveland and for a little while after arriving, I had some apprehensions about the work of the Conference this year. But things worked out very well. During the past four years, I have enjoyed very much attending each of the Annual Meetings, and I knew of the work and the problems with which the Conference concerned itself. I have enjoyed immensely serving as Governor and as a member of this Conference for four years and I have enjoyed even more so serving as Chairman. It is you, the members of the Conference, that I thank so very, very much.

I know there are other members of this Conference, like Governor Carvel, that are serving their last term. He expressed, and I, humbly and inadequately, do so, the sentiments of those who will not be at the next annual meeting.

I would now like to call upon the new Chairman of this Conference, Governor Grant Sawyer, to come forward, please.

Governor Sawyer: Mr. Chairman and fellow Governors: After watching John and a number of other Governors sweat through this position in the last six years, I just hope that I will be able to do a competent job. I had no thought or idea of this. But it is a great honor. I am very appreciative. Thank you very much.

Governor Anderson: I would like to call upon our Secretary, Brevard Carihfield, for a few announcements.

(Secretary Carihfield made several announcements.)

Governor Anderson: Will the men in charge now come forward and retire the Colors, please?

Governor Chafee: Before we do that, I would like to say that we have elections coming up this year and some of us may not be

back. I wonder if those Governors who are retiring because of their constitutions and so forth, such as Governor Carvel and yourself, would stand so that we could possibly bid them farewell. (Several Governors arose and were applauded.)

Governor Anderson: Thank you, Governor Chafee.

We will now have the Colors retired.

(Whereupon the Colors were retired.)

Governor Anderson: Please be seated.

I want to ask if there is any other business to be brought before the Conference?

If not, we will hear a motion to adjourn.

Governor Carvel: I so move.

Governor Welsh: I second it.

Governor Anderson: All in favor signify by saying "Aye."
The Fifty-sixth Annual Meeting of the Governors' Conference is adjourned.

(The Conference adjourned at 12:20 p.m., sine die.)

Appendices

Appendix I

GOVERNORS, JUNE, 1964

State or Other Jurisdiction	Governor and Political Party	Length of Regular Term in Years	Present Term Began January	Number of Previous Terms	Max. Consecu- tive Terms Allowed by Constitution
Alabama	George C. Wallace (D)	4	1963	-	(a)
Alaska	William A. Egan (D)	4	1962(b)	1	2(c)
Arizona	Paul Fannin (R)	2	1963	2	-
Arkansas	Orval E. Faubus (D)	2	1963	4	-
California	Edmund G. Brown (D)	4	1963	1	-
Colorado	John A. Love (R)	4	1963	-	-
Connecticut	John Dempsey (D)	4	1963	(d)	-
Delaware	Elbert N. Carvel (D)	4	1961	1(e)	2
Florida	Farris Bryant (D)	4	1961	-	(a)
Georgia	Carl E. Sanders (D)	4	1963	-	(a)
Hawaii	John A. Burns (D)	4	1962(f)	-	-
Idaho	Robert E. Smylie (R)	4	1963	2	-
Illinois	Otto Kerner (D)	4	1961	-	-
Indiana	Matthew E. Welsh (D)	4	1961	-	(a)
Iowa	Harold E. Hughes (D)	2	1963	-	-
Kansas	John Anderson, Jr. (R)	2	1963	1	-
Kentucky	Edward T. Breathitt (D)	4	1963(g)	-	(a)
Louisiana	John J. McKeithen (D)	4	1964(h)	-	(a)
Maine	John H. Reed (R)	4	1963	(i)	-
Maryland	J. Millard Tawes (D)	4	1963	1	2
Massachusetts	Endicott Peabody (D)	2	1963	-	-
Michigan	George Romney (R)	2(j)	1963	-	-
Minnesota	Karl F. Rolvaag (D)	4	1963	-	-
Mississippi	Paul B. Johnson (D)	4	1964	-	(a)
Missouri	John M. Dalton (D)	4	1961	-	(a)
Montana	Tim Babcock (R)	4	1961(k)	-	-
Nebraska	Frank B. Morrison (D)	2	1963	1	-
Nevada	Grant Sawyer (D)	4	1963	1	-
New Hampshire	John W. King (D)	2	1963	-	-
New Jersey	Richard J. Hughes (D)	4	1962	-	2
New Mexico	Jack M. Campbell (D)	2	1963	-	2
New York	Nelson A. Rockefeller (R)	4	1963	1	-
North Carolina	Terry Sanford (D)	4	1961	-	(a)
North Dakota	William L. Guy (D)	2	1963	1	-
Ohio	James A. Rhodes (R)	4	1963	-	-
Oklahoma	Henry Bellmon (R)	4	1963	-	(a)
Oregon	Mark O. Hatfield (R)	4	1963	1	2
Pennsylvania	William W. Scranton (R)	4	1963	-	(a)
Rhode Island	John H. Chafee (R)	2	1963	-	-
South Carolina	Donald S. Russell (D)	4	1963	-	(a)
South Dakota	Archie Gubbrud (R)	2	1963	1	2(l)
Tennessee	Frank G. Clement (D)	4	1963	2(m)	(a)
Texas	John B. Connally (D)	2	1963	-	-
Utah	George D. Clyde (R)	4	1961	1	-
Vermont	Philip H. Hoff (D)	2	1963	-	-
Virginia	Albertis S. Harrison, Jr. (D)	4	1962	-	(a)
Washington	Albert D. Rosellini (D)	4	1961	1	-
West Virginia	William Wallace Barron (D)	4	1961	-	(a)
Wisconsin	John W. Reynolds (D)	2	1963	-	-
Wyoming	Clifford P. Hansen (R)	4	1963	-	-
American Samoa	H. Rex Lee (D)	(n)	1961(o)	-	-
Guam	Manuel Flores Leon Guerrero(D)	4	1963(p)	-	-
Puerto Rico	Luis Munoz Marin (q)	4	1961	3	-
Virgin Islands	Ralph M. Paiewonsky (D)	(n)	1961(r)	-	-

FOOTNOTES

- (a) Governor cannot succeed himself.
- (b) Alaska Constitution specifies first Monday in December as Inauguration Day.
- (c) Since the first Governor was precluded from serving a full four-year term, the two-term constitutional limitation did not apply to his first term.
- (d) Governor Dempsey, formerly Lieutenant Governor, succeeded to office in January, 1961, to fill unexpired four-year term of former Governor Abraham A. Ribicoff (resigned), which began in January, 1959. Elected to full term, November, 1962.
- (e) Previous term 1949-53.
- (f) Hawaii Constitution specifies first Monday in December as Inauguration Day.
- (g) December 10, 1963.
- (h) May 12, 1964.
- (i) Governor Reed, formerly Senate President, succeeded to office in December, 1959, upon the death of former Governor Clinton A. Clauson and was elected in November, 1960, to fill unexpired four-year term which began January, 1959.
- (j) New Michigan Constitution provides that term of office for Governor will be four years beginning with January, 1967, term.
- (k) Governor Babcock, formerly Lieutenant Governor, succeeded to office in January, 1962, upon the death of former Governor Donald G. Nutter, and will fill unexpired four-year term which began January, 1961.
- (l) Nomination for third successive term prohibited by state law.
- (m) Two previous terms, 1953-55, four-year term 1955-59.
- (n) Indefinite term.
- (o) May, 1961.
- (p) Became Acting Governor on January 20, 1963, upon resignation of Governor Bill Daniel. Inaugurated on March 9, 1963.
- (q) Popular Democratic Party.
- (r) April, 1961.

Appendix II

ARTICLES OF ORGANIZATION^{*}

Article I

NAME AND MEMBERSHIP

The name of this organization shall be the "Governors' Conference."

Membership in the Governors' Conference shall be restricted to the Governors of the several states of the United States, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Article II

FUNCTIONS

The functions of the Governors' Conference shall be to provide a medium for the exchange of views and experiences on subjects of general importance to the people of the several states; to foster interstate cooperation; to promote greater uniformity of state laws; to attain greater efficiency in state administration; and to facilitate and improve state-local and state-federal relationships.

Article III

MEETINGS

The Governors' Conference shall meet annually at a time and place selected by the Executive Committee. The agenda as announced and printed in the official program for the Annual Meeting shall be the official agenda. The Proceedings of the Annual Meetings shall be fully reported and published.

Special meetings of the Governors' Conference may be held at the call of the executive Committee.

Twenty-five members present at the Annual Meeting or a special meeting shall constitute a quorum.

^{*} General revision adopted at Fifty-first Annual Meeting, San Juan, Puerto Rico, August 3, 1959; as further amended at Fifty-third Annual Meeting, Honolulu, Hawaii, June 28, 1961; at Fifty-fourth Annual Meeting, Hershey, Pennsylvania, July 3, 1962; at Fifty-fifth Annual Meeting, Miami Beach, Florida, July 22, 1963; and at Fifty-sixth Annual Meeting, Cleveland, Ohio, June 10, 1964.

Article IV

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Executive Committee of the Governors' Conference shall consist of the Chairman of the Conference and eight other members elected at the final business session of the Annual Meeting.

Not more than five members of the Executive Committee shall be representative of a single political party. To the extent practicable, the members of the Executive Committee shall be widely representative of the various areas and regions of the United States.

Members of the Executive Committee shall hold office until the adjournment of the succeeding Annual Meeting and until their successors are chosen. Vacancies in the Executive Committee may be filled by the Chairman subject to ratification by the remaining members of the Committee by mail ballot or by vote at the next subsequent meeting of the Committee.

The Executive Committee shall meet not less than three times each year. It shall have authority to act for the Governors' Conference in the interim between Annual Meetings.

The Executive Committee is empowered to authorize the creation of standing, special project or study committees of the Governors' Conference, and to assign and reassign to such committees the studies authorized by the Conference.

Article V

CHAIRMAN

The Chairman of the Governors' Conference shall be elected by the Conference at the final business session of the Annual Meeting.

The chairmanship shall alternate annually between the two major political parties, and a majority of the members of the Executive Committee shall always be of a political party other than that of the Chairman.

He shall hold office until the adjournment of the succeeding Annual Meeting and until his successor is chosen. A vacancy in the chairmanship shall be filled by vote of the remaining members of the Executive Committee at the next subsequent meeting of the Committee.

The Chairman shall preside and vote at meetings of the Executive Committee and of the Governors' Conference.

He shall appoint a Nominating Committee to serve at the Annual Meeting, and he shall appoint the members of standing, special project or study committees created by the Conference or by the Executive Committee.

The Chairman shall arrange the program of the Annual Meeting with the advice and counsel of the Executive Committee.

Article VI

SECRETARY-TREASURER

A Secretary-treasurer shall be elected by the Conference at the final business session of the Annual Meeting. He shall attend and keep a correct record of all meetings of the Conference; safely keep all documents and other property of the Conference which shall come into his hands; and he shall perform all other duties usually appertaining to his office or which may be required by the Executive Committee.

He shall make all necessary arrangements for the Annual Meeting and special meetings with the advice and counsel of the Executive Committee and shall edit the stenographic record of the proceedings of all meetings.

Subject to the authority of the Executive Committee, he shall have custody of the funds of the Conference. He shall deposit funds of the Conference in its name; shall annually report all receipts, disbursements, and balances on hand; and shall furnish a bond with sufficient sureties conditioned for the faithful performance of his duties.

Article VII

DUES

Each member shall contribute the sum of \$100 per year to defray necessary expenses of the Conference.

Article VIII

AMENDMENTS

The Governors' Conference at any meeting may amend these Articles of Organization by a majority vote of all Governors present and voting. Notice of specific amendments together with an explanatory statement shall be mailed to all members of the Conference at least thirty days prior to submitting an amendment to vote at a meeting. In the absence of such notice, a three-fourths majority vote shall be required for the adoption of any proposed amendment.

Article IX

SUSPENSION

Any Article of procedure for conducting the business of the Conference may be suspended by a three-fourths vote.

Appendix III

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE*

Preamble

1. These rules of procedure shall be in specific conformity with the articles of Organization of the Governors' Conference and, to the extent practicable, shall be consonant with precedents and traditions of the Governors' Conference.

2. On any issue not covered by these rules of procedure or by the Articles of Organization, Mason's Manual of Legislative Procedure shall be the standard authority, when applicable.

Rule I — Resolutions

1. By action of the Governors' Conference at its 1963 Annual Meeting, the Articles of Organization were amended to abolish resolutions and the Resolutions Committee. Hence, the Articles of Organization must be suspended by a three-fourths vote in order to consider a resolution. Under such suspension, the resolution itself may be adopted by a simple majority vote.

2. Any member intending to offer a motion for suspension of the Articles of Organization in order to consider a resolution shall give notice of such intention and shall distribute to all other members present a copy of such proposed resolution, at least one session before such motion is put to a vote.

3. Any proposition of a policy nature that purports to express the view of the Governors' Conference shall be considered and voted upon as though it were a resolution, including any proposition for the creation of a standing committee of the Governors' Conference.

Rule II — Committee Reports

1. A committee chairman or other committee member may offer a motion with respect to a committee report in either of the following forms: (a) that the report be approved; (b) that the report be received and filed. A substitute motion may be offered from the floor to refer the report back to committee for further study. A committee report may include minority or dissenting views. A motion to table is not in order.

2. If there be separate majority and minority reports from a committee, the following motions shall be in order: (a) a motion to

* Adopted at Fifty-sixth Annual Meeting, Cleveland, Ohio, June 8, 1964.

approve the majority report (by a majority member of the committee); (c) a motion to receive and file both reports (by any member from the floor); and (d) a motion to refer both reports back to committee for further study (by any member from the floor). Voting on any of these motions shall be in reverse order of the above. A motion to table is not in order.

3. No individual amendments to a committee report, a separate majority report, or a separate minority report may be offered from the floor.

4. Action on the motions described above shall be by a simple majority vote.

5. Any resolution or excerpted policy statement with respect to the substance of a committee report shall be voted upon as though it were a resolution (see Rule I — Resolutions).

Rule III — Ordinary Business

1. Any proposition of a non-policy nature, but necessary to carry on the business of the Governors' Conference, may be approved by a simple majority vote.

Rule IV — Motions to Amend

1. Motions to amend most propositions are in order. An amendment may be amended, but an amendment to an amendment may not be amended because this would lead to undue confusion. Amendments may be adopted by a simple majority vote.

2. Every amendment proposed must be germane to the subject of the proposition to be amended. To be germane, the amendment is required only to relate to the same subject, and it may entirely change the effect of the proposition. An amendment to an amendment must be germane to the subject of the amendment as well as to the main proposition.

3. Any amendment must be in writing if the chairman so requests.

Rule V — Motions to Table

1. The purpose of a motion to table is to eliminate further consideration of any pending matter. Such motion is in order on either the entire question or on a pending amendment, and the member offering the motion should identify the breadth of his motion. A motion to table is not debatable. Adoption requires a simple majority vote. Motion may be renewed after progress in debate.

Rule VI — Previous Question

1. The purpose of a motion for the previous question is to close debate and vote immediately on either the pending amend-

ment alone, or on all amendments and the main question seriatim. Member offering the motion should identify the breadth of his motion. A motion for the previous question is not debatable. Adoption requires a two-thirds vote. Motion may be renewed after progress in debate.

Rule VII — Postpone Indefinitely

1. The purpose of a motion to postpone indefinitely is to reject a main proposition without the risk of a direct vote on final passage. It may not be applied to an amendment and may not be renewed. The motion is debatable. Adoption requires a simple majority vote.

Rule VIII — Roll Call Votes

1. A roll call vote may be requested by any member on any pending question. The roll shall be called upon a show of hands by ten members.

2. Whenever the roll is called, all members present shall be entitled to vote. No proxies shall be permitted.

3. The proportion of votes required for passage of any proposition or motion, as set forth in these rules of procedure, refers to the number of members present and voting.

Rule IX — Adoption, Amendment and Suspension of Rules

1. These rules of procedure may be adopted or amended at the first business session of any annual or special meeting of the Governors' Conference by a simple majority vote. Thereafter, for the duration of any such annual or special meeting, amendment or suspension of the rules shall require a three-fourths vote.

Appendix IV

TREASURER'S REPORT

Summary of Cash Receipts and Disbursements for the Period
July 1, 1963 - May 31, 1964

BALANCE

Balance on hand as of June 30, 1963 \$ 1,449.96

RESERVE

Reserve for 1962 Governors' Conference Proceedings 2,000.00
Reserve for 1963 Booklet, Governors of the American States, Commonwealths and Territories . . 1,500.00

RECEIPTS

Dues received from states 5,500.00
Sale of Proceedings 534.41

TOTAL \$10,984.37

DISBURSEMENTS

Crewdson Printing Company, 1,000 copies of the
1963 Booklet, Governors of the American
States, Commonwealths and Territories \$ 1,290.00
University of Chicago Press, 300 copies, 1962
Governors' Conference Proceedings 1,523.22
Deauville Hotel, Expenses for 1963 Annual Meeting 22.02
Deauville Hotel, Expenses for 1963 Annual Meeting 143.62
Marshall Field & Company, Gifts for Conference
Host and Chairman 132.40
Arthur Young and Company, 1963 Annual Audit . . 130.00
Burrows Reporting Service, Transcript of Proceedings, 1963 Annual Meeting 407.11
University of Chicago Press, 300 copies 1963
Governors' Conference Proceedings 2,164.56
Reserve for 1964 Booklet, Governors of the American States, Commonwealths and Territories . . 1,500.00

TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS \$ 7,312.93

Net Balance, May 31, 1964 \$ 3,671.44

Appendix V

GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE ANNUAL MEETINGS

1st	Washington, D. C.	May 13-15	1908
2nd	Washington, D. C.	January 18-20	1910
3rd	Frankfort and Louisville, Kentucky	Nov. 29-Dec. 1	1910
4th	Spring Lake, New Jersey	September 12-16	1911
5th	Richmond, Virginia	December 3-7	1912
6th	Colorado Springs, Colorado	August 26-29	1913
7th	Madison, Wisconsin	November 10-13	1914
8th	Boston, Massachusetts	August 24-27	1915
9th	Washington, D. C.	December 14-16	1916
		No Meeting	1917
10th	Annapolis, Maryland	December 16-18	1918
11th	Salt Lake City, Utah	August 18-21	1919
12th	Harrisburg, Pennsylvania	December 1-3	1920
13th	Charleston, South Carolina	December 5-7	1921
14th	White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia	December 14-16	1922
15th	West Baden, Indiana	October 17-19	1923
16th	Jacksonville, Florida	November 17-18	1924
17th	Poland Springs, Maine	June 29-July 1	1925
18th	Cheyenne, Wyoming	July 26-29	1926
19th	Mackinac Island, Michigan	July 25-27	1927
20th	New Orleans, Louisiana	November 20-22	1928
21st	New London, Connecticut	July 16-18	1929
22nd	Salt Lake City, Utah	June 30-July 2	1930
23rd	French Lick, Indiana	June 1-2	1931
24th	Richmond, Virginia	April 25-27	1932
25th	Sacramento and San Francisco, Calif.	July 24-26	1933
26th	Mackinac Island, Michigan	July 26-27	1934
27th	Biloxi, Mississippi	June 13-15	1935
28th	St. Louis, Missouri	November 16-18	1936
29th	Atlantic City, New Jersey	September 14-16	1937
30th	Oklahoma City, Oklahoma	September 26-28	1938
31st	Albany and New York, New York	June 26-29	1939
32nd	Duluth, Minnesota	June 2-5	1940
33rd	Boston and Cambridge, Massachusetts	June 29-July 2	1941
34th	Asheville, North Carolina	June 21-24	1942
35th	Columbus, Ohio	June 20-23	1943
36th	Hershey, Pennsylvania	May 28-31	1944
37th	Mackinac Island, Michigan	July 1-4	1945
38th	Oklahoma City, Oklahoma	May 26-29	1946
39th	Salt Lake City, Utah	July 13-16	1947
40th	Portsmouth, New Hampshire	June 13-16	1948
41st	Colorado Springs, Colorado	June 19-22	1949
42nd	White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia	June 18-21	1950
43rd	Gatlinburg, Tennessee	Sept. 30-Oct. 3	1951
44th	Houston, Texas	June 29-July 2	1952
45th	Seattle, Washington	August 2-6	1953
46th	Lake George, New York	July 11-14	1954
47th	Chicago, Illinois	August 9-12	1955
48th	Atlantic City, New Jersey	June 24-27	1956
49th	Williamsburg, Virginia	June 23-26	1957
50th	Bal Harbour, Florida	May 18-21	1958
51st	San Juan, Puerto Rico	August 2-5	1959
52nd	Glacier National Park, Montana	June 26-29	1960
53rd	Honolulu, Hawaii	June 25-28	1961
54th	Hershey, Pennsylvania	July 1-4	1962
55th	Miami Beach, Florida	July 21-24	1963
56th	Cleveland, Ohio	June 6-10	1964

Appendix VI

CHAIRMEN OF THE GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE, 1908-1965*

Governor Augustus E. Willson, Kentucky	1910
Governor Francis E. McGovern, Wisconsin	1911-14
Governor David I. Walsh, Massachusetts	1914-15
Governor William Spry, Utah	1915-16
Governor Arthur Capper, Kansas	1916-17
Governor Emerson C. Harrington, Maryland	1918
Governor Henry J. Allen, Kansas	1919
Governor William C. Sproul, Pennsylvania	1919-22
Governor Channing H. Cox, Massachusetts	1922-24
Governor E. Lee Trinkle, Virginia	1924-25
Governor Ralph O. Brewster, Maine	1925-27
Governor Adam McMullen, Nebraska	1927-28
Governor George H. Dern, Utah	1928-30
Governor Norman S. Case, Rhode Island	1930-32
Governor John G. Pollard, Virginia	1932-33
Governor James Rolph, Jr., California	1933-34
Governor Paul V. McNutt, Indiana	1934-36
Governor George C. Peery, Virginia	1936-37
Governor Robert L. Cochran, Nebraska	1937-39
Governor Lloyd C. Stark, Missouri	1939-40
Governor William H. Vanderbilt, Rhode Island	1940-41
Governor Harold E. Stassen, Minnesota	1941-42
Governor Herbert R. O'Connor, Maryland	1942-43
Governor Leverett Saltonstall, Massachusetts	1943-44
Governor Herbert B. Maw, Utah	1944-45
Governor Edward Martin, Pennsylvania	1945-46
Governor Millard F. Caldwell, Florida	1946-47
Governor Horace A. Hildreth, Maine	1947-48
Governor Lester C. Hunt, Wyoming	1948
Governor William P. Lane, Jr., Maryland	1949
Governor Frank Carlson, Kansas	1949-50
Governor Frank J. Lausche, Ohio	1950-51
Governor Val Peterson, Nebraska	1951-52
Governor Allan Shivers, Texas	1952-53
Governor Dan Thornton, Colorado	1953-54
Governor Robert F. Kennon, Louisiana	1954-55
Governor Arthur B. Langlie, Washington	1955-56
Governor Thomas B. Stanley, Virginia	1956-57
Governor William G. Stratton, Illinois	1957-58
Governor LeRoy Collins, Florida	1958-59
Governor J. Caleb Boggs, Delaware	1959-60
Governor Stephen L. R. McNichols, Colorado	1960-61
Governor Wesley Powell, New Hampshire	1961-62
Governor Albert D. Rosellini, Washington	1962-63
Governor John Anderson, Jr., Kansas	1963-64
Governor Grant Sawyer, Nevada	1964-65

* At the initial meeting in 1908, President Theodore Roosevelt presided.

Appendix VII

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS

No one at all acquainted with government in the United States would question the great and increasing significance of intergovernmental relations. Be it education, highways, welfare, health, taxes or any one of a score or more of other functions, there are activities on the part of two or more levels of government—federal, state, county and municipal—and, in some instances, entities such as authorities, corporations, special districts and regional organizations. Given this degree of complexity of governmental structure, perhaps the wonder of it is not that our federal system does not work better than it does, but that it works at all.

In recent years, increasing attention has been given to studying and to suggesting means of improving relations among governments. A landmark study was published in 1955 by the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (Kestnbaum Commission). This was followed by studies done by the Federal-State Joint Action Committee. Currently the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations publishes studies of and reports on significant aspects of intergovernmental relations. Congressional inquiries are undertaken by the two Subcommittees on Intergovernmental Relations of the Senate and House Committees on Government Operations.

In terms of devices and mechanisms, increasing use is being made of interstate compacts. Various arrangements—as formal as contracts and as informal as conferences among representatives of the same level or several levels of government—are being employed more frequently. These may relate to a specific function or may cover a multitude of functions.

In the area of intergovernmental relations, Governors have played a leading role. Governors were members of the Kestnbaum Commission and the Joint Action Committee. Four Governors now serve on the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. For years, the Committee on Federal-State Relations of the Governors' Conference has concerned itself with major problems falling within its jurisdiction.

Yet, despite the increased attention and despite the ingenuity shown in devising means to achieve ends, less than enough is being done in the area of intergovernmental relations. As will be seen, this report recites instances of success and of failure as well as those in which the issue is still in doubt. "What is everybody's business is nobody's business" cannot be true here. Too much is at stake. The degree of success achieved in cooperation

and coordination of programs among the several levels of government, if not precisely correlative to the successful operation of our federal system, is certainly as accurate a measure as any.

No suggestion is made here that another organization or a different device is needed or will provide the answer sought. What does seem to be required is increased attention on the part of state officials generally, and Governors particularly, to problems having federal-state, interstate or state-local implications.

Water Resources Planning

It is hoped that S. 1111 will come to fruition before the 88th Congress adjourns. The bill was passed by the Senate in December, 1963, and hearings before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs were completed April 20, 1964.

Enactment of the legislation would cap a three-year cooperative effort of federal and state officials and the Congress to map the route toward widespread, comprehensive multi-purpose planning of water and related land resources. It is fair to say that S. 1111 may be the key to a situation brought to light as a problem in federal-state relations by President Theodore Roosevelt at the first national Governors' Conference in 1908.

The proposal began life as S. 2246 in the 87th Congress. It was transmitted to Congress on July 13, 1961 to implement several recommendations of the report of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources. S. 1111 of the 88th Congress, the measure that evolved from numerous conferences among federal and state officials and congressional committee staff personnel, would overcome objections expressed by the Governors and by the Interstate Conference on Water Problems in resolutions and in testimony at several stages in the development of the proposal.

S. 1111 recognizes the primary interest of the states in water resources and provides for state-appointed and state-compensated representation on Commissions established under the bill. It is not to be construed as expanding or diminishing either federal or state jurisdiction or rights in the field of water resources planning, development or control, nor to displace established planning bodies such as exist in the Tennessee Valley and the Delaware and Columbia River Basins.

Water Pollution Control

A bill that would go a very long way toward supplanting state with federal activity in the determination of water quality standards and the control of pollution, S. 649, was adopted by the Senate in October, 1963. Although the Senate passed a much-amended version of the bill, it still retained provision for the Secretary of

Health, Education, and Welfare to fix effluent standards for virtually all the waters in the nation. Such power would involve the determination of allowable water uses in any given area of the country, presenting state and local authorities with a fait accompli as to the value and uses of their waters. Hearings have been completed by the House Public Works Committee. No executive committee sessions have been scheduled.

Taxation of Multi-state Businesses

Of the greatest interest to the states is the development of a workable plan whereby all segments of the business community, including those engaged in interstate commerce, are required to pay a fair and equitable proportion of state and local taxes. This will be done by the states working together—or it will be done by Congress.

What appeared to be signal victories in the continuing battle over the extent of the state taxing power with respect to multi-state businesses were won in Northwestern States Portland Cement Co. v. Minnesota, 358 U.S. 450 (1959) and Scripto, Inc. v. Carson, 362 U.S. 207 (1960). The decision in the former case held in effect that a fairly apportioned net income tax could be levied on an out-of-state corporation engaged in business in the taxing state even though the business activities were exclusively in furtherance of interstate commerce. In the latter case, it was held that a state could require an out-of-state corporation having no office or regular employee or salesman traveling within the taxing state to collect sales taxes on goods sold to customers in the taxing state.

The dust had not settled following the decision in the Northwestern Cement Case before federal legislation was sought and, what is more, enacted. Moving with astonishing swiftness, Congress passed Public Law 86-272 in less than seven months from the time the case was decided. Intensive pressure from the major business associations coupled with an inability of state officials to offer an organized resistance brought about this result.

Title I of Public Law 86-272 sets forth the type of activities a multi-state business corporation must conduct within a state before that state may impose a net income tax on the income of such corporation within the state. Many observers feel that the language of the Act merely codifies existing U.S. Supreme Court decisions. Its impact on the states, if any, will have to be measured over time.

Title II directs the House Judiciary Committee and the Senate Finance Committee to "make full and complete studies of all matters pertaining to the taxation by the States of income derived within the States from the conduct of business activities which are exclusively in furtherance of interstate commerce or which are a

part of interstate commerce, for the purpose of recommending to the Congress proposed legislation providing uniform standards to be observed by the States in imposing income taxes on income so derived." In 1961, Public Law 87-17 broadened the mandate to "full and complete studies of all matters pertaining to the taxation of interstate commerce by the States" The decision in the Scripto Case furnished the momentum necessary to bring about the enactment of Public Law 87-17. By agreement between the two Committees, the House Judiciary Committee assumed responsibility for making the studies and, for the purpose, set up the Special Subcommittee on State Taxation of Interstate Business Income. After several extensions, the Subcommittee now is required to report by June 30, 1965.

Following enactment of Public Law 86-272, state reaction was both swift and predictable. The Board of Managers of the Council of State Governments on December 3, 1959, adopted a motion creating a Committee on State Taxation of Interstate Income. The motion directed the Committee ". . . to study existing patterns of state taxation of interstate business income, particularly the possibility of developing uniform standards between the states to eliminate the danger of taxation of more than 100 per cent of such income and to minimize the cost of compliance with the law to the taxpayer."

Based on extensive correspondence and its own study, the Committee, reporting to the Board of Managers in December 1960, recommended (1) that all states levying a net income tax on businesses engaged in interstate commerce enact the "Uniform Division of Income for Tax Purposes Act" developed by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws; (2) that Congress delay enactment of legislation prescribing apportionment of income standards until the states had an opportunity to take steps toward achieving uniform standards on their own initiative; and (3) that if Congress feels impelled to act it do so only after giving appropriate organizations of state officials an opportunity to be heard. In a further report to the Board in December 1961, the Committee indicated that there had been achieved some progress by the states in the enactment of the uniform law; stated that the matter over which it had been given jurisdiction was now before committees of the Governors' Conference and National Association of Attorneys General; and asked that it be relieved of further responsibility.

With respect to the Governors' Conference, in 1962, by resolution, it declared its opposition to legislation restricting the state taxing power, urged the states to enact the uniform law and authorized its Committee on Federal-State Relations to present its views on appropriate occasions.

The National Association of Attorneys General has maintained a continuing interest in this matter since 1960, when it indicated its opposition to Public Law 86-272 and bills then pending to over-

rule Scripto. In 1961, the Association authorized the appointment of a Committee on Federal-State Tax Problems and directed it to communicate the Association's views to Congress and others. In 1962, it authorized the Committee to represent it in opposing federal legislation restricting the power of the states to tax; in urging states to enact the uniform law; and in seeking repeal of Public Law 86-272.

The "Uniform Division of Income for Tax Purposes Act" was promulgated after four years of study by NCCUSL in 1957, too late for a majority of states to take action with respect to it before 1959. Two states have adopted the act; a third state has taken a major step in that direction; and 17 other states appear to have laws substantially in conformity with the uniform act. To put it another way, of the 36 states having a corporate income tax, including the District of Columbia, 33 states use a property factor, 36 use a receipts or sales factor and 29 use a payroll factor in one form or another—property, sales and payroll being the three factors employed in the uniform act to determine income allocable to business activity within a given state. In addition to the two states where the act already has been enacted, 29 other states could adopt it with only minor adjustments in their tax structure.

From the discussion above it would appear that several conclusions may be justified:

1. Even though there is the first time that Congress has enacted legislation in this area, there is no reason to believe that when the subcommittee reports there will not be strong impetus to enact standards that states must follow in taxing.

2. This impetus will come from the business community led by its two major associations, the combined capacity of which to initiate and sustain impetus is testified to by the great speed with which Congress acted on both Public Laws 86-272 and 87-17.

3. The opposition of the states to these enactments—and their activities since—are examples of "too little and too late." Opposition to all that is represented by these enactments on the part of the Governors' Conference, National Association of Attorneys General and Council of State Governments—to which should be added the National Legislative Conference and National Association of Tax Administrators—has been sporadic and probably ineffectual.

4. The position taken by these organizations has been weakened by the failure of the great majority of states to get their own houses in order through adoption—or adoption in substance—of the uniform act.

5. Even though under ordinary circumstances states might wish to enjoy the luxury—or the right—to adopt or not adopt the uniform act, circumstances are not ordinary. While enjoying this luxury or right, they may find themselves fettered by federally imposed standards.

6. Arguments in favor of federal standards may be demonstrably false, but the states have far too much at stake to rely entirely on winning their argument through logic and persuasion in Congress, given the pressure that those who favor federal standards can employ.

Taxation of State and Local Bonds

Since 1938, the Governors' Conference has participated as a member of the Conference on State Defense in efforts to protect state and local government bonds from federal taxation. Other organizations of state and local government officials affiliated with the Conference on State Defense include the National Association of Attorneys General, the American Municipal Association, the Municipal Finance Officers Association, the National Association of Counties, the National Association of State Auditors, Comptrollers and Treasurers, the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers and the United States Conference of Mayors.

Resolutions of the Governors' Conference reaffirming its position were approved in 1959, 1960 and 1961. Efforts were made, on the basis of these resolutions, to obtain suitable language in the Life Insurance Company Income Tax Act of 1959 (such efforts were thought to have been successful) to obtain regulations to carry out what the Governors' Conference believes was the intent of the Act, and, when these efforts failed, to get amendatory language included in other legislation. On the strength of these resolutions, too, the Governors' Conference joined as a member of the Conference on State Defense in filing a brief amicus curiae in the case of the Atlas Life Insurance Company v. United States in District Court. Subsequently, the case was decided against the insurance company and an appeal was taken to the Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit. Again an amicus brief was filed. On May 25, the Circuit Court reversed unanimously the decision of the District Court. Presumably, the Justice Department will ask for review by the Supreme Court.

Judicial Review of Administrative Decisions under the Public Assistance Titles of the Social Security Act

The Federal-State Relations Committee of the Governors' Conference has become concerned with such recourse as the states might have in instances where a state may feel itself aggrieved by action of the administering federal official relative to a state plan for participation in a grant-in-aid program. In particular, the question is being considered with respect to the Social Security Act. Under present law, an administrative disallowance of a state plan for participation on the ground that such plan is not in conformity with the federal statute; disallowance of an amend-

ment of the state plan; withdrawal of federal assistance by reason of alleged substandard state administration of the program; or disallowance of federal participation through the taking of an audit exception carries no remedy for the state. Of course, request for administrative reconsideration by the federal agency of the action is always possible, but no appeal to the courts can be had.

The Federal Administrative Procedure Act gives "an aggrieved" party a right of appeal to the federal courts for review of administrative action. However, grant-in-aid programs are not generally considered to give states standing to bring a legal proceeding. The theory behind this view is that a state does not have a right in the traditional legal sense to receive grants-in-aid from the federal government and that a withholding of federal funds is not to be construed as a legal injury to the state. On the other hand, it would seem that the terms upon which a state may participate in federally aided programs and its rights with respect to such participation are rights in the practical sense, whether or not they might be held so in the legal sense. Moreover, the conditions of such participation are of crucial importance to millions of actual or prospective beneficiaries of the programs, and to state and local administration and finance. In order to make judicial review available with respect to some federal aid programs, Congress has enacted a number of statutory provisions dealing with particular programs. There is no such judicial review provision in the Social Security Act. This is a matter of special importance, because the Act contains many of the large social welfare programs carried on cooperatively by the states and the federal government.

H.R. 6202 of the 88th Congress would provide judicial review of certain administrative determinations at the instance of dissatisfied states. The bill would apply to the Public Assistance titles of the Social Security Act. In order to make certain procedural and technical revisions in legislation on this subject, and at the direction of the Federal-State Relations Committee, staff work has been in progress to determine whether a suitable judicial review provision to the Social Security Act can be evolved and enacted. Another proposal for judicial review has been made by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. While it does not deal with all aspects of the problem outlined above, it merits careful consideration. What appears to be needed is legislation to authorize judicial review of disputes over changes in state plans initiated by the states and controverted by the administrator, and changes in regulations sought to be instituted by the administrator and resisted by the states. In both instances, it is possible to write statutory language that would assure speedy determination of controversies through use of declaratory judgment proceedings in the federal courts and by requiring preferences for such controversies on the federal court calendars. In many situations it would be

quite appropriate to empower the courts to grant or deny applications for stays of either the project state or HEW action pending the outcome of the litigation. In deciding whether to grant such stays, the courts could be more accurate and intelligent in assessing the advantages and disadvantages of putting the change into effect or freezing the existing situation pending the determination of the suit, because they would be acting on a case by case basis with the specific facts before them.

The time situation in the current Congress is such that, even if it were possible to work out the desired legislation and get it introduced, passage could not be anticipated. Accordingly this subject will have to be pursued in the succeeding Congress.

Walsh-Healey Radiation Protection Regulations

During the past year the U.S. Department of Labor has become active in the radiation protection field. These activities threaten to impinge directly upon Atomic Energy Commission-state agreements covering regulation of by-product, source and special nuclear materials pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act Amendment of 1959 which state officials helped to develop.

The actual sequence of events began in 1960, when the Department of Labor promulgated general health and safety regulations under the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act. That statute, dating from 1936, makes it possible for the Department to enforce certain minimum standards as conditions of contracts for items purchased by the federal government. Under Walsh-Healey, public contractors having contracts of a value of \$10,000 or more are required to pay prevailing wages to workers engaged on the work for such contracts. The Act also has provisions dealing with health and safety. They recite that compliance with health and safety laws of the states in which the work is done shall be prima facie evidence of compliance with federal health and safety standards under the Act. In implementing this part of the statute, the Department of Labor for twenty-five years contented itself with publishing guides to good health and safety practice. It was presumed that the burden would be on the Department to demonstrate on a case by case basis that a contractor who was complying with state laws was still not doing enough to protect the health and safety of his workers. However, late in 1960 the Department changed its policy to contend that the Walsh-Healey Act required the promulgation of a single, uniform set of health and safety regulations.

During the last half of 1963, the Department published a new part of its general health and safety regulations dealing with radiation protection. It went into effect at the end of February, 1964. Following objections by the six states having agreements with the Atomic Energy Commission, the application of the regulations to

state licensees in agreement states was postponed and a hearing held on April 13-15, 1964 to consider whether special regulations should be made for agreement states.

The National Association of Attorneys General appeared in opposition to the Department's putting into effect its radiation protection regulations. Numerous other states and groups of state officials took a similar position. The first ground for this position was that yet another set of regulations would be duplicative at best, and would discourage and impede state regulatory programs undertaken in good faith pursuant to AEC-state agreements. Also, it would make it more difficult for additional states to see why they should enter into agreements with the AEC.

In addition, the Department's regulations cover radiation from sources not contemplated by AEC regulatory authority, notably industrial use of X-ray, radium and other radiation sources.

The effect of this coverage is both disturbing and paradoxical. For the states which have entered into agreements pursuant to the express will of Congress, their entire radiation protection programs (medical radiation only excluded) are in danger of being superseded or confused. States which have not entered into agreements do not have their situations in respect of so-called "agreement materials" altered, because the possession and use of such materials continues to be under license from the AEC. However, in respect of non-agreement materials, both agreement and non-agreement states are in a similar position.

Finally, witnesses noted that the Department of Labor is not equipped to enforce its regulations and contended that Congress has never intended such activity under the Walsh-Healey Act.

While the outcome of this controversy is not known, since the Department has not announced its decision, this would certainly seem to be a subject in which the Governors' Conference must maintain an interest and, depending on developments, be prepared to take appropriate steps. It should also be added that, on May 14, Senator John L. McClellan, Chairman, Committee on Government Operations, announced that he would inform the committee of the facts of the situation with a view to recommending that the committee investigate the matter thoroughly.

Habeas Corpus

For more than ten years, law enforcement and judicial officials of the states have been concerned about the use of writs of habeas corpus in federal courts to review decisions of state courts in criminal cases. Persons who have been convicted in state courts and whose convictions have been reviewed and affirmed by state supreme courts, and whose petitions for certiorari have been denied by the United States Supreme Court can and do seek further

review by filing petitions for habeas corpus in United States District Courts. Such petitions may be filed at any time and may contain all kinds of allegations regarding the trials which led to their conviction. To counter these claims states are put to the trouble of answering the allegations no matter how unfounded. Moreover, if the District Court Judge grants a hearing in the case of a prisoner who was convicted many years previously, it may be difficult or impossible for the state to provide the records necessary to contest the claims. In the event a new trial is ordered, the state may find it impossible to produce the necessary witnesses. In addition, the repeated use of writs of habeas corpus in these cases means, in effect, that there often is no finality to decisions in criminal cases.

For over a decade the Conference of Chief Justices and the National Association of Attorneys General have protested against the use of the writ of habeas corpus in this manner and have sought remedial action in the Congress. They have proposed that decisions of the highest state courts be reviewable only by the Supreme Court of the United States, and that restrictions be placed upon the repeated use of the writ, so that prisoners would be required to raise all issues on one occasion rather than coming back many times.

Efforts to obtain such legislation in the Congress have not succeeded, in part because of the opposition of the Judicial Conference of the United States. That body now has proposed a bill of its own, but at this time it does not appear that this proposal would meet the basic objectives of state officials. If the states are to continue to have responsibility for basic administration of most criminal justice, decisions of state courts properly reviewed by the highest tribunals of the states should not be subject to continued collateral attack in the lower federal courts.

This is a matter of considerable significance, one that merits the attention of the Committee on Federal-State Relations and the Governors' Conference. At such time as the Conference of Chief Justices and the National Association of Attorneys General are satisfied with proposed legislation, the Committee and the Conference should give consideration to lending support in the enactment of such legislation.

Postal Rates

There is before the present Congress a bill which, if expanded, might merit the consideration and support of the Committee on Federal-State Relations and the Governors' Conference. The bill, as it is now written, would amend postal laws to classify as third-class mail certain letters posted by state departments of motor vehicles (or similar authorities). Included would be letters containing drivers' license renewal applications, applications for registration

of motor vehicles, drivers' licenses, and motor vehicle registration cards bearing handwriting in response to questions on such forms as well as signatures.

The American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators adopted resolutions at both its 1962 and 1963 annual conferences seeking to accomplish such a change in United States Post Office Department Policy. It is stated in a memorandum prepared in November, 1963 by the AAMVA that inconsistent rulings account for some exceptions to the rules that require first-class mailing of motor vehicle registration and driver license forms and driver license renewal applications, and that permit third-class mailing of registration forms. While it has sought favorable rulings on behalf of several state motor vehicle agencies from post office officials, the AAMVA has made no approach to Congress to gain legislative relief which would benefit motor vehicle departments only.

Other state agencies that might seek relief through broader legislation include those concerned with taxation and revenue, welfare, education and game and fish. If each of these agencies were required to pay first-class postal rates on all their mailings—various forms, license applications and renewals, etc.—the cost to the states in the aggregate could rise sharply. Accordingly, it is the recommendation of the Federal-State Relations Committee that the Governors' Conference support legislation to permit states to mail such material at third-class rates.

Appendix VIII

REPORT OF THE INTERIM STUDY COMMITTEE ON COLD WAR EDUCATION

Introduction

The report presented to the National Governors' Conference last year was the outgrowth of two major conferences on Cold War Education staged for the benefit of the Committee and involving more than a hundred outstanding leaders representing all walks of life and a wide range of personal and political views.

This report defined Cold War Education as "the development of knowledge essential to the understanding of America's heritage of freedom, and of the nature of the attacks upon that freedom, open and covert, by the followers of International Communism."

The goal of Cold War Education was found to be "an informed individual, cognizant of the responsibility conferred by citizenship and confident of his ability to function effectively as an important link in the governmental structure of which he and his fellows are the vital foundation." The report noted that to be successful, Cold War Educational efforts should be affirmative in tone and related to three basic areas of information:

1. The Foundations of American Freedom
2. The Communist Assault on American Freedom
3. The methods whereby the various elements of a free society can contribute to the defeat of the Communist assault.

Worthy of repetition was the finding of the Committee that "Cold War Education differs from indoctrination in that it follows no party line requiring blind adherence and unwavering obedience. It depends upon, and seeks to stimulate, the mind and the spirit of the individual in the belief that these are America's greatest resources in the bitter conflict called Cold War."

The Appendix to the 1963 Report, entitled "Why Cold War Education?" has become one of the most widely quoted and reprinted documents in the nation dealing with the Cold War.

It is the belief of the Committee that this acceptance and approval was based on the clear delineation set forth in the commentary between Cold War Education and the many "anti" movements abroad in the land today. Cold War Education asks not that the citizen be "against" any system or philosophy per se, but rather that he face squarely the major issues of the day, inform himself and express himself in an "aroused and concerned exercise of those acts of citizenship unique to our democratic system." The emphasis of Cold War Education lies not with mass action, but with the individual who must:

Understand what he is fighting for. He must understand the basic foundations of American strength and freedom, and why freedom is worth fighting for.

Understand that the Communist bloc is waging a very real war against the free nations. He must fully understand the nature and extent of this war and of Communist objectives.

Understand that he, himself, must determine how he can be most effective as a free citizen in defeating the Communist attack upon his freedom.

Despite more than a decade of discussion and the use of real and imagined threats of Communist influence or involvement in nearly every major national and international issue discussed by the American people, there exists today very little real grass-roots understanding of the nature of Communism or the application of its theory by the totalitarian dictators based in Moscow and Peking.

This lack of understanding has been recognized by academicians and educational administrators throughout the nation. Today there are but a handful of states not aggressively pursuing secondary school education designed to inform young Americans of the theory and practice of Communism and to equip them to evaluate propaganda, pledges and pacts of the Communist world in the light of history and of the special definitions employed by today's Communist leaders for many of the common and comforting terms of the free world.

This progress is in keeping with the recommendations of the Committee on Cold War Education but does not allay its concern that the present generation needs similar knowledge as urgently as the next generation.

The 1963 report has served as a meaningful stepping stone toward widespread public informational efforts geared toward non-partisan and unemotional presentation of the realities of the Communist challenge to American freedoms.

More than 25,000 copies of the report have been distributed by the Committee, and sections of the report have been reprinted by other organizations so that its message can truly be said to have reached into every state. Responses received by the Committee indicate that it has served to initiate soundly conceived programs of adult education, and that the implied interest of the nation's Governors has been a potent stimulus to educators previously undecided on embarking on formal programs of study in the schools.

Typical of the business community's acceptance of the report and estimate of its worth, was the distribution of 1,500 copies of the full report by the McGraw Edison Company to key executives and cooperators, and the extensive reprinting and distribution of pertinent sections to its 3,000 business members by the respected American Security Council.

An outline of the Committee's philosophy on Cold War Education and review of the role of local leaders in making Cold War Education a reality was presented to more than 2,000 members of the National Association of Local Officials gathered in annual convention, and a copy of the Committee report was given each delegate to that convention. The responses from local officials indicate that in many communities across the country Cold War Education is becoming a part of the training program for county and municipal employees, and a major discussion point for local officials.

A presentation similar to that made to the local officials was part of the annual meeting of the American Legion Auxiliary, and several thousand copies of the 1963 report were furnished for the use of Legion and Auxiliary study groups in many sections of the country. The report likewise has been utilized by educators and the role of the Governors in stressing the importance of the American heritage of freedom has been significant in both formal courses and the planning of new offerings in many local school systems.

All of the interest which has centered on the 1963 report, and the apparent effectiveness with which it has been used by responsible leaders, many responding directly to the stimulation and expressed interest of their Governor, has been a source of satisfaction to the Committee. It has indicated clearly that there exists a great thirst for an oasis of unprejudiced knowledge in the desert of confusion that surrounds popular consideration of Communism today.

The mature and sound leadership offered by the Governor within his state offers what is perhaps the best means available to the nation today for the stimulation of study and transmission of information vital to the national well-being. In addition to the problems of his state, each governor has a responsibility to his citizens to have an abiding interest in, and abundant information on, the welfare of the Union.

Toward that end, the Committee recommends that upon acceptance of this report by the Governors' Conference, communication be established with the President of the United States to seek creation of those conditions under which the Governors of the several states might, on the one hand, become an effective instrument of national policy in keeping with their proper relationship with the total government of the Union, and, on the other, make available their talents and knowledge, and those of their associates in the broad field of Cold War Education, for the achievement of a national consensus on America's relationships with totalitarian governments.

Civil Defense—A Path to Mental Security

The experience of the Committee on Cold War Education has shown extensive citizen interest in and acceptance of the concept

of Cold War Education. The practice of the federal civil defense program has established the existence of considerable citizen apathy toward the civil defense needs of our times.

Every Governor has observed, and the Conference Committee on Civil Defense has taken note of, the peaks and valleys of public interest in civil defense, with great interest and concern being manifested in times of national crisis, and virtually no interest existent at other times. The security felt by the American people is obviously such that unless the fuse of our powder keg planet burns with extraordinary intensity, not even the instinct for self-survival is adequately stimulated.

Civil defense officials in our states have cited the need for finding some means of sustaining the interest of the public in the increasingly long periods of non-crisis through which we move in these times. They seek a means by which the interest of the public can be held during the acquisition of the skills of physical protection and survival from the weapons of modern war.

The Committee suggests that not only is this nation in need of preparedness for physical civil defense, but that it cries out for adequate mental civil defense. By this is meant both an appreciation of our heritage and an awareness of the worth of our freedoms to reinforce each citizen's conviction that these freedoms are worth defending. Envisioned, too, is a sufficient understanding of Communism's challenge to enable each citizen to make those judgments and evaluations that will render him impervious to the propaganda thrusts and ideological assaults that have become an accepted part of the current global conflict.

The Committee on Cold War Education called its concern in this area to the attention of the Department of Defense and raised a question as to "the development of a program of citizenship education that might be introduced into the civil defense programs of the several states, both as a supplement to the important basic training now imparted, and as a stimulus to the development and retention of interest on the part of citizens whose current concern with civil defense drifts on the tide of world crisis and tension."

The Committee noted that it recognized "the problems which would be involved in the addition of broad educational materials to the current civil defense structure, and the need for non-partisanship in any discussion of those policies which might be construed as political in nature." It emphasized its belief "that suitable materials are within reach and that through civil defense more than any other available media we could generate the nucleus of an informed populous, thereby combating the propaganda from our ideological enemies abroad, and also that of the extremists at home."

In response, the Department of Defense, through the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civil Defense, advised the Committee that the structure of the existing Civil Defense Act is such as to

prohibit any activity beyond that directly related to physical defense activities.

The Committee is sufficiently convinced of the value and potential of the interrelationship of the mental and physical aspects of civil defense to recommend that, upon adoption of this report by the National Governors' Conference, discussions be initiated with appropriate leaders and committees of the Congress to determine the feasibility of broadening the Civil Defense Act to make possible carefully controlled Cold War Educational activities under the auspices of civil defense agencies.

Educational Television—A Path To Knowledge

In its 1963 Report, the Committee noted the advent of formal education about Communism in the secondary schools of forty-eight states and of the availability of a number of new and effective textbooks for these courses.

During this year, emphasis by qualified educators has continued, and the extent and quality of the coursework offered has been enhanced, in some instances at the urging of the Governor. There has been added emphasis, too, on the need for instructors well-prepared to cope with the special problems of teaching about Communism and its relationship to the American system.

In Florida, which was the first state to make a course entitled Americanism vs. Communism a requirement for high school graduation, a survey of teachers who had handled this unit showed a strong feeling on the part of most that they could benefit from a greater personal understanding of the nature of Communism and more extensive backgrounding for meeting the questions of their classes. Other states have noted comparable needs among their faculties. It is, in fact, generally recognized by educators that special care must be taken to maintain the sometimes fine line between teaching about Communism and teaching Communism.

In many areas of the country, special summer institutes have been established to provide specialized training for teachers, but only a fraction of the many individuals who must discuss Communism in the classroom can attend these institutes. This limitation, coupled with the great number of new teachers entering the profession each year, poses a serious stumbling block to the effective implementation of formal programs compatible with the concept of Cold War Education.

The 1963 Conference on Cold War Education was staged for the development of resource materials for the Committee on Cold War Education. In planning the Conference, the Florida Center for Cold War Education, its sponsor; the Institute for American Strategy, its secretariat; and the Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies, educational consultant, gave recognition to the need for better trained teachers and built into the Conference format

special film sessions at which twenty-nine of the nation's leading authorities delivered lectures suitable for teacher training via television.

Following their participation in the development of this resource material, Dean Ewing Shahan of Vanderbilt University and Dr. Gerhart Niemeyer of Notre Dame, finalized plans to translate the highly successful Vanderbilt Summer Institutes on the Nature of Communism into a meaningful television course. Dr. Shahan is Director of Vanderbilt's Institute on Communism and Constitutional Democracy and Dr. Niemeyer is an internationally known authority on Communist theory and Soviet practice.

With the aid of substantial support from responsible foundations, the Shahan-Niemeyer effort has moved forward steadily during the year. Rather than run the risk of having competing productions diminish the effectiveness of an important new effort, the Florida groups and the Institute for American Strategy joined forces with the Vanderbilt Institute to work toward a superior product. The Florida Institute has contributed the extensive pioneer ETV evaluative experience of its radio-TV division, and the Institute for American Strategy its outstanding Educational Advisory Committee, which includes top authorities on the many facets of Communism and Americanism from more than forty leading colleges and universities, and the chief state school officers of fifteen states.

From the joint efforts of these groups, under sponsorship of the Institute on Communism and Constitutional Democracy, the course is currently in production at Notre Dame. When the fifty-six half-hour video tapes and attendant kinescopes are complete, they will provide for teachers nationwide a careful and scholarly treatment of this sensitive subject, presented by eleven persons nationally known for their contributions in the area of study. This resource will be available at mere reproduction costs to institutions and school systems who may wish to use it. There will be nothing comparable otherwise available, and its suitability will not be limited to teachers, but will extend also to the public at large.

Because neither Vanderbilt nor Notre Dame is in a position to offer extension credit for this course, and because credit coursework is important to many teachers faced with tenure requirements, the Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies is exploring the possibilities of providing suitable examination procedures so that acceptable credit may be offered teachers studying this series in all areas of the nation.

This use of educational television is illustrative both of the stimulation the activities of the Committee on Cold War Education has provided, and of the manner in which educators are making wise use of the electronic and technological advances of our times for the benefit of American students. The Committee believes the

end product of the unique multi-state-and-institutional effort here outlined will be of such quality and service as to merit the attention of all states, and commends it to the members of the Governors' Conference.

Yet another illustration of the application of Cold War Education concepts and of the roles open to individual states may be drawn from the television series on the Nature of Communism.

The State of Florida has been acutely aware of the spread of Communism in the Caribbean and Latin America because of its geographic location, economic links with nations to the South, and its role as host to refugees from Communist Cuba.

Through the Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies and Florida Center for Cold War Education, the State is seeking to use the basic resource prepared by Vanderbilt-Notre Dame as a tool to provide a service and in a modest way to advance the cause of freedom within our borders and among our neighbor nations.

Florida is calling upon skilled educators and linguists from within its refugee colony to prepare Spanish-language versions of the fifty-six units of the course on the Nature of Communism. With these individuals working closely with appropriate state educators, supplemental video tapes or films will be prepared for specialized uses among Spanish-speaking peoples, a Spanish-language study guide with charts and other resource materials will be prepared, and a brief summary guide for general interest viewing will be developed.

The resultant production, after careful evaluation, will be used within Florida's refugee and resident Spanish-speaking colonies and, with the support and assistance of private organizations, made available to the ministries of education and development institutes of Central and South American Nations, using professionals from within the refugee colonies to further discussion and seminar applications related to the basic resource unit.

Because of a Cold War Education consciousness within the state, Florida is moving forward to fulfill its opportunity to combine Cold War Education, refugee assistance, Latin-American relationships, understanding of the Communist threat, informative uses of television and international service in a manner appropriate to its status and in no way conflicting with national interests.

The Committee recites this case history because similar, if less dramatic, opportunities exist in every state, awaiting strong leadership to convert them to realities.

Gubernatorial Leadership—The Path To Progress

In his book, Masters of Deceit, J. Edgar Hoover placed considerable emphasis on the training given Communists, including those in the United States. He said:

"Most people don't think of the Communist Party as an educational institution. Yet year after year the Party operates a school system of vast proportions: theory schools; orientation schools; specialized schools in current events, history, economics, social problems; schools in Party techniques: how to collect dues, recruit new members, serve as a club chairman, be a better public speaker; and, of course, schools on revolutionary tactics and procedure."

In his Inaugural Address, President Kennedy said: "We intend to re-examine and reorient our forces of all kinds, our tactics and our institutions here in this community. We intend to intensify our efforts for a struggle in many ways more difficult than war."

Toward this end, there has been pending in the Congress for the past four years a bill calling for the creation of a Freedom Academy, to place Cold War Education for government officials, citizen leaders and foreign students on a broad and meaningful basis. Emphasis in this Academy would be on the many and complex aspects of political warfare, a battleground too little understood by those who are engaged in the day-to-day fight to keep peace and preserve freedom.

In support of the Freedom Academy Bill, which has once passed the Senate, and carries the endorsement of such organizations as the AFL-CIO and the American Legion; Alan Grant, one of its originators, has written:

"Probably no other nation has as many service organizations as ours. While some have been organized for a limited special purpose, many are general service organizations (Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, Jaycees, Pilots, Business and Professional Women, Confederation of Women's Clubs, etc.), and each year they map out programs which they feel will be of greatest value to the community and nation. Yet . . . little of this effort is attuned to the global struggle. There is too much business or pleasure as usual during one of the great turning points of history. They have displayed a marked inability to visualize the opportunities."

These organizations, and others like them at the state level, do provide a unique opportunity for the exercise of leadership designed to rekindle America's lagging sense of national pride and seeming complacency in the face of world tensions and challenges unparalleled in our history.

The Committee believes that leadership at this level need not await the creation of a national Freedom Academy—that it can, and should, stem from the Governor. As pointed out in the Committee's 1963 Report, the Governor, "as head of one of the united states, is possessed of solemn responsibilities; not only those comprising his constituency, but for preserving and strengthening the Union of which his state is part. Be he Republican or Democrat, liberal or

conservative, he bears an obligation to provide leadership for the enhancement of American liberty under law.

"No one is better equipped than a Governor to induce large numbers of citizens to learn and relearn voluntary and intelligent loyalty to the subtle and complex values of the Constitution, of economic freedom, and of personal integrity and responsibility. No one is better able than a Governor to keep Cold War Education from becoming a device for terroristic attacks on unconventional ideas; for negative hate-movements under an anti-Communist banner, or for indulgence in blind praise of our own system. No one can be more effective than a Governor in stimulating and encouraging those men and women who can rise above partisan considerations, who can resist attacks or infiltration by extremist groups, and who can gain the respect and cooperation of their intelligent fellow-citizens, including political experts and professional educators."

During this year, the Committee has considered carefully the leadership challenge Cold War Education poses for each Governor in the implementation of the report presented to the last Conference. It has reviewed the diverse but effective approaches undertaken by such states as Utah, North Carolina and Florida.

The key conclusion reached was that, by its very nature, a major Cold War Educational effort requires that a Governor have a knowledgeable associate available to carry forward his plans under his supervision. This individual's charge must be to translate the Governor's interest in Cold War Education into action programs of consequence, and he must have a basic knowledge of the Cold War; Communist Ideology; American Freedoms and Values; Psychological and Political Warfare, and the mechanics and techniques of conducting soundly based Cold War Educational programs within a state.

Recognizing that such qualifications are not readily to be found, the Committee has made its principal project of the year the financing and organization of a major seminar program for individuals designated by the several Governors to serve them in this field.

The Committee invites and urges each Governor to be represented at a two-week school to be held November 22 through December 5 in Florida.

Through the financial support of the Lilly Endowment Fund of Indianapolis, Sears, Roebuck and Company and the Florida Center for Cold War Education, it has been possible to secure the services of the widely respected Institute for American Strategy to devise the curriculum and conduct the coursework.

The Institute for American Strategy initiated the first National Strategy Seminar for Reserve Officers, held at the National War College in July, 1959, served as secretariat for the 1962 and 1963 Conferences on Cold War Education, and has published a number

of books and pamphlets having bearing on Cold War Education. It draws upon a sound spectrum of cooperating organizations and a broad and well-balanced Educational Advisory Committee in the conduct of its activities. The membership of this Committee is listed as an appendix to this report. To direct the School for Governors' Cold War Education Leaders, the Institute has secured the services of Dr. Stefan Possony, Director of the International Studies Program, Hoover Institute, Stanford University. He will be assisted by Dr. James D. Atkinson, Associate Professor of Government at Georgetown University, President of the American Military Institute, and will head a staff of nationally known instructors in presenting the curriculum developed by the Institute for American Strategy and approved by the Committee on Cold War Education of this Conference. Because of the financial support made available to the Committee, neither tuition nor accommodation costs will be assessed the states for their representatives. Transportation to and from the host state will be the responsibility of the participant.

In the development of the concept and mechanics of the school, the Committee and its consultants have formulated a detailed statement setting forth the need for this action on the part of the nation's Governors, and of the approach to be followed in the classes. Because it enunciates and underlines the background of this recommendation, it is included as an appendix to this report.

It is the hope of the Committee that in those states where a new Governor is to be elected in November, the outgoing Governor will encourage and assist his successor in having a representative on hand for this important study program, so that Cold War Education may be a part of the new administration from its inception.

The Committee has directed that the program and materials prepared for its use in this specialized educational effort be so conceived as to be adaptable for use by the individual states in the furtherance of their Cold War Educational efforts, so that within the next year we may see many miniature freedom academies functioning and flourishing in each of the fifty states.

The Committee cannot overemphasize the importance of participation in the seminar program by every state possible. Efforts in this area are not without pitfalls, and it behooves each Governor to have working with him a trusted associate well-versed in both the theory and the mechanics of Cold War Education. The application of the knowledge each individual gains during the two weeks of intensive study must properly be in keeping with the personal convictions of the Governor he serves and the conditions within the state he represents.

This pioneering effort by the Governors' Conference is not likely to change the course of history, or win peace for the world tomorrow, but we are firmly convinced that it can lead to the sort of

bold new programs and the enlightened citizen support that can change the course of history and strike vital blows for peace. It can assure that the great body of public opinion on pressing issues will not be shaped by either extremists or opportunists, and it carries the promise that no ideological battles will be defaulted to the Communists by ignorance or naiveté in America.

Cold War Education For State Leaders

The Cold War of Communism is the broadest, most effective warfare ever conducted in the history of mankind.

The only real obstacle standing today between Communism and world dictatorship is a strong United States, determined to use its strength in freedom's cause.

Our Communist opponents intend to continue with the Cold War indefinitely, until the United States has been defeated. The conflict which even now occasionally assumes military form, may culminate in a nuclear struggle for survival.

The Cold War has been raging for close to twenty years. The United States, more or less uninterruptedly since the beginning of World War II in 1939, has been forced to participate in international conflict. Nevertheless, the American people have yet to face the Communist challenge realistically.

The Communists are taking advantage of our peacefulness and gullibility to deceive the American nation about the true nature of their operations. Since Americans do not want anything from other countries, but, on the contrary, are quite willing to give away treasure, they cannot quite bring themselves to accept the danger of Communist hostility, or that the degree of that hostility determines the actions of the Soviet Union and may be pursued beyond the limits of "acceptable risk."

Some Americans are impressed by the external, others by the internal Communist threat. Very few realize that these two threats are nothing but the two sides of one coin. Communist successes on the external front will entail successes on the internal front, or vice versa, just as Communist failures in one area would be followed by failures in another.

So far, American Cold War activities have centered in Washington. This is as it should be with respect to American activities that are projected outward: the federal government is in charge of foreign policy and defense.

But the Cold War also must be an effort by the entire American people. The United States is a federal union. With the exception of the District of Columbia, every acre of this land is both under a federal and a state government, just as every citizen is a citizen of the United States and of his own state.

Washington cannot, alone, manage all efforts that must be projected inward. Besides, many of the domestic efforts that are, or

should be, devoted to defense in the Cold War, fall under the jurisdiction of state governments. This is not just a legal triviality, but starkest American reality: Key activities of public life are under the jurisdiction of state governments and lie outside the purview of the federal government. As a practical matter, the federal government cannot, by itself and alone, galvanize all those American efforts that must be undertaken if we are to prevail.

It is clear, therefore, that if we are to wage the Cold War effectively, we must involve the state governments in the Cold War and establish a genuine partnership between the federal government and the states.

Let us look at some of the responsibilities of Governors which tie them clearly into Cold War tasks. In peacetime, Governors command the National Guard, and at all times they protect the internal security of their state and form part of the civil defense organization of our country. Governors are responsible for the state police systems which include such missions as riot control. In case of hostile attack, and especially if guerrilla techniques should be employed in North America, state Governors might be called upon to play a far more prominent role than most Americans now expect. The Constitution, at any rate, empowers the several states to take defensive actions against impending attack before war has been declared by Congress.

Communists are eager to infiltrate government agencies of all types and on all levels; hence they also try to infiltrate agencies of the state governments. For some types of hostile attack, such as the utilization of biological agents, infiltration into state and municipal agencies (e.g. water works) would be of the greatest importance.

Similarly, espionage takes place on state territories. Clearly, counterespionage activities are the primary responsibility of the federal government and any activities in this area by state governments must be with the sanction of and in cooperation with appropriate federal agencies. However, effective anti-espionage actions by state governments under proper authorization can be of material assistance to the F.B.I. and other counterintelligence arms of the federal government. While the F.B.I. has been assigned a number of police missions (including counterintelligence) it is not a federal police force.

Propaganda is one of the foremost techniques of Communist aggression. Such propaganda may be directed against conditions in a particular state or region. In any event, enemy propaganda activities, except those that are broadcast from abroad, are taking place on the territories of the several states and it is there where they can be opposed most effectively.

State governments also are heavily engaged in education, including education at university levels. Presently, the main effort

of the Communist Party of the United States is directed toward propagandizing college and university students. In some areas, there also seems to be an effort to get propaganda into the high school system. In addition, there is a great deal of lecture activity that is directed at the population at large. There are indications that Communists may be trying to run for state and local offices. At the present time, many of these Communist activities in the several states remain virtually unopposed.

State governments are heavily involved in business activity. There may be a labor dispute that is being exploited by the Communists, there are areas of high social mobility, there are pockets of poverty, and there are concentrations of so-called "minority groups." Any number of situations exist in individual states that could provide openings to a resourceful and aggressive enemy. Apparently trivial matters such as compliance with building codes or release of industrial information to unauthorized persons could be significant factors.

Finally, Governors and leading members of state administrations are called upon to transact business in state legislatures, to consult with civic and religious leaders, to make public speeches, and to keep the people that elected them informed about the main public problems. Much of this type of business deals, directly or indirectly, with Cold War matters. The way in which these tasks are being handled has a bearing on the security of the state and the United States in general.

For these multifarious responsibilities and activities, the Governors need staff support. They require professional information about the latest international developments and current Communist strategy and tactics. They need Cold War data as inputs into their decisions. They need channels of communication and coordination with other state governments and with the federal government. They need assistants who, in addition to doing effective staff work for the Governors, also can explain these decisions to the legislature, the press and the public. Many state governments require experts of a special type to handle particular local problems. In brief, the staff personnel attached to the state governments must be fully conversant with the challenges of the Cold War.

There is no reason to doubt that the staffs of practically all Governors include personnel who already today are quite conversant with Cold War problems and recognize the precise stake which their state has in the current conflict. It remains true, however, that though these staffs include former military and F.B.I. personnel, most of the personnel have acquired their knowledge through on-the-job training and outside reading. It may be presumed that in most instances, knowledge of Cold War problems is fragmentary, just as it must be assumed that persons who work many long hours in their present assignments will not have the time, nor the oppor-

tunity, to round out their knowledge through their own private efforts. There is the danger that, in some cases, the wrong type of information has been absorbed.

Put in another way: Whenever a new body of knowledge must be imparted to a relatively large number of people, it is best to provide formalized instruction. This is so for the following reasons:

1. Formalized instruction allows the students to concentrate full-time on the subject, to study systematically, and to discuss the subject matter with trained instructors and colleagues of similar interest.

2. Otherwise inaccessible study materials will be available.

3. Complex problems can be debated leisurely and in an objective manner, and their implications be brought out without danger of undue emotional disturbance.

4. Discriminatory judgments can be developed.

There is the added enormous advantage that persons who have received such systematic training, usually find it easy to transmit their knowledge to other persons, including their superiors and their assistants.

It is toward this end that the Committee on Cold War Education of the National Governors' Conference has developed the concept of a two-week school of gubernatorial assistants and associates who will provide Cold War Education leadership in their states under direction of the Governor.

The proposed instruction course will consist of:

- (1) lectures by the faculty and invited academic experts;
- (2) assigned systematic reading;
- (3) seminar discussions;
- (4) oral and written student presentations; and
- (5) lectures by outside prominent speakers, including persons who have had direct exposure to Cold War problems (e.g. persons from the federal government, foreign officials, guerilla fighters, ex-communists, etc.).

Content-wise, the instruction will consist of a general and a special part.

The general part will deal with the purposes, history, activities and techniques of the Communist movement, Communist semantics, the various threats to the United States, background data on Communist operations in the United States, pertinent examples from other countries, related technological trends, and U.S. Cold War policies and strategy.

The special instruction will bear on specific Cold War problems that arise for state governments. Some of this would deal with the National Guard, military bases in the state, the police department, internal and industrial security, riot prevention, and similar "military" topics. Much attention would be given to the problems

arising in the educational systems, in particular the utilization of free speech against Communist agitators. In a broader sense, much attention will be devoted to propaganda analysis and Cold War Education of the people at large.

A third group of topics will deal with the positive Cold War contributions open to the several states (e.g. ethnic groups and their relations with the "old country," and the role of border states). It is contemplated to ask the students for short papers discussing what their state could or would be doing to strengthen the defense of the Union as a whole.

It is not intended to institute an inflexible and monotonous curriculum. Certain basic lectures must be given and certain readings must be assigned to each class, but otherwise each group of students is expected to have a different focus of interest; furthermore, interest will change as situations vary. On the ground that a student gets most out of a course if his interest is aroused, it is proposed to vary, within limits, the content of the special instruction. Since the students will be mature and experienced men, each of whom could make significant contributions of his own, the special instruction will consist largely in stimulating seminar discussions and guiding student presentations on subjects chosen by the students themselves.

It is anticipated that certain students will want to obtain specific training for specialized jobs. Every effort will be made to help in problems of this type.

There will be no attempt to preach a "party line." Lecturers will present different points of view. The school is based on the principle that although historical facts can be established with considerable objectivity, estimates concerning future events will vary, inevitably so. Consequently, students will interpret the Communist threat differently. Even if all students were to interpret Communism in the same fashion—which is most unlikely—there may be wide variations between preferred courses of actions. It is believed that differences in approach and judgment would render the instruction, and notably the seminars, most productive. Thus, the school will be run strictly on the principle of freedom of speech. At the same time, the students will be expected to support their arguments logically and with the best factual evidence they are able to collect.

In conclusion: the federal government has profited immensely from its system of war colleges and advanced schools. The effectiveness of state governments would be similarly enhanced if key staff members of state administrations were given instruction that broadens their horizon and knowledge, and prepares them for assignments which at present they have no choice but to handle through improvisation.

Appendix IX

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ON THE NATIONAL GUARD

A Ready Force

The Advisory Committee on the National Guard seeks to provide for the chief executives of our states and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico an over-all view of the National Guard, both Army and Air, at the national level. Your Committee is aware that each of the members of this Conference is cognizant of the status of the National Guard in his state. But the National Guard, in a collective sense, is more than the organized militia of each state. It comprises the largest reserve force available for the immediate defense of the United States and, considered separately as the Army National Guard and the Air National Guard, each comprises the single reserve component of its appropriate Armed Force. It is in this national context that the status and the problems which affect that status are herein presented.

The National Guard is today at the highest level of mobilization readiness in history. Never before have non-regular components attained a comparable stature. Moreover, the organization of the National Guard is neither antiquated nor static. Its constant modifications reflect the number and type of units required by the Active Forces but not capable of organization within the authorized Active Force Troop Basis. Included in the National Guard are such modern increments as Special Forces Detachments, missile battalions and Century Series Aircraft. Six of the Army National Guard 23 Combat Divisions and a substantial number of combat and service support organizations are in first priority status and are included within the Active Army's 22 Division Force Structure. Concurrently, Air National Guard aircraft contribute to the capability of the Active Air Force on a day-to-day mission basis.

In cooperation with the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force, the National Guard continues to seek means of improving its readiness posture by the application of more advanced training techniques. For example, this year Air National Guard heavy transport squadrons will airlift brigade size units of the Army Guard to new and distant areas for annual field training. There these units will join with units of other states for training and tactical maneuvers. Such operations provide fresh horizons, realistic logistical planning, and contribute valuable experience.

Another progressive training procedure will be the employment of Army National Guard Brigades and Air National Guard

Control and Warning Groups in Operation Desert Strike, an Active Force maneuver of considerable size and importance. These operations can only be characterized as significant advancements in the training of reserve components.

The readiness and combat capability which the National Guard seeks results from a proper combination of many factors. Strength, equipment, maintenance, unit training periods and areas, specialized school training, and technicians, are the principal program areas bearing most upon the degree of readiness and capability attainable. In turn, the adequacy of support in these important areas is in direct ratio to the degree of federal funding provided in annual appropriations acts.

The Air National Guard not only met but exceeded its programmed strength in fiscal year 1963. It is currently programmed for an authorized strength of 75,000 in fiscal years 1964 and 1965. Actual strength requirements are considerably in excess of this figure and the Air National Guard has demonstrated its ability to recruit to a higher level. The perpetuation of the 75,000 strength ceiling does not permit reasonable growth toward requirements and will result, in any future mobilization, in the necessary utilization of "filler personnel" with the same probable unfortunate consequences attendant to their use in the call-up for the Berlin Crisis.

The Air National Guard existing aircraft inventory consists of planes which were phased out of the Active Force several years ago. Future programs project a continuation of the practice of equipping the Air National Guard with aircraft which, when retired from the Active Air Force, are fast approaching, or have reached obsolescence. The Air National Guard has proved itself as a ready-now force capable of immediate deployment and operations. It should be provided with personnel and aircraft commensurate with its missions and capabilities. Nonetheless, except for these two items, federal funds proposed for the support of the Air National Guard in fiscal 1965 will continue the level of presently approved programs.

The federal support proposed for the Army National Guard in fiscal year 1965 is not as encouraging. Recently, the Secretary of Defense in a statement before the Armed Services Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate revealed that, "In terms of readiness, the Reserve Components have made less progress, but there has still been distinct improvement." He stated further that, "Faster progress toward the achievement of the readiness goals will be one of our major objectives in the coming fiscal year."

The states can provide and are providing the strength, the initiative and the willingness to produce combat-ready units. Provision is not made, however, in either the current fiscal year or in

fiscal year 1965 for sufficient funds to produce the other resources that combine to prepare a unit for commitment to combat, or to attain the readiness goals established by the Secretary of Defense.

Your Committee invites the attention of this Conference to specific areas in the proposed federal appropriations for support of the Army National Guard in fiscal year 1965 which, in the judgment of the Committee, are distinctly inadequate.

The Army National Guard School Program, which is designed to provide an adequate military education essential to the technical progress of both officer and enlisted personnel, is at least \$4 million less than the amount required. Accordingly, only the most critical school training can be supported. This limitation on the advancement of technical proficiency represents a serious deterrent to the achievement of a 90% MOS qualified Army National Guard, a criterion established by the Secretary of Defense as applicable to authorized Army National Guard strength.

The expansion of the present pilot project of weekend unit training to the majority of Army National Guard units is desirable and necessary. These two four-hour consecutive unit drills double the training time without corresponding increase in pay, enable better utilization of equipment and provide more realistic training than can be accomplished within the normal armory environment on a week night. Inherent in this program, however, are requirements for additional training areas and one-time and recurring costs such as the provision for essential all-weather clothing, subsistence, and repair parts and fuel and lubricants resulting from increased use of tracked and wheeled equipment. Proposed federal funding deficiencies in this area are in excess of \$11 million.

For a number of years the slippage in the procurement program for repair parts and equipment has presented a dismal picture. Such items are essential to training. Much of this equipment has already exceeded its normal life expectancy, but, since it is valuable for training, an investment in its maintenance is warranted. As the equipment ages, the cost of maintenance increases. Notwithstanding, the dollar amount appropriated annually to support this activity is decreasing.

Within the ability of the state maintenance shops, every means of economizing has been effected. Equipment has been cannibalized and procurement reduced. Combat readiness maintenance standards have been overlooked in order to limit repair part utilization to the bare maintenance necessary to support minimum training requirements.

The foregoing observations are equally applicable to secondary equipment items such as tool kits, tents, ammunition belts, protective masks, and other items required to support the individual soldier in combat. Normal wear-out, losses, obsolescence and changes in design mandate continuing replacement, funds for which are inadequate.

There are undoubtedly other areas in which federal funding support could logically be improved. The foregoing, however, are considered to be most vital at this time.

Concurrently, the emphasis being placed upon the priority forces of the Army National Guard, those which it is contemplated will be ready for immediate deployment and operations in the event of need, may be ultimately reflected in a corresponding downgrading of the non-priority forces within the Army National Guard. This would be a matter of grave concern to the states.

The continuing task of the National Guard must be to exploit its demonstrated capabilities. It must seek to develop missions within those capabilities that can be performed efficiently, effectively, and at lower cost than by the Active Forces.

Within the resources available, your Committee is convinced that the National Guard, both Army and Air, is meeting its commitments and making substantial and worthwhile contributions to our National Defense Posture.

Army National Guard

The downward trend in Army National Guard strength has not only been arrested but reversed.

You will recall that the 1963 report of this Committee invited attention to abnormally high personnel losses and drastically reduced reenlistment rates which, together with other factors, contributed to the then reduced strength of the Army National Guard. At that time the Committee also indicated its confidence that the problem was interim in nature and would shortly be overcome. The present and projected strength as of June 30, 1964 is a vindication of the Committee's estimate of that situation.

During the past few months we have witnessed a remarkable gain in the nationwide strength of the Army National Guard. The states, and particularly those individuals within the units upon whom falls the ultimate burden of recruiting, are to be highly commended for this effort and resulting significant increase.

The authorized strength of the Army National Guard and its attainment and maintainment has been a matter of concern to this Conference for a number of years.

As far back as 1957, we vigorously opposed any reduction from an authorized nationwide strength of 400,000, in the firm belief that that figure represented a reasonable level for the purpose of providing units with sufficient strength for efficient training and insuring an adequate force to cope with natural disasters or civil emergencies.

Many of you will also recall that this Conference, acting through its individual members and later through this Committee, has furnished representation before appropriate Congressional

Committees concerned with the strength and organization of the Army National Guard.

In the past, our interest has been principally directed to the maintenance of an already attained strength of 400,000 in the Army National Guard. Heretofore, when such a figure was authorized by the Congress, the states had little difficulty in maintaining that level.

Unit mobilizations during the 1961 Berlin crisis, together with other factors, for the first time caused a drastic reduction below authorized strength. During the last two fiscal years all recruiting efforts have been directed to a reattainment of the 400,000 level.

In this respect, two years ago the Department of Defense recommended and the Congress included language in the annual Defense Appropriation Act which stated: ". . . That the Army National Guard will be programmed to attain an end strength of four hundred thousand in fiscal year. . . ."

Standing alone, this language might have permitted the states to recruit to the authorized 400,000 level. However, coupled with this appropriation language were several recruiting and strength guidelines one of which, in particular, makes it a practical impossibility to recruit to the authorized strength figure. This guideline, recommended by the Department of Defense and approved by the Congress states: "No units will be permitted to exceed the authorized strength except those specifically authorized excess strengths to accommodate reservists on drill pay status who have been displaced by the realinement of the Army's Reserve Forces."

In the time frame immediately following the Berlin crisis when Army National Guard units had suffered excessive personnel losses and when most units were considerably below authorized strength, the restrictive nature of the cited guideline had little impact upon recruiting.

The picture has now changed. Many units have achieved authorized strength and considerable numbers of units are actually carrying personnel overages resulting from reorganization. These overages, under Defense Department policy, are permitted for a period of one year.

During the current fiscal year the Department of the Army, recognizing the undue restrictiveness of the recruiting guidelines, authorized units within a so-called "mobilization entity" to exceed by 10% their authorized strengths. Within this 10%, however, had to be included overages resulting from reorganization. "Mobilization entities" were defined to be Divisions and separate Brigades, separate Battalions, and separate Companies.

It is clear from the foregoing that even though a Division or other mobilization entity may attain its authorized strength, the units thereof may well vary from 10% over authorized strength to 10% under authorized strength. Accordingly, all recruiting in under-

strength units must cease until excess over-strength in other units has been reduced or otherwise adjusted.

Recruiting is cyclic and is affected by seasonal factors in farming and industrial areas, local economic factors, local draft calls, and other factors peculiar to local communities.

The Congress clearly intends that the Army National Guard attain and maintain a strength of 400,000. The Department of Defense clearly desires that, within the 400,000 strength, each and every unit attain and maintain its specific authorized strength. The states and the Army National Guard concur in this concept and are sincerely seeking its accomplishment.

The Department of Defense Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1965, now under consideration by the Congress, contains the programming language and restrictive guidelines previously mentioned.

It is estimated that Army National Guard strength on June 30 of this year will be in the neighborhood of 390,000. The unit distribution of that strength will make it practically an impossibility to attain the 400,000 strength desired by the Congress, or even to maintain it were it achieved. Flexibility in programming is urgently required if the states are to be permitted to recruit to the nationwide and unit standards of strength intended by the Congress and desired by the Department of Defense.

Consultation with experienced senior officers of the Army National Guard indicates that, with slight modification to existing restrictive recruiting and strength criteria, the attainment of 400,000 early in fiscal year 1965 and its maintainment at that strength for the balance of the fiscal year is within reach of the states.

To that end, your Committee recommends a 2% excess strength authorization at national level.

The recommended flexibility in programming is nothing more than a personnel management tool to be utilized by the National Guard Bureau to insure compliance with strength goals.

If approved, the foregoing would permit an orderly progression to a 400,000 nationwide strength while insuring that strength would be distributed properly among the thousands of units in the troop unit basis.

Your Committee likewise coordinately recommends that the existing and proposed appropriation language be amended substantially as follows to reflect the flexible criteria: "Provided further, that the Army National Guard shall be programmed to attain a strength of 400,000 in fiscal year 1965 and thereafter to maintain that strength as an average; . . ."

The importance of this subject has moved your Committee to provide for representation from among its members before the appropriate Congressional Committee this fiscal year in order to furnish the views of this Conference to that body prior to finalization of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1965.

Air National Guard

The nation's best trained, most completely equipped and most readily responsive reserve component, the Air National Guard, continued to play its efficient and effective role as an important part of the Air Force First Team during the past year.

The flexibility, demonstrated capability, and seemingly unlimited potential of the Air National Guard to contribute to the first line defense of the country constantly amazes the military professional.

Posting an impressive number of firsts for a reserve component, the Air National Guard:

- Deployed 12 RF-84F jets non-stop from Birmingham, Alabama, to Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska, with in-flight refueling being furnished by Air National Guard KC-97 aircraft together with personnel and support equipment;

- Converted four medium troop carrier groups to the Air Commando mission;

- Won the Air Defense Command's "William Tell" World-wide Interceptor Weapons Meet, outscoring 13 Regular Air Force units;

- Received its first tactical F-105 Fighter aircraft as a preliminary to the reception of more modern aircraft;

- Provided the first officer from the Air Reserve Forces to be selected for astronaut training;

- Provided the outstanding graduate at the Air Force's pilot training school at Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas;

- Deployed 12 F-100C tactical jet fighters in Operation "Cane Cutter" overwater to Puerto Rico with in-flight refueling again being furnished by Air National Guard KC-97s;

- Ended 1963 with the lowest aircraft accident rate achieved in its history;

- Provided command communications for the entire Active Force exercise of "Desert Strike" with the participation of 2 TAC Control Groups;

- Participated in operation "Swift Strike III," the largest joint exercise in peacetime history with transport aircraft furnishing airlift for Army troops, Air Commando Groups flying special Air Warfare missions, F-86Hs engaging in close support missions, RF-84Fs and RB-57s flying reconnaissance missions, F-100s flying tactical fighter missions, KC-97s furnishing in-flight refueling, and Aircraft Control and Warning units providing traffic control; and

- Initiated operation "Guardlift" in which more than 10,500 Army National Guard personnel will be ultimately airlifted for annual full-time field training in the continental United States, Hawaii and Alaska.

The Air National Guard is likewise intensely proud that for the first time an outstanding Air National Guard officer was selected and appointed to the top National Guard position of Chief of the National Guard Bureau.

Truly, the Air National Guard has won its "spurs" on the Defense Team.

The Recovery Mission

Ever since the Soviet Union exploded its first atomic weapon, the frightening prospect of an all-out devastating thermonuclear attack on the United States has haunted high officials of our federal and state governments. Presently, our deterrent forces have apparently generated a nuclear stalemate. Nonetheless, pending the development of a complete and adequate defense against a nuclear onslaught, common sense demands that we plan for such a possibility.

Since 1959 the chief executives of the states, and in particular this Committee, have stressed the necessity of planning for recovery during a postnuclear attack period. It has long been recognized that in the event of an attack, State Civil Defense organizations would be responsible for tasks such as interment, hospitalization, feeding, housing, communications, transportation, and internal security. It has concurrently been recognized that the magnitude of this task would far exceed Civil Defense capabilities. It is significant in this respect that the Governors, acting in concert in this United States Conference of Governors, have vigorously opposed reductions in the authorized strength of the National Guard as being the only state forces capable of providing trained and equipped organizations and personnel to assist in this mission. While we have underlined the relationship of the National Guard to our vital interests in this area, we have never proposed, nor shall we, that a recovery mission be substituted for, or encroach upon, the primary combat mission of that force.

During the past several months, the Secretary of the Army, charged with the responsibility of developing plans for the military support of civil defense authorities, established a study group for this purpose. We are pleased to report that membership in this group included representation from the National Guard Bureau and the Adjutants General Association of the United States. Moreover, the states, through their Adjutants General, were extended ample opportunity to communicate comments and recommendations to that group.

It is believed patently unnecessary to present here other than a general consensus of the proposals which have been evolved by the Army study group. Specific details of the program, satisfactory to all concerned, remain to be worked out. Suffice it to say

that the problem has been recognized at the highest levels and that something is finally being done.

Basic concepts underlying consideration of the problem are that:

Civil Defense, including recovery operations in a post-attack period is, and must remain, the responsibility of civil authorities;

All Armed Services, including their Active and Reserve Components, must plan for and, depending upon the immediate tactical situation, assist civil authorities in a post-attack period;

Military commanders must be assured that identification with Civil Defense does not reduce the importance of traditional combat missions; and

Progressive planning must be accomplished through negotiation with and concurrence of the Governors.

Many complex factors are inherent in any proposal which seeks to meld state and federal agencies, civilian and military personnel, Army, Navy, and Air Force units, and Active and Reserve Forces into a singleness of purpose. The study group has wisely and intensely analyzed these potential difficulties and has outlined in broad terms organizational and operational plans and procedures which your Committee believes are reasonably capable of implementation.

It is contemplated that full advantage will be taken of the existing military headquarters in each state augmented as necessary to cope with the situation. Moreover, it is intended that planning be in depth as well as laterally and that full complete disclosure and coordination between the various elements be maintained at all times.

It is axiomatic that the degree of effectiveness of military support to civil authorities will be in direct ratio to the effectiveness of pre-attack planning and the capability of post-attack operations.

Naturally it is impossible to anticipate every requirement and every situation that may develop subsequent to a nuclear attack. Nonetheless, your Committee is convinced that long strides have been taken in the direction previously recommended by the Committee and this Conference.

This program, when ultimately formalized, finalized, and followed by efficient and effective participation will provide for order in lieu of chaos and contribute in large measure to the enhancement of our deterrent stature.

Appendix X

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The Committee on Juvenile Delinquency is concerned with a problem for which there is no easy solution and no single panacea. It is a problem with which government—and particularly state government—must deal, but the best efforts of governments will come to naught unless they reinforce and are supported by the work of other institutions and agencies of society. The basic patterns of behavior in society and the strength of the family and its ability to inculcate lasting moral values in youth are perhaps more important than anything that government can do to prevent juvenile delinquency. The family is the basic element in determining behavior and in the final analysis it has the basic responsibility for preventing juvenile delinquency. Governmental efforts, therefore, should be directed toward strengthening the family's ability to fulfill its responsibility, but, if the family fails, government must deal with the consequences of the failure.

All of the states have many programs which have an effect upon juvenile delinquency. These include the work of agencies concerned with education, employment, law enforcement, corrections, child welfare, mental health, housing and many others. All of these agencies have responsibilities which are in no way focused on problems of delinquency, but the work of all of them is of importance in a concerted attack on delinquency. The Committee recommends, therefore, that each state establish machinery to coordinate the activities of these various departments so that the skills and programs of each of them can be utilized in a comprehensive approach to the task of preventing, treating, and controlling juvenile delinquency.

In the last few years many of the states have established new juvenile delinquency programs, particularly in the areas of prevention and treatment. Notable among these activities is the growing use of work programs of various sorts including forestry camps and other types of camps in which youth learn skills and new attitudes about the values of useful work. Such programs appear to be successful both in the treatment of delinquents and in the prevention of delinquency. Almost every state has tried some new approach in this field and the experiences of the several states are of value to all the states, for each can learn from the others. The Committee, therefore, encourages each state to share with all states the knowledge gained in these programs so that all may benefit from them. With this in mind, the Committee has asked all Governors to designate an official to serve as a source of information and as a coordinator of the state's juvenile delinquency programs.

Plans are under way to hold a conference of these coordinators this coming fall.

The Committee is cognizant of the relationship between unemployment and the incidence of juvenile delinquency. Out-of-school youth who cannot find employment are more likely to commit acts of delinquency than are those who are employed. Likewise, children in families in which the father cannot obtain a job are more prone to drop out of school and to become delinquent than are those who enjoy a stable family situation. A few states have experimented with programs to employ fathers on public works projects which otherwise would not be undertaken and a number of states have made special efforts to find jobs for unemployed youth. The results indicate that such programs help to reduce the incidence of delinquency. The Committee, therefore, endorses federal and state efforts to increase employment opportunities through job training and other ways of helping those who wish to work to find meaningful employment.

In its work, the Committee has had the benefit of the assistance of an Advisory Committee composed of professional state officials concerned with various aspects of juvenile delinquency. The Committee commends to each Governor the report* of the Advisory Committee which includes recommendations on state action with respect to juvenile delinquency and a review of some new delinquency prevention and treatment services being provided by the states.

The juvenile delinquency problem continues to be a serious one. The number of youths involved in acts of delinquency continues to increase each year. No final solutions to the problem are evident, but state governments must continue their efforts to prevent, treat, and control delinquency. The Committee believes that the Governors' Conference can perform a useful service by encouraging the interchange of ideas and knowledge among the states in this area and by demonstrating the interest and concern of the Governors with this problem. It, therefore, recommends that the Conference continue its work in this area either through the present Committee on Juvenile Delinquency or in other appropriate ways.

* Copies of this report are on file at the headquarters of the Governors' Conference in Chicago.

Appendix XI

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CIVIL DEFENSE AND POST-ATTACK RECOVERY

Introduction

Letters from individual Governors to your Committee, supplemented by the reports we have received from the Department of Defense and the Office of Emergency Planning, all underscore the steady and continuing progress made this past year toward an effective civil defense program throughout the nation.

Rewarding as this progress continues to be, it still falls far short of the program which this Conference has persistently urged as the essential minimum required by the realities of the nuclear age if we are to meet our personal responsibility as Governors for the safety of our citizens.

Recent State and Local Progress

Progress has been made in the past twelve months on a number of fronts: on the construction of protected emergency operating centers to assure continuity of state and local government in the event of a nuclear emergency, on training, on resources planning, and on the marking and stocking of available fallout shelters.

Thirty-nine of the reporting states now have emergency operating centers ("EOCs") with some degree of protection, as compared to the twenty-four last reported. At the county level, also, progress in EOC construction is continuing. Hawaii reports 75% of its counties with protected EOCs, Pennsylvania 40%. Although all reports show some effort by individual counties, a great deal still remains to be done in most states to insure continuity of the local government function in a nuclear emergency.

The Federal University Extension Program for training CD instructors was widely put into effect last year. A number of states, while endorsing the program, however, express concern that in its establishment, state civil defense authorities were bypassed. These states feel that better results, at lower over-all cost, could have been achieved by accepting the appropriate state agency as a full partner in the program's implementation.

The Comprehensive Emergency Resources Planning Program is also receiving active support. Many states have already applied to the federal government for funds to assist in the employment of personnel for this project. Others are conducting a planning program with their own funds. Only one state, Alaska, reports its inability to pursue the program, due to the disruptions caused by the March 27th earthquake. Hawaii, on the other hand, reports that its entire emergency planning program is already 85% complete.

During the past year the federal marking and stocking shelter program, similarly, made satisfactory progress. Vermont reports that it has achieved 124% of its shelter stocking goal. Connecticut will complete its program during June, 1964. In some states, however, delays in transporting shelter stocks are occurring, due to lack of local funds and the consequent need to rely on the relatively few volunteer workers available.

It is especially interesting to record that this year thirty-seven Governors report a more favorable public attitude toward civil defense than existed a year ago. In western states particularly, the Alaskan disaster seems to have stirred public interest in all forms of pre-disaster planning. Most Governors, however, report a continuing apathy in many quarters toward the entire program. They attribute this to a number of factors, including a lack of understanding of the essentiality of the effort, the apparent détente in the cold war, the failure of Congress to act on the shelter incentive legislation and the belief that a major nuclear conflict is becoming less and less likely.

The Federal Program

During the past year the Secretary of Defense and senior military leaders have testified before Congress, and in public statements, that the civil defense program, built around fallout shelter, should have a firm and high priority as an integral part of our national security effort. Indeed, the Secretary of Defense, in discussing ballistic missiles, made clear his view that the civil defense program recommended by the President "should be given priority over the procurement and deployment of any major additions to the active defenses" of the United States.

Since the Governors' Conference last year, the House of Representatives, for the first time, acted favorably on a Bill (H.R. 8200) requiring the incorporation of shelters in federal buildings and providing federal financial assistance to those states and local governments, as well as non-profit institutions, that create shelter space in their facilities. The responsibility and leadership exhibited by the House of Representatives in this respect did much to improve the public understanding and acceptance of the essentials of civil defense.

It is regrettable that the Senate Armed Services Committee has elected for the present to defer action on this modest but most significant legislation. We concur with the Secretary of Defense, and with our national military leaders, that favorable action on this bill by the Senate, and its approval by the President, are essential to national defense.

Substantial progress has nevertheless been made in the federal shelter program during the past year. More than 100 million shelter spaces have now been located, 74,000 buildings and over

57 million spaces are now marked, and over 38,000 buildings and 20 million shelter spaces have been stocked. Large numbers of shelter managers and radiological monitors are also being trained and shelter use plans are being developed.

Impressive as these figures are, shelter capacity should be further expanded. We are satisfied that the Congress should appropriate the funds requested by the President for these purposes.

Your Committee is also seriously concerned at the continuing delay by the Congress to enact legislation continuing the federal matching funds program for state and local personnel and administrative expenses. Unless renewed, authority for this program will expire June 30, 1964, resulting in the dismissal on that date of many state and local civil defense employees. Even now, a number of these employees, facing possible loss of employment by July 1st, are seeking positions elsewhere. Significant further delay in authorizing continuance of this matching-funds program will seriously disrupt civil defense planning and operations in most, if not in all, states. The Congress should take immediate action to enact this matching program legislation.

Suggestions for the improvement of federal civil defense and emergency planning operations have been offered by a number of Governors. These suggestions fall mainly into two categories: First, considerable feeling has been evidenced that stronger leadership at the federal level is essential if further significant progress is to be achieved. Several Governors, in fact, urge a public statement by the President, endorsing the civil defense program and emphasizing its essentiality to our over-all national defense posture.

Second, the feeling still persists on the part of many Governors, though perhaps fewer than last year, that the division of responsibility and lack of close cooperation in Washington, as between the Department of Defense and the Office of Emergency Planning, continues to cause difficulty, duplication and uncertainty at state and local levels.

To quote from one report: "At present, responsibility for the planning for secondary (intrastate and retail) resources is assigned to the Office of Civil Defense, whereas, responsibility for the planning for the same resource—as a primary resource (interstate and wholesale) is that of the Office of Emergency Planning." In most states, civil defense and emergency planning functions are either combined in one agency or are closely related one to the other. The need for corresponding organizational relationships within the federal government is still apparent.

The Alaska Disaster

The capability of civil defense to perform under disaster conditions was critically tested by the earthquake in Alaska last winter.

The civil defense organization in Alaska passed this test with flying colors. It coordinated the rescue and relief activities and acted as a center for liaison with military forces and city civil defense heads. Communications and other equipment purchased with federal financial assistance provided the vital link between state and local governments and the disaster areas in need.

As Governor Egan has said:

"Anyone in Alaska who had reservations about civil defense in Alaska, I am sure has changed his mind now after seeing the great job this agency did and is continuing to do for our people.

"Civil defense shone all the way through. Those who had been sniping at the civil defense organization have now seen where they were wrong. Without civil defense we would have had a dreadful time. The Civil Defense people simply took hold of things in this emergency and proved its worth and value. . . ."

Conclusion

As has been demonstrated by the resolutions adopted at these annual Governors' Conferences, and by the action taken in the fifty states, we as Governors are committed to providing for the American people an adequate, well-rounded civil defense program.

Essential to such a program are advance planning, resources management, training of personnel, establishment of better warning and communications systems, provisions for continuity in government, protected emergency operating centers for all levels of government, improved plans for radiological monitoring, decontamination and post-attack recovery and stocked fallout shelters in homes, factories, schools, offices and public buildings.

Thus far the Congress has not provided the financial support requested for the necessary federal programs. Such financial support, together with federal leadership, are crucial to our own efforts as Governors to meet our responsibilities to our people. It is central to these responsibilities to provide the maximum feasible assurance that American families and American democracy can survive the threat, and if need be, the actuality of a nuclear attack against us.

In the service of that responsibility we urge the adoption by the 1964 Governors' Conference of the resolution attached to and made a part of this report.*

*For text of resolution, see Appendix XV.

Appendix XII

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE

Introduction

In this, its second annual report, the Committee on Public Health and Welfare is pleased to review its consideration and the unanimous agreement of all committee members attending the 56th Governors' Conference on four matters of vital importance to all Americans.

We have considered and reached agreement on matters presented herein: Health Insurance for the Aged, The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Proposed Federal Legislation on Support of Dependents, and Resettlement of Cuban Refugees.

Undoubtedly, some or all of these matters will remain subject to the concern of the committee and the entire Conference. In addition, it is recommended that the committee, when it is reconstituted, take into consideration a number of other matters which entered the fruitful discussions held in Cleveland.

Health Insurance for the Aged

Last year, the Public Health and Welfare Committee took under consideration the proposed Hospital Insurance Act of 1963, commonly known as Medicare. It was agreed that this type of program clearly fell within the orbit of the committee's mandate. At its Washington meeting of April 9-10, 1963, the committee heard various witnesses on this program, including Mr. Wilbur Cohen, Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of HEW; Mr. Robert Ball, Commissioner, Social Security Administration; and, Dr. Ellen Winston, Commissioner, Welfare Administration. In addition, considerable material was distributed to the committee members for their study.

Also at the April meeting, the committee was advised that a comprehensive study of this subject was being undertaken by the National Committee on Health Care for the Aged. This study was headed by the Honorable Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of HEW under President Eisenhower and now the distinguished President of the University of Oregon. It was referred to as the "Javits Committee" because of the Senator's role in its formation. It was hoped that this study would have been completed before the Governors' Conference in July of 1963 so that the Public Health and Welfare Committee might make a recommendation to the full conference. Unfortunately, the study was not completed and the committee deferred action.

The Majority Report of last year proposed ". . . to continue its

review of the Hospital Insurance Act of 1963 and related proposals and to comment thereon . . . to the 56th annual meeting of the Governors' Conference." The Minority Report recommended ". . . that further study be given to possible alternatives." In keeping with these sentiments and in view of the fact that the National Committee on Health Care for the Aged has completed its study and made its recommendations, the Committee on Public Health and Welfare believes that it is now in order to make certain recommendations.

First, it is quite obvious that a definite need exists in this area. The number of people age 65 or over has increased from 12 million in 1950 to almost 18 million at present. This figure is expected to reach 20 million by 1970 and almost 25 million by 1980.

Most of this increase is due, of course, to the advances which are continually being made in medical science. Paradoxically, these advances have placed the cost of medical care out of the reach of many who require it. For example, daily hospital costs averaging \$37 per day, are four times as high now as they were in 1947. Furthermore, health care expenses, excluding services financed by public funds, are more than twice as high for those over 65 as for those under that age bracket.

For the aging, these figures paint an increasingly dismal picture. Bureau of Census figures show that of the aged who live alone, almost half had money incomes of \$1,000 or less in 1960 and 3/4 had less than \$2,000 per year. For two-person families, the median annual income was \$2,530 as compared to \$5,314 where the head of the family was younger than 65.

The aging also suffer from the fact that they are sick more often than younger people. Almost four out of five in the non-institutional population have one or more chronic health problems. They are bedded by illness over 2-1/2 times longer than younger people; require hospitalization more often; and, when hospitalized, stay more than twice as long as younger people.

The Kerr-Mills law was enacted in hopes of solving this dilemma. But not all of the states have adopted this program. Even among the states which have such programs, the level of benefits varies greatly.

As of June 1, 1963, only four states provided comprehensive programs. A comprehensive program, however, can be very costly. The limited financial resources, rather than an unwillingness on the part of state officials, has delayed the adoption of comprehensive programs in most states.

The result is that the aging in most states are denied benefits equal to those of the aging in other states even though their illnesses are equally severe.

Although there has been a significant expansion of private insurance programs, the National Committee for Health Care for the Aged states, "It is evident that the effectiveness obtained by pri-

vate insurance in meeting the impact of health costs is far less for elderly persons than for those who are younger." The members took pains to point out that only slightly more than half of the non-institutionalized aged population has some health insurance as compared to three out of four in the general population. Also, the proportion of health costs paid by insurance companies has been found to be lower for the aged than for most of the population.

The impact of the medical problems of the aging is also felt in the private non-profit programs, such as Blue Cross. As mentioned, those aging who are members of the program are forced to avail themselves of benefits more often than younger members. This contributes greatly to the general upward trend in Blue Cross rates. For example, Blue Cross in New Jersey this year requested a 32.6 per cent increase in rates and was granted an 18-1/2 per cent increase; New York City Blue Cross requested a 34.8 per cent increase and was granted 32.9 per cent; and, Kentucky Blue Cross requested an increase of 38.5 per cent and received 19.9 per cent. This, in turn, becomes a two-edged sword. The increase in premiums not only works a hardship on the younger enrollees but even more so on the aging who are least able to afford it. As a result, many are forced out of the plan altogether and are left without protection, raising thereby a constant threat to an expansion of welfare costs.

It is possible that should a program of hospital insurance for the aging be enacted, this would have a beneficial effect on insurance rates. It would provide for the vast number of high risk cases now enrolled in the private plan. It is also conceivable that, just as social security helped foster a vast growth in private life insurance plans, a hospital insurance program for the elderly could stimulate a similar expansion of private medical plans.

It is apparent, from the many proposals under consideration, that action is needed to cope with the ever-increasing severity of this problem. One of the proposals, such as that recommended by President Johnson in the "Health of the Nation" message of February 10, 1964, would be totally financed through the Social Security System. Another, such as that recommended by the National Committee on Health Care for the Aged, would supplement the social security feature with expanded private insurance coverage for other medical costs. Still another, such as that by Congressman Lindsay of New York, would provide the option for older people of being covered by social security or receiving from the government the money to pay for private insurance. Last year, a proposal by Congressman Bow of Ohio would have granted annual premiums to the aging of up to \$125 per year so that they could maintain private insurance.

It is considered by many that this last proposal would have a serious impact upon the general treasury. Billions of new tax dol-

lars would be required to finance it as it envisions the use of the general fund to defray the expense.

The members of the Public Health and Welfare Committee, after careful consideration of the various proposals, make the following recommendations:

a. The Kerr-Mills system of medical assistance should be adopted as soon as possible by those states which do not now have it.

b. Those states which do have Kerr-Mills should act to work toward uniformity of the benefits being paid in order to insure equality of treatment for the aging under this program.

c. The adequacy of Kerr-Mills is under continuing scrutiny and criticism. The scope and urgency of the medical needs of the aging require government action at all levels so that an adequate program of health protection can be provided for the aging persons of America.

If action is taken along the lines outlined above, the Committee can find no better conclusion than that expressed by Secretary Flemming's National Committee on Health Care for the Aged:

"The nation is confronted with a continuing problem, calling for long-term provision—a solution that will meet the needs of this generation and will keep the next generation from being faced with the problem that now confronts us."

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964

In March of 1964, after the introduction of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, commonly known as the "War on Poverty," Governor Anderson, Chairman of the National Governors' Conference, referred this program to the Public Health and Welfare Committee for its consideration.

After making an informal poll of the members of the committee, and having secured an endorsement of the concept of this legislation from a majority, the chairman, Governor Richard J. Hughes, appeared before a select Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor and testified for this bill.

It is evident, from numerous sources, that the problem of poverty is a major American challenge. Assuming an annual income of \$3,000 before taxes as a poverty level, the United States had more than 9-1/2 million poverty-stricken families based on the United States Census of 1960. They made up 21.4 per cent of all families in America. To make these statistics even more meaningful, we can envision more than 10 million families attempting to shelter and to feed and clothe themselves as well as purchase the other necessities of life on less than \$60 a week.

The problem is especially acute in regard to the young. As late as 1963 there were 630,000 out-of-school, out-of-work young people between the ages of 16 and 21. The steady sophistication of

technology is placing an ever-increasing number of jobs, traditionally reserved for youth, out of the reach of this untrained group. This is expected to become even more serious in the future. By 1970 there will be over 7 million persons in the 16 to 21 age group. Unless the current trend is reversed, we can expect more than 1 million of these to be out-of-school and out-of-work.

Poverty casts its shadow on many groups. The poor are found among those bypassed by technological change and left, thereby, without marketable skills. They are found in rural areas where 1-1/2 million farm families live on less than \$250 a month. They are found among minority groups, such as Negroes, of whom nearly half live in poverty, and among Puerto Ricans, of whom 53 per cent of the more than 1 million living in the New York metropolitan area subsisted on less than \$4,000 in 1959. The Spanish-speaking American of the Southwest and the American Indians also are greatly affected by economic privation. In addition, there are almost 2.3 million fatherless families headed by women who are unable to cope financially with the burdens which have been thrust upon them. The aged make up still another significant group. Of these, 1.7 million families headed by those over 65 are supported by incomes of less than \$1,000 annually.

This is a nationwide problem requiring concerted action on a nationwide scale. The pending legislation seeks to provide such leadership. This legislation contains a variety of proposals. First, it lays great stress on youth. A volunteer Job Corps would be created for out-of-school, out-of-work young men and women between the ages of 16 and 22. First-year funds provide for an enrollment of 40,000 in various conservation camps and residential centers where the time of the enrollees would be divided between job training and remedial education.

Also to be created is a Work-Training program for the same age group. Some 200,000 youths would benefit from this section which is designed to pay part of the employment costs of those who must work to help their families. The youths would be employed on projects, either public or private, which would not otherwise have been undertaken and which would not displace existing workers. Keeping these youngsters in school or providing them with the education required to be productive in our society would be a significant step in improving their lives and in enhancing the economic picture of the United States.

Another section of the bill provides for a part-time Work-Study program in our institutions of higher learning. This would be created to benefit those from poor families who have been accepted into college but who would be otherwise unable to attend without the benefits of a part-time job. It is estimated that this program will help almost 140,000 students to continue their education.

The largest single program under the bill is that which finances

90 per cent of the cost of comprehensive community anti-poverty action programs. The initiative for this program lies with each community and/or private groups within it. The aim is to develop locally based attacks on such factors as poor health conditions, lack of education and job skills, poor homemaking habits and other causes and results of poverty. It is felt that these programs can best be drawn at the local level because the citizens of the community are more cognizant of their needs. Federal funds are required because it is too often these same communities that are least capable of financially helping themselves.

Other sections of the bill provide for programs in agriculture, small business and for grants for pilot projects to develop work and training opportunities for unemployed fathers and needy, unskilled widows. An Office of Economic Opportunity would be established to coordinate the war on poverty. In addition, a Volunteers In Service To America group (VISTA) is authorized and is patterned along the lines of the proposal, last year, for a Domestic Peace Corps.

The problem of poverty is serious, not only from the standpoint of human suffering, but also when viewed in terms of economic cost. Among the poor is found a greater share of the expense for welfare services, institutionalization, police and fire protection and health service. It is estimated that if government public assistance costs could be cut by 25 per cent, this would reduce the tax burden by \$1 billion. A 10 per cent reduction in police, fire and health services would also bring a saving amounting to almost \$1 billion.

These accomplishments can be anticipated if the capacity of the nation's poor to earn a living can be increased substantially over today's level. This would not only save tax dollars but would have a significant effect on the economy in general. For example, if the average production of poor wage earners could be lifted by a mere \$1,000 annually, the economy would gain an additional stimulus of \$14 billion in output. This figure is almost \$3 billion greater than the recent tax cut.

While many methods exist for meeting this problem, including that of school drop-outs, at the state and local level, the Committee is in agreement with the principal objectives of the proposed programs in the pending legislation in that they implement a nationwide attack on the causes of poverty. However, the Committee recognizes the necessity of insuring a measure of control by the states over the programs. The Committee concurs, therefore, in the resolution on this bill adopted by the Western Governors' Conference on May 6, 1964, which endorsed "the broad objectives of the program, subject, however, to maximum use of appropriate existing agencies and to proper checks and balances at all levels of government."

Support of Dependents

The Council of State Governments requested that the Public Health and Welfare Committee review the implications for state government of two pending federal bills. These are H.R. 4927, which would make it a federal offense to travel in interstate commerce for the purpose of avoiding a support order, and H.R. 4939, which includes the same provision but which, in addition, would provide that federal courts would have concurrent authority with state courts to hear support actions brought by citizens of other states and to register and enforce existing support orders.

From information available, this appears to be an unwarranted intrusion by the federal government into this aspect of state responsibility. Moreover, the states have not been lax in seeking to remedy, on their own, the problem of enforcement of support orders. As of the present, all 50 states, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the Territories of Guam and the Virgin Islands have passed the basic legislation for reciprocal support which was drafted by the Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws in 1950 and amended slightly in 1952. Beyond this, the 50 states have each designated an information agency under this law to be used to implement its intent. The object, of course, is to expedite enforcement.

The procedure of the Reciprocal Support Act is simple. Those to whom support is owed file petitions in the court of their jurisdiction setting forth their need and the basis for seeking support from the individuals named. If the court deems the facts in the petitions to be correct, the petitions are certified and forwarded to the court of jurisdiction in which the persons owing support reside. These people are then called for a hearing. If the presiding judge finds that the facts in the petitions forwarded to him are correct, an order is entered and the recipients are required to make payments at regular intervals. These payments are transmitted through the courts involved to the people for whom support was ordered.

The Council of State Governments feels that this law contains adequate provisions for necessary governmental involvement in support cases. It recognizes that, because a high degree of cooperation is required, the procedure may sometimes break down. However, the Council has provided statistics from 1962 indicating that on the whole the procedure is working well. They found that, in that year, over \$4 million in reciprocal support money was collected in New York City; \$1.7 million in Massachusetts; \$1.5 million in Connecticut; \$1.5 million in Wayne County, Michigan; and over \$1 million in Cook County, Illinois.

The Public Health and Welfare Committee notes that the federal courts currently lack machinery to handle these kinds of cases and would have to create it to do a satisfactory job. This would

mean additional expense at the same time that the state courts are utilizing a proven and effective system. However, the committee believes that there are actions which the federal government can take to help the states in this area. These are as follows:

a. Require a uniform policy of access to records, for the purpose of locating persons wanted for support, of the Veterans Administration, the Social Security Administration and the Internal Revenue Service. All of these agencies currently supply some information but each has a different policy. A uniform system would be of great help to the states.

b. Federal matching funds are now granted to help defray state costs for general administration of the departments of welfare. Many cases of support involve families which are receiving welfare. The location of those owing support, therefore, although a responsibility of law enforcement officials, is integrally related to the administration of welfare. Consideration should then be given to the extension of federal matching payments for law enforcement activities in this field.

The states, themselves, can intensify their efforts in this area. Those which have designated information agencies under the reciprocal support law should, if they have not done so already, give this agency real authority. This would be of help in those instances where the effort of a local jurisdiction in one state is blocked by the failure of a local jurisdiction in another state to cooperate. The states should also provide more effective machinery for utilizing the records of state agencies in tracking persons liable for support. New regulations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare require states to set up location services in cases involving persons receiving ADC funds. This regulation could be expanded for use in all aspects of support. New Jersey has recently established a staff position to concentrate upon this activity. The records of Motor Vehicle Divisions, Employment Security offices, tax bureaus and departments of correction can all be used in this effort.

The Committee recommends that the aforementioned action proposed for federal and state governments be implemented at the appropriate levels so as to strengthen the reciprocal support effort for the benefit of those families and individuals involved directly and for the taxpayer in general.

Resettlement of Cuban Refugees

The first subject which the Public Health and Welfare Committee ever considered was that of Cuban Refugee Relocation. Last year, this committee urged all Governors to aid in the relocation effort by establishing state commissions for this purpose.

As of the last Governors' Conference, 168,000 Cuban refugees had been registered in the Miami, Florida area and, of these,

63,000 had been resettled in nearly 1,400 communities in 49 states. Since that time, the number of registrants has risen to 170,000 and the number of those resettled has reached 74,000 in 1,800 communities including some in every state. A chart reflecting these figures is attached.

Of the 96,000 remaining in the Miami area, over 45,000 are dependent on federally financed public assistance because of the lack of job opportunities. Refugees continue to arrive, but because of the termination of commercial air flights since October, 1962, the number has diminished considerably. Last year, for the first time, the number of resettlements exceeded the number of new registrations. During the fall, winter and spring months, the volume of resettlement from Miami is not great because of some increase in job opportunities in Miami and because of the reluctance to move during the cold weather and while children are in school. In the summer, however, resettlement will once again become a matter of urgent necessity for many.

Resettlement and relocation is important in order to avoid the concentration of Cubans in a small number of urban areas and to give them an opportunity for a productive existence instead of dependence on federal handouts. In view of the timeliness of the Governors' Conference in relation to the summer movement, the Public Health and Welfare Committee once again urges the Governors to do all within their power to assist in this effort within their states.

Number of Cuban Refugees Resettled through

January 31, 1964

	<u>Total number of persons</u>	<u>During last four months</u>
New York	21,782	961
New Jersey	9,107	682
California	7,016	893
Puerto Rico	6,362	647
Illinois	3,552	388
Massachusetts	2,499	287
Texas	2,320	289
Pennsylvania	1,495	80
Louisiana	1,284	122
Ohio	1,090	61

	<u>Total number of persons</u>	<u>During last four months</u>
Florida*	930	74
Connecticut	893	106
Virginia	888	80
District of Columbia	873	23
Colorado	843	26
Michigan	801	60
Georgia	689	89
Missouri	662	28
Indiana	588	22
Maryland	526	22
Nevada	355	25
Wisconsin	344	14
North Carolina	333	17
Kansas	322	39
Oklahoma	310	11
Oregon	291	17
Minnesota	279	5
Tennessee	269	9
Iowa	261	6
Nebraska	258	2
New Mexico	257	3
Alabama	210	18
Rhode Island	180	9
Washington	179	18
Kentucky	154	1
South Carolina	126	15
Delaware	118	3
Arizona	117	4
Mississippi	74	7
West Virginia	70	1
New Hampshire	62	3
South Dakota	48	0
North Dakota	40	0
Vermont	38	0
Arkansas	32	0

* Outside Miami area.

	<u>Total number of persons</u>	<u>During last four months</u>
Montana	29	0
Hawaii	24	0
Virgin Islands	21	5
Maine	14	0
Wyoming	11	0
Utah	10	6
Idaho	4	0
Alaska	1	0

Appendix XIII

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ROADS AND HIGHWAY SAFETY

To remark that individual Governors and the Governors' Conference have long been intensively concerned with safe, efficient and economical highway transportation is to understate the case. This may be illustrated by referring to a few examples of the last decade in which the Governors' Conference has acted in the spirit of that concern.

In 1954, the Conference made a Report to the President urging a "Cooperative Program for Highway Construction." This report was helpful in pointing out the need for a greatly expanded highway construction program and in leading the way toward enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956.

Turning to traffic accident prevention, the Governors' Conference Committee on Highway Safety in 1956 developed a comprehensive report based on recognized standards. Widely distributed, it served many as a useful guide.

In 1959, the Conference authorized the establishment of a standing Committee on Roads and Highway Safety "to concern itself with keeping under continuous scrutiny the various problems relating to highways and highway safety."

Beginning in 1961, the Conference has taken a sympathetic interest in and helped to develop the Driver License Compact and the Vehicle Equipment Safety Compact. Thirteen states are now party to the former; 30 to the latter.

Last year the Committee developed "A Guide for Highway Safety," thousands of copies of which have been distributed. In the briefest possible compass, the "Guide" seeks to come to grips with the many-faceted problems of traffic safety.

This report aims to build on what has been done by the Governors' Conference and others to make tomorrow's system of highway transportation capable of moving more persons and goods more safely, more rapidly and more economically than today's.

A Guide for Highway Safety

As indicated, "A Guide for Highway Safety" is a brief document. It is comprehensive in the sense that it lists the steps a Governor can take to help reduce traffic losses. It is by no means exhaustive in its treatment of these steps. Its value is in its implementation.

Briefly stated the Guide recommends: First, get the facts. Second, develop a plan of action and select priorities. Third, inform the people. Fourth, initiate action necessary to overcome

shortcomings and keep the strong points strong.

Recently regional representatives of the Council of State Governments and field staff of the National Safety Council completed a survey of 46 of the 50 states to determine to what extent the recommendations in the "Guide" have been implemented. In 31 states action on such recommendations was reported to have been under way prior to the publication of the "Guide." In an additional four states, action was initiated subsequent to publication.

In 21 states, the Governor personally has brought the document to the attention of his highway traffic officials. In 20 states the document is receiving careful study by the state's traffic safety coordinating committee and is being used in planning or supplementing its present program. Policies similar to those recommended in the "Guide" were already being followed in an additional 15 states, it was reported.

One thing the survey shows is that use is being made of the "Guide." Another is that the states are overmodest in their claims concerning implementation of its recommendations. For example, information from other sources discloses that all states are getting the facts—the first recommendation—and all states are establishing a priority of needs—the second recommendation. With respect to the fourth objective, good coordination, progress is being made, but it is slow. It appears that up to one-third of the states does not have adequate coordinating mechanisms. Informing the people, the third objective, is the one toward which the least progress has been made. In some states an admirable job is being done, but in many the effort is spotty and uncoordinated.

To accomplish the objectives of the "Guide," the assistance of agencies outside state government is needed. Such assistance includes consultants and technical services and they should be utilized to the fullest. For your information, the committee has distributed to all Governors a directory of services available to the states.

Traffic Safety Compacts

As indicated, 13 states have enacted the Driver License Compact. The Compact provides that action commensurate with its own laws will be taken in the home state of a driver upon conviction of such driver in another state of violation of the law with respect to any one of four named violations. It also provides a mechanism whereby party states may be apprised of the complete driving records of their licensed drivers. Finally it embraces the one-license concept.

The Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission, the operating agency established by the Vehicle Equipment Safety Compact, has already held its organization meeting. Ready for submission to the

Commission at its next meeting will be committee-developed recommendations for projects, budget and operations. Also developed by a committee were recommended by-laws and a Code of Ethics. Assuming that 33 states were to be signatory to the Compact—and 30 are now—the per state assessment would run from \$622 to \$5,335. These are modest sums certainly to do the tasks the states have imposed on the Commission. As time goes on the Commission's activities will illustrate the wisdom of states working together to solve their problems.

Military-Civilian Cooperation

Another example of cooperation is that between the military services and the states. Since 1956, a growing number of states have been sponsoring military-civilian traffic workshops and conferences. About half the states are now participating. More recently attention has been turned to provision of a forum for resolution of problems which transcend state jurisdiction and are interstate and regional in nature. Three Military-Civilian Conferences have been held—one among western states, one southern and one mid-western. The conference involving eastern states will be held later this year. The target date for the First National State Military-Federal Safety Council Conference is April, 1965.

The military services are making an all-out effort to reduce their serious annual losses from highway accidents—about 1,500 fatalities and 15,000 injuries. Since about 95 per cent of their serious accidents occur on public roads, it behooves the states to cooperate with them in every way. This includes sponsorship by states of military-civilian traffic workshops and conferences and participation in regional military-civilian conferences. By cooperating with the military services the Governors can commend their activities and encourage their continuation.

Operation 66

Another example of cooperation is afforded by the Operation 66 Project. Here the parties involved are the States of California, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, Oklahoma, Missouri and Illinois. Also cooperating are the Bureau of Public Roads and the International Association of Chiefs of Police. The general purpose of the project is to apply the combined resources of police traffic supervision and engineering services to examine the relevant factors to determine police manpower needs; sample data on emergency services for motorists; develop more effective proceedings for accident investigation; and advance uniform engineering standards relevant to traffic control. Its five specific objectives are to: provide a pattern for interstate cooperation in planning and conducting highway safety projects; study police services for motorists; examine in

depth causes and circumstances of single vehicle non-pedestrian accidents; determine the need for median crossovers on freeways; and develop uniform traffic control measures for points of transition between four and two lanes.

Some Measure of the Problem

In 1963, drivers on the nation's roads and streets traveled an estimated 798 billion miles, an increase of 4 per cent over the 1962 total of 768 billion miles. Were the increase in travel to continue at no greater rate, by 1969, we shall exceed one trillion vehicle-miles of travel.

Motor vehicle registrations reached 82,692,314 in 1963. The increase over 1962 was 3.6 million registrations, or 4.5 per cent. At such a rate of increase, there will be more than 100 million vehicles registered during 1968.

According to the latest statistics, work was in progress or completed on more than three-fourths of the 41,000-mile network of highways comprising the interstate system. Completion date for the entire mileage is 1972.

For all highways, nationwide expenditures were estimated to be \$12.3 billion in 1963. By 1970, the figure will probably reach \$15.2 billion. Capital expenditures, \$7.8 billion in 1963, are expected to total \$9.1 billion in 1970. Construction, estimated at \$6.1 billion in 1963, would account for \$7.7 billion in 1970. As right-of-way costs decline from 13.5 per cent of current total expenditures to 8 per cent in 1970, maintenance costs are expected to rise by more than one-third.

Beginning July 1, 1965, the Secretary of Commerce may not approve any program for projects in an urban area of more than 50,000 population unless the projects are based on a continuing comprehensive transportation planning process carried on cooperatively by the states and local communities.

Beginning with the current fiscal year, 1.5 per cent of all federal aid funds must be used for planning and research. An additional 1/2 of 1 per cent may be used for such purposes. All highway planning and research funds must be matched by the states unless the Secretary of Commerce has determined that the interest of the federal-aid highway program would be best served without matching.

We may anticipate that primary, secondary and urban grants will continue at the current rate—about \$1 billion per year. With respect to the interstate system federal aid will increase to \$3 billion per year for each of the last three years of the program, 1970, 1971 and 1972. Then the flow of this 90-10 money will cease.

What then do all these statistics add up to? What is the measure of the problem? We can with confidence expect more drivers

to drive more miles in more vehicles on a much improved system. We have need to do more and better planning. We can expect our costs for maintenance, policing and other administration to climb as the total of federal grants declines precipitously. It seems almost to go without saying that now is the time we must begin to devise answers to some of the questions that face us.

Should the interstate system be expanded? Main routes generally were selected in 1947; urban extensions for the most part in 1955. Should not the criteria for selection be reexamined to determine if the system is a well-rounded, comprehensive one that truly meets our major traffic needs?

Should the 90-10 cost sharing formula be continued for operation of the Interstate System, once construction of the original 41,000 miles has been completed?

What would be a reasonable level of service for federal-aid primary roads? Currently the range of service is very wide, from just below that of the interstate level—occasionally even above—to barely over that of secondary roads. Is there a case for reassignment of roads to a new system lying between the primary system and the Interstate System?

What should be the role of the secondary system? In 25 years it has nearly doubled in mileage. Among states, the range in percentage of secondary road mileage to total federal-aid mileage is from less than 5 per cent to more than 50 per cent.

Is the present method of handling urban extensions of the primary and secondary systems adequate for the years after 1972? Do we wish to continue the apportionment of funds initiated in 1944 whereby the division is 45-30-25 per cent among primary, secondary and urban roads?

Statistics show that modern freeways—limited access, divided highways—are safer highways. Accident rates decline by two-thirds, fatalities by half where access is controlled, median strips are employed and over- and underpasses are used at intersections. Can we not utilize some of the same techniques that have been employed in building freeways, including the Interstate System, on other highways?

These might include widening of traffic lanes; reconstruction to improve sight distances on curves; installation of traffic control devices in conformity with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices; construction of stable shoulders of adequate width; widening of narrow bridges; and other measures.

These suggestions all involve expenditures which would otherwise be used for new construction. Suitably employed, particularly in high accident locations, they could save many lives at the expense of deferring completion of other needed projects. To this committee, this would appear to be a reasonable expense.

Up to this point we have been talking about a nationwide prob-

lem and some possible steps that can be taken in its solution. It may be, however, that we do not have a clear, over-all picture of how big the problem is and how significant its solution is to our entire economic and social life.

Based on the best available information, the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety estimates that our highway transportation system includes a physical plant worth about \$200 billion. This includes costs to build the 3.5 million miles of roads, plus an average value of \$1,000 for each one of our 82 million motor vehicles. There is in addition an enormous annual reinvestment of about \$73 billion a year. This includes retail auto sales, accessories, gasoline, further construction, maintenance, etc.

The economic loss from accidents is estimated to be almost \$8 billion a year. Delay, disruption and other inefficiencies in our highway transportation system will balloon this figure. The question then is, are our present efforts to manage our highway transportation system adequate. The answer is an emphatic no. The National Safety Council has estimated that currently \$700 million is spent annually on police, court, licensing, educational, and other activities. Another \$9 million is being spent by national traffic service agencies and citizen public support organizations. The latter portion is designed to give the responsible public officials support and assistance. It is unrealistic to expect that a \$710 million annual investment is capable of managing a \$200 billion system.

The highway transportation problem in our cities and states will increasingly outstrip the present, already inadequate effort to manage the system. It is imperative that immediate attention be given to increasing the resources available. If the proved corrective measures were put into effect in their entirety, the National Safety Council estimates the cost would be an additional \$500 million annually, but the savings resulting from just the reduction in accidents would be six to eight times this amount every year. We cannot, at this time, place a value on the increased efficiency of transportation that would also be brought about by these corrective measures. A suggested breakdown of the \$500 million increased expenditure would include:

1. \$217 million for 24,000 more state and local police assigned to traffic.
2. \$62 million for high school driver education.
3. \$12.5 million for additional traffic engineering personnel.
4. \$6 million for maintenance of traffic control devices.
5. \$150 million for improved driver licensing procedures, motor vehicle inspection, more adequate record keeping and improved traffic safety programs in rural areas.
6. \$32 million for improved traffic courts.
7. \$3 million for national traffic service organizations de-

signed to give technical counsel, guidance and assistance to state and local communities.

8. \$18 million for state and local citizen support groups to develop public understanding of and support for official programs.

Unless these additional expenditures are made, traffic deaths could continue to climb and the inefficiency of our highway system create such delays, congestion and disruption that the economy would suffer serious dislocation.

In the light of these rough estimates, we hope that the Governors attending this Conference, in accepting the report of this Committee, would request that the highway-transportation economic-consequences study, currently sponsored by the National Safety Council, be completed as soon as possible and that progress reports be made to the Conference. It is understood that to complete this study substantial costs will be involved. It is hoped therefore that all segments of the economy will assist the National Safety Council in financing this study so that assurance will be given of obtaining complete data. Funds for completion of the study will contribute significantly to the ability of states and communities to secure the public funds necessary to put corrective measures into effect.

The Challenge

This then is the challenge. We are approaching a moment in time when we must take stock, when we must plan and when we must put into effect those measures that appear to be called for.

By whatever measure one cares to employ, it is clear that the problem of providing safe, dependable and rapid highway transportation is growing in size and complexity. At the same time, the capabilities of government to manage the highway transportation system seems not to be keeping pace. To cite the most critical measure of all—despite what may have seemed to be heroic efforts, last year the number of persons killed on our roads and streets reached a new high.

Nor is this a time to despair. Some of the answers to our problem are apparent. These we must apply. Others are not so evident. These we must search for. And it will be necessary both in the application of and the search for answers that we have the cooperation of all levels of government as well as those interested groups outside government.

In itself, this report has been devoted largely to the posing of questions. It has sought to cover all phases of highway transportation and has alluded at least to other forms of transportation. This has been deliberate. A highway engineered, marked and policed to effectuate the rapid movement of goods is a safe highway for the

movement of people. Similarly one method of transportation must complement another if the highest ends of society are to be served.

Your Committee, aware of the magnitude of the jurisdiction you have given it, is reconstituting its Advisory Committee. Every facet—engineering, administration, policing, courts, education, laws—will be represented. Each level of government will be represented. Members will be named who can relate highways to other forms of transportation and to the economy in general. In short, it is our aim to be able to assist in finding the answers we need and to give this Conference and the states the most thoughtful advice possible.

Appendix XIV

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON STATE PLANNING

The Committee on State Planning offers to the Conference a joint staff paper agreed upon by the members of the Committee and the appropriate officials on the federal executive level, more specifically the White House and the Bureau of the Budget. The staff paper, itself, describes to some extent the background and activities of the Committee in the area of communication and coordination with the Executive Branch, and is self-explanatory in this respect.

In previous years this Committee has reported to the Conference on matters pertaining to state planning. The staff paper, appended hereto and made a part of this report, would require action by this Conference to finally establish the authority of such an agreement.

This Committee was established by the Conference in 1961. The Committee conceived as one of its principal functions that of making recommendations on state planning to the Governors. Recommendations pertaining to this area have been made to previous Conferences, and it is the consensus of the Committee that this subject has been adequately covered. As a practical matter there is nothing further that can be done in this area at this time.

In the last two years, and more specifically in the last year, the Committee has concentrated on the question of communication and coordination with the federal executive. It is apparent that there is much still to be done in establishing a mutually agreeable relationship and communication with the White House and executive agencies. Your Committee feels that this matter is of sufficient importance that one group representative of the Governors' Conference should have as its particular responsibility concentration on this field. We are also cognizant of the fact that the Executive Committee of the Governors' Conference is the supreme authority representing the Conference. We are aware of the activities of the Standing Committee on Federal-State Relations, a Committee which has concerned itself with matters of broad significance, particularly on the Congressional and legislative levels.

Your Committee would suggest to this Conference that the Committee on State Planning, as it is now constituted, be dissolved. Further, that a committee, advisory to the Executive Committee, be established, and that it be entitled the Advisory Committee on Executive Communication and Coordination. It is further recommended that, in order to minimize conflict, duplication or overlapping of activities, the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Commit-

tee on Federal-State Relations be ex-officio members of the proposed Advisory Committee.

This Committee would then concern itself exclusively with the matters described in its title. It would be anticipated that such a Committee would actively work with the President of the United States, his Cabinet Officers and executive agencies toward the end that more effective communication could be established with the Governors of the respective states.

FEDERAL-STATE JOINT STAFF PAPER ON COORDINATION OF FEDERAL AND STATE PLANNING

Background

In recognition of the need for more effective planning at the state level, and pursuant to a resolution adopted by the Governors' Conference in 1961, a Governors' Conference Subcommittee on State Planning of the Committee on State Planning and Urban Regional Development was established. In its report to the 1962 Governors' Conference, the Subcommittee recognized that a necessary ingredient of effective state planning is the improvement of coordination of state planning with federal planning, and recommended measures to achieve such improvement. Subsequent to a meeting of the Subcommittee with White House and Cabinet officials in Washington on February 16, 1962, President Kennedy directed a memorandum to agencies with major public works or capital improvements programs. In his memorandum of October 1, 1962, he instructed federal departmental and agency heads to make every effort to give the states timely information on physical development programs or projects contemplated by the executive branch. They were further instructed to make sure that there were effective channels of communication and arrangements for consultation with state governments with regard to development plans or major projects.

To continue the program initiated by the Subcommittee on State Planning, the fifty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Governors' Conference on July 2, 1962, by resolutions, requested that a Committee on State Planning be appointed to "work in cooperation with federal representatives toward closer federal-state coordination in planning programs and projects for the development of the nation's resources."

The Basic Problem

Although substantial coordinative activity presently occurs between federal agencies and various state and local agencies, a

major problem centers around assuring the effective flow of planning information at the highest executive level. A basic necessity for the coordination of federal and state planning is the timely and meaningful communication both within and between the two levels of government to assure that agencies concerned with planning public works and capital improvements have the necessary information for their use in the planning and programming of future developments for which they are responsible. The present joint staff paper, prepared at the request of the White House and Governors' Conference Committee on State Planning, is directed at this fundamental element for effective coordination—communication. The paper proposes action to establish basic procedures for achieving better communication between the executive branches of the federal and state governments on planning for physical development. By physical development is meant public works, capital improvements, and community facilities and major improvements thereto; capital acquisitions, such as purchase of conservation areas and forest lands; and associated activities.

Joint Staff Recommendations

The recommendations which follow are both immediate and prospective in their implications. Certain steps can be undertaken at once, while others are more exploratory as they deal with problems that are quite complex. All, however, are to be considered as first steps only, with the expectation that improved mechanisms for coordinated and joint planning will be developed and perfected as experience is gained in coordinated intergovernmental planning.

The joint federal-state staff paper has the following recommendations:

1. That, in order to make optimum use of planning information concerning federal and federally aided development activities, the Governor of each state establish arrangements within his office or designate an agency responsible to him for the performance of the following coordinative functions:

- a. Collecting on a systematic basis planning and development information concerning federal, state and local public works, capital improvements, capital acquisitions, and associated activities.

- b. Developing of administrative arrangements for the exchange of such information between state agencies, and between the various levels of government—federal, state and local—and their agencies, including metropolitan and regional planning bodies.

- c. Representing the Governor on planning and development matters of statewide, interstate and intergovernmental concern.

2. That information concerning federal or federally supported planning for or the undertaking of activities which have a significant

impact on state planning and development be made available to the Governor's office in each state, so that it may be related to overall state planning activity. To accomplish this, it is recommended:

- a. That arrangements be devised for making available, on a systematic basis, summary information concerning development projects for which applications for federal assistance are being received from each of the various states.

- b. That arrangements be made for exploring the feasibility of providing the Governors on an orderly basis such planning information concerning contemplated federal public works as might be found relevant for the development of state comprehensive plans.

- c. That federal agencies notify the Governor when any public announcement has been made concerning action taken on any federal or federally assisted physical development project in his state.

- d. That the Governors' Conference Committee on State Planning, the White House staff, and the Bureau of the Budget cooperate with federal agencies in perfecting arrangements for transmitting the types of information referred to in this recommendation.

3. That the Governors' Conference Committee on State Planning explore with the White House staff and the Bureau of the Budget possibilities for making information developed by federal surveys of federal public works and development activities available to the Governors. In support of the foregoing, it is recommended:

- a. That the Council of State Governments canvass the Governors to discover the types of information most generally useful and needed.

- b. That the Committee and the Bureau develop procedures for providing such information to the states to the extent that it may be available and is determined by the White House and the Governors to be feasible.

4. That opportunities be provided for the regular exchange of information between Governors and federal regional officials at the periodic meetings of the Governors in the various regions.

5. That cooperative arrangements between the White House staff, the Bureau of the Budget, and the federal agencies, and the Governors' Conference Committee on State Planning, such as those used in developing these recommendations, be continued in order to seek improved mechanisms and arrangements for coordinated and joint federal-state-local planning, including arrangements for establishing in the executive branch a contact point for the Governors on such matters.

Appendix XV

SUMMARY OF POLICY ACTIONS AND RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE AT ITS 56th ANNUAL MEETING

1. Tabled, by a roll-call vote of 29 yeas to 16 nays, a motion to establish a Resolutions Committee for the regular processing of resolutions under the Articles of Organization. The effect was to continue the prohibition of resolutions except by suspension of the articles. (Pages 10-12)
2. Adopted Rules of Procedure as proposed by the Executive Committee, after defeating two amendments offered from the floor. (Pages 12-19)
3. Defeated, by a roll-call vote of 18 yeas to 25 nays, a motion to suspend the Articles of Organization in order to consider a proposed resolution on civil rights. (Pages 58-61)
4. Suspended the Articles of Organization and adopted a motion calling for a committee study of election laws and communications media operations "to explore ways and means of furthering the public interest in the handling and reporting of election results." (Pages 116-18)
5. Amended the Articles of Organization (Articles IV and V) so as to empower the Executive Committee "to authorize the creation of standing, special project or study committees of the Governors' Conference, and to assign and reassign to such committees the studies authorized by the Conference." It was agreed that the newly elected Executive Committee should review the existing committee structure in the light of the amendment. (Pages 118-19)
6. Suspended the Articles of Organization and adopted a motion requesting the Executive Committee to study and make appropriate recommendations to the states for the standardization of statistical data in reporting, analyzing and evaluating governmental services. (Pages 119-22)
7. Referred to the Committee on Public Health and Welfare a resolution which would have called for assessment by the individual states of the problems of older citizens. (Page 126)
8. Suspended the Articles of Organization and adopted resolutions dealing with the National Guard, Civil Defense and Post-Attack Recovery, and appreciation to the host state, the guest speakers and the officers, copies of which are appended.

Resolution on the National Guard

Whereas, the unique dual status of the National Guard dispersed throughout 2,500 separate communities provides the nation a responsive combat ready reserve force in time of national emergency or war and coordinately furnishes the states a trained, disciplined force in the event of civil or natural disaster; and

Whereas, the organization, strength, training, support and disposition of the National Guard is a matter of mutual interest to the federal government and the states; and

Whereas, the federal government has often acted unilaterally with respect to the National Guard and without due consideration for the interests of the states; and

Whereas, recent published reports attributed to the Department of Defense relating to a reduction in the federal support of the reinforcing reserve elements of the National Guard would, if implemented, seriously impair the total mobilization capability of the United States, and the ability of the states to cope with local disaster;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Governors' Conference assembled this 10th day of June, 1964 in Cleveland, Ohio reaffirms its continuous and vital interest in any and all programs and plans affecting the National Guard and expresses its grave concern about any reduction in federal support for any element of the National Guard;

Be it further resolved, that a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, each member of Congress, and to appropriate officials of the Department of Defense.

Resolution on Civil Defense and Post-Attack Recovery

1. Resolved, that the Report of the Committee on Civil Defense and Post-Attack Recovery endorsing an expanded civil defense effort by all levels of government, be and it hereby is, adopted and that a copy of that report, together with a copy of this resolution, be transmitted by the Chairman of the Governors' Conference to the President of the United States and to the Chairman of the Armed Services Committees and the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate of the United States Congress;

2. Further resolved, that the Governors' Conference recommends that the Congress give the President's civil defense program, built around fallout shelter, a firm and high priority as an integral part of the national security effort;

3. Further resolved, that the 1964 Governors' Conference commends the Honorable Steuart L. Pittman, who resigned as Assistant Secretary of Defense in charge of civil defense on April 1, 1964, and the Honorable Edward A. McDermott, Director of the

Office of Emergency Planning, who is shortly to return to private life, for the significant contributions they both made in the past two years to the development of sound and effective programs for civil defense and records its appreciation for the energy, competence, and character of which they both gave so generously in the public service;

4. Further resolved, that the 1964 Governor's Conference urges the Senate Armed Services Committee to reconsider its postponement of action on H.R. 8200 since the Conference believes that the President's fallout-shelter program, of which the shelter incentive feature of H.R. 8200 is a vital element, is essential and minimal, since the Conference is convinced that the effectiveness of the fallout shelter program is not dependent upon other programs for the active continental defense, and since the Conference concurs with the Secretary of Defense that a fallout-shelter program will contribute far more to the saving of lives per dollar spent than any other active defense program;

5. Further resolved, that the Conference recommends as imperative the enactment before June 30, 1964, by the Congress of H.R. 10314, which extends the expiring matching fund provisions of the Federal Civil Defense Act;

6. Further resolved, that the federal financial assistance program for resources management be continued and an additional \$1.5 million be appropriated by the Congress for this purpose;

7. Further resolved, that each state take action to require the incorporation of fallout-shelter space-meeting criteria established by the Department of Defense, in new construction of public buildings under its jurisdiction, and that local governments be encouraged to take corresponding steps;

8. Further resolved, that each state emphasize in the coming year the licensing, marking and stocking of shelters identified by the National Shelter Survey, the training for special civil defense skills, the development of shelter allocating plans and the establishment of protected emergency operating centers to assure the continuity of state and local governments;

9. Further resolved, that the Chairman and the Vice Chairman of the Committee on Civil Defense and Post-Attack Recovery be authorized in their joint discretion and on behalf of the Governors' Conference, to appear and testify before any of the appropriate committees of the Congress of the United States so as personally to convey to the Congress the convictions of the Governors, demonstrated at each Conference for the past six years, as to the crucial significance of an adequate civil defense program and especially as to the importance of a nationwide system of fallout protection, the soundness of the proposed Federal Shelter Development Program, outlined in H.R. 8200, and the need for better understanding and affirmative leadership with respect to the nation's capabil-

ity for survival and recovery in the event of nuclear attack.

Resolution on Guest Speakers and Officers

The Governors' Conference is deeply appreciative of the participation in its Fifty-sixth Annual Meeting by the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, Former President of the United States

To the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, the Governors' Conference extends its thanks for his succinct, informative commentary on the major aspects of American foreign policy.

We are grateful, too, to the Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, for his challenging remarks in areas for which the Governors also have major responsibilities.

To our former colleague, the Honorable Frank J. Lausche, Senior Senator from our Host State, we extend our thanks for his excellent address at the State Dinner.

We appreciate the participation in the discussion of federal-state relations, a subject of enduring concern, of those former Governors now serving in the United States Congress:

Senator J. Caleb Boggs, Delaware

Senator Frank Carlson, Kansas

Senator J. Howard Edmondson, Oklahoma

Senator Ernest Gruening, Alaska

Senator Len B. Jordan, Idaho

Senator Frank J. Lausche, Ohio

Senator Milward L. Simpson, Wyoming

Finally, we wish to extend special thanks to our retiring Chairman, and to the other members of the Executive Committee for their untiring efforts to make this the successful meeting that it has been, and for their energetic leadership throughout the year.

Resolution of Appreciation to the Host State

The Fifty-sixth Annual Meeting of the National Governors' Conference greatly appreciates the gracious hospitality, superb organization and outstanding cooperation of participating officials which have made this 1964 Conference one of the most successful in the history of our organization.

We particularly commend Host Governor, James A. Rhodes, and Ohio Conference Chairman Curtis Lee Smith, and their staffs and volunteers for the excellent advance planning and skillful coordination of facilities, programs and services which anticipated and met our every need and have made this a most memorable occasion.

We are grateful to the General Motors Corporation and the Ohio State Patrol for the courteous driving and excellent transpor-

tation throughout the Conference. Also for the efficient security provided by the Cleveland Police Force, the F.B.I. and the Secret Service. Our appreciation goes to the Sheraton-Cleveland Hotel and its staff for their efficient service and personal care in such beautiful surroundings.

The commodious facilities provided for members of the press, radio and television enabled them to maintain their very high standards in the coverage of the Conference, aided by the efficient services furnished by the Ohio Bell Telephone Company and the Western Union Telegraph Company.

A special vote of thanks to the sixty-nine corporations and other Ohio industry and business firms who provided the sponsorship of activities and the wonderful selection of delightful gifts. And we especially commend the individual sponsors of the major social events of the Conference—The National Cash Register Company; John Galbreath-Peter Ruffin and Associates; the Central National Bank of Cleveland; The Coca-Cola Company; the National City Bank of Cleveland; the Cleveland Department Stores; the Republic Steel Corporation; and the Western and Southern Life Insurance Company.

Finally, our deep and very sincere gratitude to all Greater Cleveland and Ohio citizens who participated in the Conference and contributed to its success.