

Legislative Journal.

Session 1962.

146th of the General Assembly.

Vol. 39.

HARRISBURG, PA., TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1962.

No. 19.

SENATE

TUESDAY, February 27, 1962.

The Senate met at 11:00 a. m., Eastern Standard Time.

The PRESIDENT (Lieutenant Governor John Morgan Davis) in the Chair.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. STEPHEN A. McCARREN, Assistant Pastor of St. Mary's Roman Catholic Church, Ford City, offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, Amen.

O Holy Lord, Father Almighty, Eternal God, give us to realize that we are instruments in Your hands. Make us worthy of that honor and make us good instruments. Make us realize, now and in the future, that that which is pleasing to You is automatically just and good.

Bless us with the knowledge that the only criterion of good legislation is Your divine approval and that a fearful penalty, possibly eternal punishment, will be exacted by You of those who are untrue to the faith, trust and confidence placed in them by their people. Encouraged and made steadfast by this conviction, may we bring into law only such proposals as are pleasing to Thee and in accord with Thy divine will.

Force us to realize that we shall die, but that our works will live on. Help us to serve You and our people in such a manner that we need never fear the scrutiny of Your infinite wisdom, either here or in eternity.

Forever keep us from doing that which is temporarily or personally expedient at the cost of what is morally just and right. Bring us to understand that we are personally responsible to You for every judgment that we make, both as to our personal lives as well as to public policy. Give us the grace to act accordingly, unmindful of personal cost or inconvenience.

Having so acted, may we never fear to meet You, our Creator, our Redeemer and our Judge. Amen.

JOURNAL APPROVED

The PRESIDENT. A quorum of the Senate being present, the Clerk will read the Journal of the preceding session.

The Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the preceding session, when, on motion of Mr. WEINER and Mr. RIPP, further reading was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

NOMINATIONS BY THE GOVERNOR REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

The Secretary to the Governor being introduced, presented communications in writing from His Excellency, the Governor of the Commonwealth, which were read as follows, and referred to the Committee on Executive Nominations:

MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF KUTZTOWN STATE COLLEGE

February 27, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate Karl F. Weber, R. D. 1, Emmaus, Lehigh County, for reappointment as a member of the Board of Trustees of Kutztown State College, until the third Tuesday of January 1967, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

JUSTICE OF THE PEACE

February 27, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate L. Fred Klosterman, R. D. 2, Gettysburg, Adams County, for reappointment as Justice of the Peace in and for the Township of Highland, Adams County, to serve until the first Monday of January 1964.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

HOUSE MESSAGES

HOUSE NONCONCURS IN SENATE AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE BILL

The Clerk of the House of Representatives being introduced, informed the Senate that the House has non-concurred in amendments made by the Senate to **HB 15**.

SENATE INSISTS UPON ITS AMENDMENTS NON-CONCURRED IN BY THE HOUSE TO **HB 15**, AND APPOINTS COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

Mr. WEINER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate do insist upon its amendments to House Bill No. 15, and that a Committee of Conference on the part of the Senate be appointed.

Mr. SEYLER. Mr. President, I second the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair announces, on behalf of

the President pro tempore, the appointment of Messrs. MURRAY, SEYLER and KROMER as a Committee of Conference on the part of the Senate to confer with a similar committee of the House (if the House shall appoint such committee) to consider the differences existing between the two houses in relation to House Bill No. 15.

Ordered, That the Clerk inform the House of Representatives accordingly.

HOUSE CONCURS IN SENATE AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE BILLS

He also informed the Senate that the House has concurred in amendments made by the Senate to HB 1, 28, 42, 56, 57 and 82.

STUDENTS WELCOMED TO THE SENATE

Mr. SEYLER. Mr. President, this morning, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to the Members of the Senate a group of students from York County. These students are members of a Ninth Grade Class in Pennsylvania History and Government, from one of York County's and one of Pennsylvania's finest high schools, the York Suburban Junior High School.

They are accompanied by their teacher in Pennsylvania History and Government, Mr. Robert Seyler. He often has occasion to relate to his classes anecdotes of his father's brilliant colleagues on the floor of the Senate and, I am sure it enlivens their information about Pennsylvania history.

I would request the Chair to welcome this group to the Senate.

The PRESIDENT. Will the students from York Suburban Junior High School, and Mr. Seyler, please rise in order to be greeted by the Senate?

The Senate is indeed very happy to have you with us. We do hope that by reason of your observation today, life may be made a little easier in your civics classes under Mr. Seyler.

Mr. KESSLER. Mr. President, I have the privilege of presenting to the Senate a group of 170 Ninth Grade Students from the Lampeter-Strasburg Union School District, in Lancaster County. This group is now studying State Government.

They are here on a field trip, under the direction of their instructor in civics, Mr. Silknetter.

I would appreciate it if the Chair would recognize these students.

The PRESIDENT. Will the young ladies and gentlemen of the Ninth Grade from the Lampeter-Strasburg Union School District, in Lancaster County, please rise?

We are very happy to greet you and your sponsor, Mr. Silknetter. I do hope, as I said to the class from York County, that you will observe things which will be of interest to you in your further work in your class.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, just coming into the hall of the Senate are a number of young Pennsylvanians from my home town of Lansford, in Carbon County. These are students from the Lansford High School, representing the Problems in Democracy Class. They have come to Harrisburg this morning to learn firsthand of the workings of our State Government. They are here under the leadership of their Professor, Mr. Frank Basholi. They are forty in number and I wonder whether the Chair would greet this group from Carbon County.

The PRESIDENT. Thank you, Senator Scott.

I was just a little bit worried as to whether or not you would allow them to get seated before I asked them to stand. Would the ladies and gentlemen from Lansford please rise for the proper greeting by the Senate?

Mr. WEINER. Mr. President, I dislike injecting a political note, but I am happy to see that these young ladies and gentlemen are sitting on the right side of the Senate for their indoctrination while they are in Harrisburg.

The PRESIDENT. You know, I think that was an excellent note, Senator Weiner.

Mr. SCOTT. In rebuttal, Mr. President, may I say that I have no control over the guides whatsoever, but I hope this will be changed next year?

The PRESIDENT. In any event, we are very happy to greet the class from Lansford High School. I like Lansford. I have heard a great deal about it ever since I was knee high to a duck because I was born in Shenandoah, which is not too far away. However, we are very happy to have you here and we hope that you, too, will receive some knowledge from your observations which will help you in your class work.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT GRANTED FOR IMMEDIATE CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. WEINER. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that we now proceed to the consideration of today's Calendar.

The PRESIDENT. There being no objection the Senate will proceed to the consideration of today's Calendar.

CALENDAR

THIRD READING CALENDAR

APPROPRIATION BILL ON THIRD READING AND FINAL PASSAGE

SB 7 (Pr. No. 7)—Read at length the third time and agreed to,

On the question,

Shall the bill pass finally?

The yeas and nays were taken agreeably to the provisions of the Constitution, and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—50

Bell,	Hays,	Mullin,	Staisey,
Berger,	Kalman,	Murray,	Stevenson,
Camel,	Keller,	Pechan,	Stiefel,
Chapman,	Kessler,	Probert,	Stroup,
Confair,	Kromer,	Ripp,	Taylor,
Devlin,	Lane,	Rooney,	Van Sant,
Distivostro,	Madigan,	Sarrat,	Wade,
Donohew,	Mahady,	Scott,	Wagner,
Ehrgood,	Mallery,	Seeler,	Ware, III,
Flack,	McCrest,	Seyler,	Weiner,
Fleming,	McGinnis,	Shafer,	Wolfs,
Haluska,	McMenamin,	Silvert,	Yatron,
Hawbaker,	Muller,		

NAYS—0

A majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Clerk present said bill to the House of Representatives for concurrence.

SECOND READING CALENDAR

SB 26 CALLED UP OUT OF ORDER

SB 26 (Pr. No. 27)—Without objection, the bill was

called up out of order, from page 2 of the Second Reading Calendar, by Mr. WEINER.

BILL ON SECOND READING

SB 26 (Pr. No. 27)—Read at length the second time and agreed to,

Ordered, To be transcribed for a third reading.

SENATE RESOLUTION, SERIAL NO. 22, CALLED UP OUT OF ORDER

Mr. WEINER, without objection, called up out of order from page 2 of the Calendar, Senate Resolution, Serial No. 22, entitled:

Directing the Joint State Government Commission to Study the Distribution of Premium Money to Fair Associations by the Department of Agriculture.

On the question,

Will the Senate adopt the resolution?

SENATE RESOLUTION, SERIAL NO. 22, ADOPTED

Mr. WEINER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate do adopt this resolution.

Mr. DEVLIN. Mr. President, I second the motion.

The motion was agreed to and the resolution was adopted.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 47 CALLED UP OUT OF ORDER

Mr. WEINER, without objection, called up out of order from page 2 of the Calendar, House Concurrent Resolution No. 47, entitled:

Directing Certain Departments, Boards and Commissions to File Rules and Regulations with the Legislative Reference Bureau

On the question,

Will the Senate concur in the resolution, as amended?

SENATE CONCURS IN HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 47, AS AMENDED

Mr. WEINER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate do concur in this resolution, as amended.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I second the motion.

On the question,

Will the Senate agree to the motion?

Mr. WEINER. Mr. President, I think it might be mentioned on the record that the purpose of this resolution is to have compiled in one area the regulations and rules that relate to Acts that have been passed by the Legislature. These Acts, as they are passed, become law, but they usually have appended to them the notation, or the gift actually, or power by the Legislature to the various boards, commissions and departments, which says that they will promulgate rules and regulations in conformity with this legislation.

Many of these rules and regulations not only implement the legislation originally passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate, but some of them go beyond that point, and there has been quite a bit of discussion in this area. Also, many of these rules and regulations are loose, or some of them are loose in various places, and the people who have to practice before these boards and commissions, either as administrators or people who come in contact with the board, commission

or department, sometimes are not aware of what these rules are:

Therefore, we are asking the Legislative Reference Bureau, which will have approximately nine or ten months in which to look at this entire situation, to advise the Legislature whether we have given up some of the power to these boards, departments and commissions, or whether we, in fact, have relegated too much power to them, or whether they are operating within the purview of the legislation enacted. We will give everybody a chance to deal with this. This will not be acted upon until the 1963 Session. The reason that the Legislative Reference Bureau is being asked to do this is because they are directly the instrument of the Legislature in the drafting of legislation, and they will also be able to interpret whether we have gone too far and suggest to the Legislature what action ought to be taken, and if no action is indicated, there will be no action.

At the same time, the Legislators will have in front of them a compilation of all of the rules and regulations of these boards, departments and commissions, and everyone will be aware of them.

These being public boards and these being public departments and we have opened by legislation various meetings of the Legislature, commissions and board, I feel these also ought to be open to the public and be available to them for anybody to make comment on these and deal with them so that we do not get into what has commonly been called bureaucracy at the highest level or at the lowest level. That is the reason for this resolution.

We have added an amendment to it here in the Senate, which we hope the House of Representatives will adopt. Therefore, we ask that it be considered on that basis.

Mr. BERGER. Mr. President, I thoroughly agree with Senator Weiner on what he has just said. However, it might be asked, why do we not adopt a method similar to that of the Federal Registry for the compilation of these rules and regulations of the various departments?

The answer to that, Mr. President, is that we did, and I am not so sure but what that legislation is still on the books. Certainly, if it still is, it was nullified, and it ought to be repealed or else enforced.

This method, Mr. President, may accomplish—and I certainly hope it will—what we have been trying to do for a long time, and that is to find out just what rules and regulations are promulgated under the powers given to the various bureaus, departments and commissions by the Legislature. It is a very confusing situation at the present time, and if this will assist in clarifying it, we certainly ought to do it.

And the question recurring,

Will the Senate agree to the motion?

The motion was agreed to and the resolution was concurred in, as amended.

Ordered, That the Clerk return said resolution to the House of Representatives with information that the Senate has concurred in the same with amendments in which concurrence of the House is requested.

SENATE RESOLUTION, SERIAL NO. 10, CALLED UP OUT OF ORDER

Mr. WEINER, without objection, called up out of order

from page 2 of the Calendar, Senate Resolution, Serial No. 10, entitled:

Directing the Joint State Government Commission to Study the Possibility of Locating a Community College in Philadelphia

On the question,
Will the Senate adopt the resolution?

SENATE RESOLUTION, SERIAL No. 10, ADOPTED

Mr. WEINER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate do adopt this resolution.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I second the motion.
The motion was agreed to and the resolution was adopted.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION, SERIAL NO. 105, CALLED UP OUT OF ORDER

Mr. WEINER, without objection, called up out of order from page 2 of the Calendar, Senate Concurrent Resolution Serial No. 105, entitled:

Directing the Joint State Government Commission to Study Desirability of Laws Making Tests for Phenylketonuria Mandatory for All Newborn Babies

On the question,
Will the Senate adopt the resolution?

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION, SERIAL No. 105, ADOPTED

Mr. WEINER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate do adopt this resolution.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I second the motion.

On the question,
Will the Senate agree to the motion?

Mr. SILVERT. Mr. President, will the Majority Leader explain what this resolution means?

Mr. WEINER. Mr. President, I will be very happy to, and I am glad the Senator asked that question.

This is a disease which affects young, newborn children, and it causes them to become retarded. Many people have for many years believed that retardation of children is due to something in the genes. It has also been thought that it is a result of heredity. However, it has been found that this is an attack made on the child itself. It is not known whether this is in the area of a virus, or whether it comes from some other area.

For many, many years, children had been born blind simply because no one took the precaution of putting into their eyes a special preparation of refined silver nitrate. Since that time, better drugs have appeared for that purpose and these measures have prevented blindness.

Prevention of retardation of children can come about by a very simple test being performed at a very early age. Many States, for a long period of time, never took the simple precaution to prevent blindness in newborn babies by using the silver nitrate solution. Today, our law requires that every doctor must do this. We are hopeful that if we can have them use this new method as well on newborn babies, maybe it will eliminate the necessity of the State supporting retarded youngsters.

We are asking the Joint State Government Commission to look into this problem. I am certain they will augment whatever study group that they appoint consisting of

Legislators, with doctors, pediatricians and obstetricians to serve on it as well. If we even save the life of one child or prevent one youngster from spending his life in an institution or being a burden to his family for the rest of his life, I think that we will have made a great contribution not only to the newborn children, but to the entire Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

And the question recurring,

Will the Senate agree to the motion?

The motion was agreed to and the resolution was adopted.

Ordered, That the Clerk present the same to the House of Representatives for concurrence.

SENATE RESOLUTION, SERIAL NO. 7, CALLED UP OUT OF ORDER

Mr. WEINER, without objection, called up out of order from page 2 of the Calendar, Senate Resolution, Serial No. 7, entitled:

Senate Committee to Investigate Sale of Lands to Curtiss-Wright Corporation

On the question,
Will the Senate adopt the resolution?

SENATE RESOLUTION, SERIAL No. 7, OVER IN ORDER

Mr. WEINER. Mr. President, I request that this resolution go over in order.

Mr. PECHAN. Mr. President, I have no objection to the resolution going over in its order today. We still have tomorrow to pass it.

I am reliably informed that an effort is being made—a real honest effort—by the Administration to use the facilities at Curtiss-Wright for which they were intended. It is my understanding that some Federal people are coming to Quahanna on Thursday. I have repeatedly commended the Governor for his efforts. I hope that no one in the Senate or the public suspects that there might be any politics in this resolution. I think those of us who attended the Governor's Prayer Breakfast this morning know that it was certainly nonpolitical and non-partisan. That is the way I feel about Curtiss-Wright.

We, in Pennsylvania, have an unemployment problem, a bad one, and if we can employ 1,000, 2,000, or, as was brought out when we gave the land to Curtiss-Wright, it might employ up to 10,000 people, I am sure that the sportsmen, the citizens of the Commonwealth, and industry, in general, will be more than satisfied to use that facility.

I want to say that I want to go along with the Governor's program. I think he is making an honest effort to have the Curtiss-Wright facilities used.

Mr. President, I would like to read, from page 21 of the Senate History, a part of this resolution:

"In 1961, a resolution similar to this was introduced by Senators Pechan and Kromer—the same sponsors that we have this year—in the Senate and reported from committee. At that time, we were asked not to act upon it since the Governor was then attempting to have the Federal Government give some of its defense contracts to Curtiss-Wright. Nothing came of his efforts."

Again, I want to say that it is not our purpose now

to chastise Curtiss-Wright or to discourage this or any other industry from locating here. It is our purpose to see this land utilized in a manner beneficial to the people of Pennsylvania and, if at all possible, to bring into reality the good effects envisioned in the sale and lease of this land in 1955.

I want to again reiterate what I said before. I am sure that my twenty-four Republican colleagues on this side will co-operate with the Administration in seeing that this land is put to good use.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. President, I believe if you will look at the Governor's agenda for this week, you will note that he will be in Quehanna on Thursday, at 10:00 a. m. I asked the Governor about this matter at our meeting, and he advised me that he was going there, and also that people from the Federal Government would be there with him to discuss this entire facility.

Not only is this not political, but I think it is a tragedy that many people of this area, which is somewhat of a remote area in the State of Pennsylvania, are unemployed. An honest effort was made. There were some of us who had certain reservations about this problem, and maybe some of these reservations were well-founded, as time has brought out. However, I believe we ought to be very careful about this situation, and not move too quickly on it or give it undue publicity or undue airing because it might be the type of situation which the Federal Government feels is a point of controversy, and it might not want to get involved at all.

I would like to assure everyone here in the Senate that the Governor is quite concerned about it. He made a trip to Washington about it on two occasions, and he is having the people from the Defense Department go up on Thursday at 10:00 a. m. to review the facility with him and go through it. I believe they are going to spend a good part of the day up there going over it. At that point, I think they will report back to see what action should be taken.

I think it can be done on an executive level. I think if someone is aware of the situation and is doing something about it, that is all that Senator Pechan, or I, or anybody else here is asking. That is one of the reasons why we put this resolution on the Calendar. The reason we put it on the Calendar is so that you are all aware of what the situation is and will try to do something in that direction.

The PRESIDENT. There being no objection, the resolution will go over in its order.

THIRD READING CALENDAR

SB 29 CALLED UP OUT OF ORDER

SB 29 (Pr. No. 30)—Without objection, the bill was called up out of order, from page 1 of the Third Reading Calendar, by Mr. WEINER.

BILL OVER IN ORDER

SB 29—Mr. BERGER. Mr. President, I request that Senate Bill No. 29 go over in its order.

The PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WEINER. Mr. President, I do not like to quarrel about a bill going over in its order, but this is an important measure. It is a measure which we have discussed during the last Session and during this Session.

Therefore, I think a vote should be taken on it, even though I am aware of the fact, as everyone else is, that this measure cannot possibly be enacted into law unless the House were to remain here for a few more days. I think I am not revealing any confidence when I say that we hope to adjourn sine die tomorrow.

This measure is on Third Reading and I think we should take a position on it and be counted as to how we stand.

I have no objection if the bill goes over in its order until tomorrow, except that I believe we should vote on it tomorrow. If I can obtain that assurance, I will be very happy to acquiesce to its going over.

Mr. BERGER. Mr. President, I appreciate the co-operation of the Majority Leader. I will not ask for any assurance that we will adjourn sine die tomorrow, but I understand that is in the books.

The PRESIDENT. There being no objection, the bill will go over in its order.

REGULAR ORDER OF BUSINESS RESUMED

The PRESIDENT. Consideration of today's Calendar being completed, we will now revert to the regular order of business.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS SENATE

Mr. BERGER asked and obtained unanimous consent to address the Senate.

Mr. BERGER. Mr. President, I am presenting the following resolution, signed by Senator Weiner and myself, on behalf of all the Members of this Senate. I am also sure that the officers and the employees of the Senate would gladly join in it, were they given the opportunity. It is a resolution which speaks for itself.

Mr. President, I just want to say on behalf of this resolution that it is one of congratulation and regret at the loss of two of our most prominent, valuable and well liked Senators.

Mr. President, I offer the following resolution on behalf of all the Members of the Senate, and ask for its immediate adoption.

SENATE RESOLUTION

TRIBUTE TO SENATORS CHARLES R. MALLERY AND GEORGE B. STEVENSON

Messrs. BERGER and WEINER, on behalf of the entire Membership of the Senate, offered the following resolution (Serial No. 28), which was read as follows:

In the Senate, February 27, 1962.

It is with heavy heart that Members of the Senate reconcile themselves to the sad knowledge that the next General Assembly will convene without Senators Mallery and Stevenson. Between them they possess fifty-two years of experience in this body. They have served through practically every kind of an emergency that can face a government. They have served well, and they have learned much. Their good judgement and wise counsel are sought by all of the Senators on both sides of the aisle and they are both ever ready to extend their full efforts to any task before them.

Both of them are attorneys-at law with a broad knowledge of law and government. Both have served with distinction on the Local Government Commission and have brought dignity to every committee to which they have been assigned. They have done this at great personal sacrifice to themselves. Whenever their time and

energy were required by both their law practice and their legislative duties, the personal work was always put aside and the public duty done.

Such men are few and the Senate can ill afford their loss. But they have earned the rest they now seek. They have served long and well and, in the estimation of all of us, they have served above and beyond the call of duty; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Members of the Senate congratulate Senators Charles R. Mallery and George B. Stevenson on their long and successful careers and, on behalf of the people of Pennsylvania, thank them for a good job well done; and be it further

RESOLVED, That we wish them well in their retirement and pray that they will at least find time to just enjoy themselves, although we will warrant that whenever the public needs them, they will put aside their pleasure and serve. We wish good luck and long life to two real gentlemen; and be it further

RESOLVED, That copies of this resolution be delivered to Senators Mallery and Stevenson.

On the question,

Will the Senate adopt the resolution?

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I want the Members of the Senate to know that I, too, will greatly miss Senator Mallery and Senator Stevenson.

When I came to this Senate quite a number of years ago, I had the pleasure of working with Senator Mallery and Senator Stevenson on the Pennsylvania Local Government Commission. I feel that my association with these gentlemen has enlightened me a great deal with reference to the over-all operation of local government in Pennsylvania. As a matter of fact, when I heard that Senator Stevenson and Senator Mallery were going to retire, I talked with both of them and I tried to talk them out of it. I do not feel the Senate will be just right if we do not see these two gentlemen in their seats, working together.

I want to express to Senator Stevenson and to Senator Mallery my personal appreciation for their leadership and for permitting me the right to associate with them. Frankly, I still hope that they will change their minds.

I talked with Senator Stevenson on about four different occasions and I said: "You know, Senator, this Senate is your life. If you leave this Senate, you are going to change rapidly and you will be inactive." I gave him all sorts of threats, so to speak, because I would like to see him stay.

I repeat, Mr. President, that I do not believe there is any Member of the Senate any closer to me than Senator George Stevenson.

Mr. STIEFEL. Mr. President, when I came to the Senate of the General Assembly, in 1937, Senator Mallery was already here, rounding out either his first or second term. Then, in 1939, it was my privilege to meet Senator Stevenson.

The best way to describe these two individuals is to say that the definition of a gentleman, by Emerson, admirably suits them. They speak in monosyllables, they speak emphatically, and they possess great humility. This, in my opinion, is the greatest asset of a gentleman.

There is one thing which I would like to stress and underscore, and that is what Senator Stevenson did when he served as Chairman of the Committee on Local Government. It is to his credit that no bill which was referred to that committee ever remained without any evaluation or, as they say in slang, without a shake. Everything was considered, whether the bill reached the floor of the

Senate or not. For this, the people of Pennsylvania owe him a debt of gratitude.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, it happened that I traveled in Pennsylvania, from Beaver to Wayne, and from Warren to York and, therefore, I know my Pennsylvania. I visited these two gentlemen in the very communities where they live. If you will come to Philadelphia and ask who Senator Stiefel is, there will be many people who will not know me because the city is immense. However, when you go to Lock Haven or to Blair County and ask where Senator Stevenson or Senator Mallery lives, they will give you all the details, just like the women in the Bible. When Saul came to ask for Samuel,—referring to the First Book of Samuel—they poured out all the information. This also applies to Senator Stevenson and Senator Mallery in their respective communities. The information is the best. That shows that they live among their people and the people like it.

It is, indeed, most regrettable that we will be lacking the warmth of their personalities in their final, true American attitude toward all the problems which came before us.

Mr. SEYLER. Mr. President, I have been listening to the speeches here about these two gentlemen who are retiring. It may be presumptuous of me, perhaps, as one of the relatively newer Members, to say a few words.

However, I want to say that I believe in losing these two gentlemen, who have announced that they are not going to seek re-election, the Senate is losing two of its steadiest hands and wisest heads. I think all of my colleagues can remember many occasions when there was considerable partisan turmoil in this chamber. These men, who are now leaving us, were the centers about which we could restore the stability and equilibrium that we often need.

I must say that Senator Stevenson has left his mark on the problem of the relationship between State Government and local government, which is historic in its importance. I think future students of this subject in Pennsylvania and in the Nation will find that the influence of Senator George Stevenson on the development of a sound basis for a relationship between local and State Government is one of the most important things that has happened during my time in this Senate.

Mr. STAISEY. Mr. President, it may be presumptuous of me also to comment on the two colleagues who are retiring. However, whenever any of us gain something from somebody, I think it is worthy of comment. I know that during my first year here, Senator Stevenson and Senator Mallery were very helpful to me in giving me of their experience and judgment.

In leaving the Senate, I do not think they are retiring. On the contrary, however, because of the kind of men they are, I prefer to think that they are re-tiring in the sense that they are re-reading and going on to other activities.

I sincerely hope that it might be said of me some day, when I leave this Body, what I would like to say of them. These two Senators, in all of their works and all of their deeds, have always left the people better off than when they found them. Mr. President, this is a real testament to dedicated public service.

Mr. PECHAN. Mr. President, yesterday we Republicans got together and had a little luncheon and party

for our two retiring Senators. Our remarks, of course, did not go into the record, but I think everybody knows of the esteem in which we hold these two gentlemen, especially myself. I think when I came to the Senate, I was perhaps the greenest fellow who ever walked into these halls. My contemporary here agrees that I still am.

I want to say that George Stevenson and Charley Mallery took me in hand. I cannot vouch for the final product, but I can say that as a result of knowing these two fine gentlemen, Al Pachan is perhaps a better Legislator and a better citizen.

We are going to miss these gentlemen very, very much. I am not going to make a lengthy speech, because I might break down and cry. However, very frankly, the people of Pennsylvania are actually going to be the losers rather than this small group of fifty people.

As Senator Staisey said, and as I said yesterday, I have hopes that when I leave the Senate, my colleagues will have the same feeling for me that we have for these two gentlemen.

I could say, facetiously perhaps, that Bill Lane and Senator Scyler would never get up and say the nice things about me that we say about Senator Stevenson and Senator Mallery.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. President, I want to assure the gentleman that if he were leaving, we certainly would say those nice things about him.

Mr. SILVERT. Mr. President, after hearing these nice words about George Stevenson and Charles Mallery, it makes me feel a little homesick and almost makes me wish that I were leaving, too.

Mr. President, I first met Senator Stevenson, of all places, at the Wissachickon Barracks in World War I. That was in 1918. I did not see Senator Stevenson then until 1951, when I came to the Senate. That was thirty-three years later. We looked at each other, and we complimented each other. I thought he looked younger than he did in 1918, and he returned the compliment.

I want to say that last night Senator Stevenson was good enough to introduce me to a very close friend of his at a dinner that we had together. He told this friend of his: "Martin Silvert, here, is a great fellow. There is only one thing that is wrong with him. He is a Democrat." Well, it sort of took me back, and I simply said: "Well, you know, nobody can be perfect."

So, I say to Senator Mallery and Senator Stevenson, even though they are Republicans, I forgive them because nobody can be perfect.

Mr. HAJUSKA. Mr. President, it is no more than fitting that I should add to the few remarks that have been said about our two colleagues, my friends, George Stevenson and Charlie Mallery. Senator Mallery is a neighbor of mine and a friend of many years, and that can also be said of Senator Stevenson.

I rise because the burden they leave is placed upon my shoulders. It is now my duty to replace Senator Stevenson, and no one realizes more than I do the task before me. I have no hope whatsoever to better his record. I have served on the Local Government Committee for many years, under the leadership and guidance of Senator Stevenson. We traveled throughout the State. We met in many cities, and at all times, I have never found any person more courteous and more honest about his convictions than the then Chairman of our Committee,

Senator Stevenson. He leaves behind a great record. I trust that he, along with Senator Mallery, will continue to stay with this committee for the balance of this year, because, the Lord knows, I need their help. I shall try to the best of my ability to come close—not to better—at least to the record he leaves behind.

The PRESIDENT. Senator Stevenson, on behalf of the employes and officers of the Senate, there is very little left to be said, except, that, as you see here today, we all love you, and we wish you great happiness and good health in your retirement. We do hope you will come back here and visit often. That, of course, also applies to Senator Mallery.

Would you like to respond, Senator Stevenson?

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, from the depths of my heart, I appreciate all that has been said here and done here today.

I have been in this Senate now almost a quarter of a century. When I came here, I came here to work, and I have tried to do a conscientious job across these years. However, anything that I may have accomplished has been through teamwork. I do not lay claim to any super knowledge and I do not lay claim to any unusual great abilities.

At one time, I coached football and basketball teams, and my theme was always teamwork, and through teamwork, we had some great teams. I have carried that same thought here in the Senate. I appreciate the co-operation of all of these men here in the Senate and how they have helped me. I do not know everything about local government, but I have been a serious student of it for a lifetime. I taught it in the schools at one time, and it has been a hobby of mine over the years. I have tried to keep abreast with the times to see that the political subdivisions of Pennsylvania had modern tools with which to give the people good service. Any accomplishments were only possible with the help of these people. Senator Lane especially has been a tremendous help to me. Bill and I have sat down and talked local government. These younger fellows, as they have come along,—Harry Scyler and the others on both sides of the aisle—have been a great help. We know no aisle in local government. All we have been interested in is to do something that would help.

In the height of sincerity, it has been a great privilege and an opportunity for me to do my part in helping to have the people live better and more richly.

This Senate is a great organization. It has always reminded me of my life in college and law school, when I lived in a fraternity house. We had a great bunch of fellows and we had a lot of fun, but we had a job to do. We had to study. The same thing obtains here in the Senate. We have a grand bunch of fellows here. We have fun, but we have a serious job. Making laws is serious business. So, I have always sort of felt that here I am, when I came down here in 1936, back in college and law school again with a grand bunch of fellows.

I am going to carry away with me some very, very happy memories. It has been grand to know all of these people. During this quarter of a century, I have seen a tremendous number of Senators come and go. Some day, I would like to sit down and just count them. It is amazing the turnover that has taken place here in the Senate over the years.

I make a remark yesterday that when I came here in 1939, on this side of the aisle there were fourteen Senators elected. Eight years ago, the last one of those left me, and for the past eight years, I have been the only one of those fourteen here in the Senate. That gives you some idea of the turnover that, unfortunately, occurs in a body of this type. I believe in a continuity of service. People get broken into the harness here and begin to get a full understanding of what the whole processes of government are, and I think it is just too bad that they do not stay longer. I know that quite often they have to do it—and I know I did it—at great personal sacrifice. However, it has been my life, and I have loved it down here. I love everybody here. As I say, I am leaving here with tremendously happy and pleasant memories, and I thank everyone for their kind and gracious remarks. They are nice to hear, even though they do overgrace you. However, they are nice to hear, anyway. Thank you so much, gentlemen.

The PRESIDENT. Thank you, Senator Stevenson. The privilege has been on our part and not on yours.

Before we go any further, I have been asked by the members of the Press—the reporters here who have worked with you—to tell you that they hold you in the highest affection and regard.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. President, I do not wish to be redundant or to repeat all of the very nice things which have been said, but I feel in my heart that, as a newcomer, I should say a few words about these two gentlemen.

In the early part of 1961, when I took office as Senator, I had a problem in one of the boroughs in my county. After discussing it with some of the other Senators, they referred me to Senator Stevenson. I went to him and he extended me a helping hand. He did some research on the problem which was before us and, within a few days, he sent me a lengthy letter, explaining all the aspects of the problem. In addition to that, Mr. President, he discussed it with me personally and it is for that reason that I feel this is the time when I should get up and express my thanks to him.

I would also like to extend my gratitude to Senator Mallery, who was a member of my Agriculture Committee. I, as a newcomer, was named Chairman of the Agriculture Committee and, believe me, I was shaky at some of those early meetings. However, Senator Mallery is a man who is very kind and, rather than trying to embarrass me, he tried to help and tried to work out the problems that were before us in that committee, the same as did many of the other Members.

Therefore, Mr. President, I would like to say that I am happy to have been associated with these two gentlemen, although it has been only for a short time. I will be benefiting from the association which I have enjoyed with them, and I wish both gentlemen well in the future years.

Mr. MCGINNIS. Mr. President, I know Senator Stevenson and Senator Mallery do not have to hear a word from me in order to know how I have appreciated them.

I came to this Senate in 1935 and was later out for four years. However, since I have been in the Senate, I never knew a man on this floor, Republican or Democrat, who was not a gentleman. These two men have been very helpful to me on many, many an occasion. I hope

that their decision to retire might yet be changed. I think they might come back and make us all happy.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I want to second Senator McGinnis's remarks. I think they should take a little time to think it over and count ten before they take any action. I think they should stay.

The PRESIDENT. I know there is no necessity of taking a vote but formally this is required.

And the question recurring,

Will the Senate adopt the resolution?

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS SENATE

Mr. KALMAN asked and obtained unanimous consent to address the Senate.

Mr. KALMAN. Mr. President, I am about to offer two resolutions. The first resolution deals with the economic situation of Fayette County and is being introduced on behalf of Senator Murray and myself, and deals generally with legislation now pending in the United States Congress.

SENATE RESOLUTIONS

MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO SUPPORT AND ENACT INTO LEGISLATION ANTIRECESSION PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS IN DEPRESSED AND DISTRESSED ECONOMIC AREAS

Mr. KALMAN offered the following resolution (Serial No. 29), which was read, considered and adopted:

In the Senate, February 27, 1962.

Twenty-five per cent of the employable population of Fayette County is unemployed. Thirty-five per cent of the employable population of the Brownsville area, in Fayette County, is unemployed.

Twenty-two thousand of 175,000 residents of Fayette County are receiving assistance. The 3,596 cases on public assistance due to unemployment compromise 17,219 persons.

The pilot program of the food stamp program in Pennsylvania, for those receiving assistance and those whose income is below the United States Department of Commerce standards for the number of persons in the family, shows \$3,000,000 worth of sales in eight months.

Twenty-four thousand persons were employed in the coal mines of Fayette County from 1940 to 1948. Currently, there are but 4,500 persons so employed.

Unemployment in Fayette County, Pennsylvania and in other depressed areas is causing misery, hunger and deprivation to thousands of honest persons desiring employment; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the Congress of the United States to support and enact into legislation antirecession public works projects in depressed and distressed economic areas, especially those having unemployment in excess of fifteen per cent of the employable population and more than ten per cent of the population on public assistance; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of each house of the Congress of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO ENACT INTO LEGISLATION THE BILL ENTITLED "STAND-BY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 1962"

Messrs. KALMAN and MURRAY offered the following resolution (Serial No. 30), which was read, considered and adopted:

In the Senate, February 27, 1962.

President Kennedy, on February 18, 1962, sent to Congress legislation to give him power to start not in excess of \$2,000,000,000 of public works projects in the early stage of any business slump. Under the bill, the President would be permitted to act when unemployment had risen in three out of four or four out of six consecutive months by not less than one percentage point.

The bill would allow use of the funds when needed and not be subject to any delay rendering the program ineffective. This, of course, would render great aid to the entire Country in any time of economic recession; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the Congress of the United States to support and enact into legislation the bill entitled the "Stand-by Capital Improvements Act of 1962"; and be it further

RESOLVED, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of each house of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

DIRECTING THE JOINT STATE GOVERNMENT COMMISSION TO STUDY CERTAIN FUNCTIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS

Mr. BELL offered the following resolution (Serial No. 31), which was read as follows:

In the Senate, February 27, 1962.

RESOLVED, That the Joint State Government Commission be directed to study and investigate:

1. The basis for the allocation and expenditure of funds in connection with the construction, reconstruction, resurfacing and maintenance of State highways.

2. The effectiveness of existing programs relating to the maintenance of State highways.

3. Whether the present system wherein the Secretary of Highways has authority and power to expend the proceeds from gasoline and motor fuel taxes as he deems best is in the best interest of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Joint State Government Commission report to the next session of the General Assembly its findings and recommendations, with particular emphasis on the correction of deficiencies found in the organization and operation of the Department of Highways, with drafts of legislation necessary to carry the recommendations into effect.

Mr. BELL. Mr. President, the question might be raised as to why I waited until the twenty-third hour to present this resolution. The reason is that yesterday, I was almost hit by another automobile, on my way here to Harrisburg, on U. S. Highway Route 13, which was dodging a big pothole. Also, last Thursday, for the first time in my legislative career of almost eight years, I was able to get hold of the figures which show how the State Highway money is spent in Pennsylvania.

This is no attack on a wonderful Secretary of Highways, Park Martin. He is a fine administrator and I believe he has done a wonderful job under the conditions he has had to work. However, these shortcomings, I believe, are the result of a system which exists in Pennsylvania, whereby the State Highways are controlled by one man.

Down around where I live, it is a very short trip to go to the State of Delaware, and their roads are in very good shape. I am very close to the State of New Jersey where their roads are also in very good shape. It is common talk in my county that you know when you hit Pennsylvania because of the roads.

Last week, when I talked about the appropriation bill,

I touched the sacred cow. I think today, I am probably daring to touch the sacred calf of State Government. Under an Act of 1929, we have given to one man the sole authority to determine how, when and where, in this year, \$414,000,000 are to be spent. This means \$414,000,000 to be spent at the discretion of one man.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am just going to take this apart. First of all, I am going to talk about where it is to be spent. In Delaware County, we have five per cent of the people in the Commonwealth and five per cent or more of the taxes come from Delaware County. I have examined the figures and I find that across-the-board, for every dollar that Delaware County spends, and which goes to the Motor License Fund, seventy-five per cent of that is spent elsewhere. In other words, we are short-changed seventy-five cents on a dollar.

I am going to read some figures. Last year, for constructing and reconstructing, there was \$153,000,000 spent in Pennsylvania. Delaware County had \$1,694,000. On the basis of population and on the basis of how this money is collected, we should have had \$7,683,000. We spent \$21,000,000 for resurfacing roads last year. One hundred and sixty-seven thousand was spent in my county. We should have had over \$1,000,000 spent in that county. On maintenance, \$63,000,000 was spent in Pennsylvania last year and, again, we had the story of discrimination because we had \$983,000 spent in Delaware County. We should have had \$3,200,000.

Now my good friends from Philadelphia are likewise in this shortchange business. In the over-all six districts, which include the counties of Bucks, Chester, Montgomery, Delaware and Philadelphia, you have the same, sad, sorry story. For every dollar coming out of those six districts, twenty-five cents comes back.

Without mentioning names, there is one county in Pennsylvania that had 36,000 people in it, or one-fifteenth the size of my county. Yet, last year, for maintenance of their highways, there was twenty-five per cent more money spent in that county than in Delaware County.

In this resolution, I am asking that the Joint State Government Commission study whether the decisions of the Secretary of Highways are proper, whether the 1929 law is good today, and whether one man should have this tremendous power of allocation of almost one-half million dollars. Gentleman, is this not worthy of a legislative study? We know what resolutions we have sent to the Joint State Government Commission. We have sent nothing compared to the importance of this item.

I am going to say a few words about how the money which is allocated is spent. First of all, in Delaware County, our highways are antiquated and worn out. I called this to the Secretary's attention many, many times. I have written hundreds of letters complaining to the District Engineer, but we are still shortchanged.

I am appalled at the road conditions. Last night, I happened to drive over some State highways in the city of Philadelphia. I was amazed to find that the serious pothole conditions about which I complained last week on this floor, on the Gray's Ferry Bridge, are still there and the bridge is deteriorating. In the county of Philadelphia, as in Delaware County, little potholes are left to grow. They do not believe that a stitch in time will save the seat of your pants. That is the way our highways are going.

Gentlemen, when you ride down the Schuylkill Expressway, a new highway, unless something is done on the bridge immediately west of City Line, you are going to have trouble. It is deteriorating because of no maintenance.

U. S. Highway 1, going south from Philadelphia, in my county, is two years old and is full of longitudinal cracks which are twenty and thirty feet long. These were not repaired for winter and already you will see small potholes in a two-year-old highway. Gentlemen, I could go on and I could read into the record hundreds and hundreds of instances. I am very much concerned about it because where you have no maintenance or improper maintenance, the roads deteriorate rapidly.

Last evening, I was in the company of a number of Army Reserve Officers and one of them, who holds the rank of full colonel and who has numerous battlefield decorations, called to my attention certain State Highways in the southeastern Pennsylvania area. He said he has seen better roads, in better condition, on battlefields after shell fire has hit them than these State Highways. I think that is something which we should concern ourselves with.

Yesterday, I drove down to a meeting which I could not avoid attending and I had to leave early. One of the local radio stations had a program entitled, "What is on your Mind?" All the complaints that came in were about the horrible condition of the State Highways in southeastern Pennsylvania. This man broke an axle, and this man had his tire blown out by hitting potholes. I talked to an official of the Teamsters Union and he told me they are having many accidents with their big trucks because they hit these potholes, doing damage to the trucks, and the first time they find out about it is when they jackknife on something like the Turnpike.

Gentlemen, I am not making this as a personal attack on the Department of Highways. I am making it as a personal attack on this Legislature. We have sat by and let this system continue. I do not say that I have the answer; I do not know the answer. I am not an investigator. However, I do know that when you see crews of men along the road, one working, one with a flag and six watching, it is wrong. I believe there is nothing as vital to this Commonwealth as highway safety. I am convinced that when we allow these potholes, tank traps and deteriorated highways to exist, we are endangering the people of the Commonwealth.

Mr. President, that is my message this morning. I am sorry I broke up the very friendly atmosphere which existed here with the nice congratulatory message to Senator Mallery and Senator Stevenson. However, I am worried about these roads and I think it is incumbent upon the Senate of Pennsylvania, even at this eleventh hour, to do something.

The PRESIDENT. Senator Bell, did you ask for the immediate consideration of this resolution?

Mr. BELL. Mr. President, I will yield to the Majority Leader. If he desires to submit it to the Rules Committee, and it is submitted, I would like it brought back to the floor tomorrow.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. President, I object to the resolution being considered at this time. If it is submitted to the Rules Committee, I assure the gentleman there will be a meeting of the Rules Committee, at which time it will

be brought up. I cannot promise him that it will be returned to the floor. I have taken up every resolution that has ever been submitted to the committee. I have never held any out.

I would just like to point out to the gentleman that the highway about which he is speaking—U. S. No. 1—is one of the most heavily traveled highways in the Country, and it happens to go through his area. Also, one of the problems we have been having is that for a long time—for many, many years—these highways have been neglected. A lot of the trouble came from the townships, the boroughs and the counties looking after these roads, and it got to be such a hodgepodge that it became very difficult to know whose responsibility this matter truly was.

We do have I think in Pennsylvania one of the finest group of people, barring none, working in the Highways Department. I think the present Secretary is not only a very capable man, but he is cognizant of many, many of the problems that go on.

I also would like to point out to the gentleman that many of the people who worked in the highway sheds in the past years are still there, and they were there eight and ten years ago or longer. There has been very little change. This maladministration is not a new thing—if there is maladministration and I do not know if there is—and the problem that we are discussing here is one of the long range type that I do not think the Joint State Government Commission or anyone can take up.

I would respectfully suggest to the gentleman that he take a walk over to the Highway Department to see the head of the department, or invite him to come over here. Either way, I am sure there will be no problem about it. I think a free discussion of this problem between the two of them and anyone else who wants to sit in would bring this matter to a head, rather than have the Joint State Government Commission convene and take lengthy testimony when the Highways Department is going to tell you they are the best in the world, and where the Legislators are going to be taking pot shots at them, and they are going to try to build a fence around themselves. If they sat down and calmly tried to iron out the situation, I think they could come to some understanding without a resolution, or the Joint State Government Commission or wasting a lot of time, effort and energy.

I would also like to point out to the gentleman that for many years, Delaware County—and that is all I am speaking about at the moment—has done very well in having the Department of Highways take over a good bit of the county responsibility by taking over these highways. Although, they have only five per cent of the population, I am sure that you will find proportionately they have had a great deal more of their highways taken over by the State. With this extra load being put on them without extra funds coming to them, you can soon see what situation will develop.

If we are going to shed tears here about counties, I might begin by saying a few words on behalf of Philadelphia, where we have one-fifth of the population, and I will assure you that of the proportionate share of the tax money we pay into the State, we get very little back. Also, the proportionate area in roads taken back for maintenance by the State is also very, very low, and not in keeping with the proportionate share of money that we pay to the State, the Motor Fund or anything else.

As a matter of fact, four years ago I made the offer—and I repeat the offer—that if Philadelphia could keep the money that it puts into the Motor Fund in its own area for maintenance of its own highways, we would not ask the State to take over one inch of our highway system, and I can assure you we would have no difficulty in taking care of that problem.

I never found anybody here in this Legislature to take me up on that offer or even offer to co-sponsor legislation along those lines. However, if you want to reconsider it, Senator Bell, I will be delighted to join with you, and you will have no difficulty from us and the State can divide that money the way they want from that point on.

Mr. BELL. Mr. President, I would like to answer the Majority Leader.

First of all, the Majority Leader brought up the fact that a lot of this stuff goes back a long time. In Delaware County, it goes back for eight years, the eight years that the Democrats have controlled the maintenance of our highways.

It is an open secret that Mr. Martin, the Secretary of Highways, has no power of hiring and firing on the county level. If you want to verify that, ask Mr. Martin.

Secondly, Mr. President, these State Highways I am talking about surely are the big ones with heavy traffic, because I did not want to burden the shoulders of this Senate with the horrible condition of the secondary roads; roads that are so horribly potholed that traffic can only go on one lane and where people are hitting other cars consistently in my county. The condition of our secondary roads in Delaware County—the roads of the State Highways Department which have been on the map since Governor Pinchot put them there—is horrible.

I will tell you about Highway 320. It is known as the Sproul Road. It is a very important road. It was an adequate road in 1922, but nothing has been done since 1922. In fact, in 1922, the road surface was much better because now it is all broken up. Sometimes you can even see steel reinforcement rods from the concrete poking up in the air, snagging cars as they go by. These conditions are on our State Highways.

You asked me to walk over and talk to the Secretary of Highways. I have walked over there, and I have a long file which I can produce.

Now, finally, let us talk about Philadelphia. I wish you Senators from Philadelphia would get as hot under the collar at the way you have been shortchanged in your highways as I am about Delaware County. I would suggest you take a trip up Roosevelt Boulevard. I was talking with a man last night, and he said it was in horrible condition. However, I am not going up there. That is your responsibility.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. President, I will take exception to the resolution that has been introduced by Senator Bell, and I certainly will take exception to a few of the remarks made about the Secretary of Highways.

The Office of Secretary of Highways and the Highways Department of Pennsylvania are in no way, shape or form a one-man operation. For the first time in the history of the Commonwealth, they have a real team over there. There are twelve districts in this Commonwealth, and each District Engineer programs his work for the next year. It is then taken into the Secretary of Highways, and

the Secretary of Highways gives it to his deputies and other individuals working over there, and they come up with a plan. For the first time, Pennsylvania has had a real road plan, and not a plan that has been guided under the guise of political secrecy. Everybody knows what is going on. You can get that information from the Pennsylvania Road Constructors, who have worked very closely with the Secretary of Highways. If one hodgepodge or one rut in one road causes an investigation like this, I think it shows that Pennsylvania is doing a very good job.

We have 42,000 miles of State Highways in Pennsylvania. That is more roads than all of the New England States, New York, New Jersey and Ohio put together, and I think we are doing a very good job.

Mr. BELL. Mr. President, I did not attack Secretary Martin. I want that clear. For the benefit of the Senator from Northampton County, I do not know how many people you have in your county, but I have the figures in front of me as to how much was spent in your county during the past few years, and I would like to put that into the record.

In Northampton County, last year, Senator,—in the last fiscal year—you had spent for new construction in your county, \$2,861,000. In my county of Delaware, with its 552,000 people, we had spent for new construction \$1,694,000. You may think that is fair. I do not.

Mr. ROONEY. Senator, I do not know what the road program in Delaware County was last year or the year before last. However, I am sure the Delaware County residents have had their fair share of highway construction during the past seven years. You cannot just take one year out and make a comparison with Northampton County. Northampton County has needed road construction for many, many years, and finally, with the realistic gasoline tax that we passed, we are getting our fair share of work that has been long overdue. I think every county—everyone of the sixty-seven counties in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania—is getting its fair share of highway construction.

You did attack Secretary Martin, because in your opening statement you said: "... one man. How can one man ascertain where each gasoline dollar is going?" I think that is a reflection on Secretary Martin.

You also mentioned the fact that Secretary Martin does not have the right to hire or fire individual employees in the districts. I can assure you that each District Engineer can fire any employee who is not doing a good job. I have seen it in my own county, and I have heard about it in other counties. Certainly, there are political repercussions at times, but what we need regarding highways is good, able-bodied men to run the show.

If you will remember, last year, for the first time in the history of the Commonwealth, we took an additional 900 men and put them under Civil Service so we could get capable and able workers in our Highway Department. I think this is a sign of what the Secretary is trying to do, and what this Administration is trying to do to improve the Highway Department. The original bill that was introduced would have taken in 3,600 but it was whittled down to 900, both by Republican and Democratic amendments.

The PRESIDENT. There being objection to the im-

mediate consideration of this resolution, it is referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. WADE. Mr. President, I understand that the resolution has been referred to the Committee on Rules.

I certainly would have liked to participate in some of the debate in regard to highway funds, but that matter has been resolved for the moment, as I understand it.

The PRESIDENT. That is correct, Senator Wade. The resolution has been referred to the Committee on Rules.

MEMBERS OF THE VIRGINIA COMMISSION ON CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT PRESENTED TO SENATE

Mr. WADE. Mr. President, I take great pleasure in presenting to this honorable body, and to you, a group of distinguished visitors from Virginia. They are members of the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government. They are led by the Honorable David J. Mays, who is Chairman of this Virginia Commission. I might say to the Senate that they are not of the same political faith as I am, but I heartily concur in their beliefs and in their principles.

Mr. President, I would like to introduce these gentlemen individually to you and to all of the Members. However, I would consider it a special favor if you would call to the Chair Mr. David J. Mays for a few remarks. I am sure we all appreciate their taking time from their very busy schedules and coming here to bring their message to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

I ask you, Mr. President, to take over from here.

The PRESIDENT. Thank you, Senator Wade. The Chair is very happy to recognize this important Commission from our sister Commonwealth. I wonder whether Mr. Mays will come forward, please?

Members of the Senate, I now present Mr. David J. Mays, who is Chairman of the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government.

REMARKS BY DAVID J. MAYS, CHAIRMAN OF THE VIRGINIA COMMISSION ON CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. HAYS. Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I think I can best show my appreciation for this invitation by not abusing it. I know how busy you are.

Our Commission has been operating for four years, having been set up by the General Assembly of Virginia for the purpose of teaching something of constitutional principles in our State and elsewhere. It was a great joy to us to have some of your colleagues with us in Virginia last fall, and to have been with them last night and today.

We are attempting to teach the Constitution anew. There are no overtones there or undertones. That is it, and that is all of it.

We are appointed by the Governor of Virginia, and some of us by the President of the Senate and some by the Speaker of the House, all of whom have asked me to extend to you their greetings.

As I came through these lovely halls today and saw the magnificent architecture, the marble and the artwork, I could not help but contrast it with our own Capitol, which has a simplicity, a Grecian simplicity which Jefferson gave it, and, of course, without the

decoration that funds would really require. As I came in,—and I will conclude with this—I said to one of my colleagues: "This is one of the most magnificent Capitols I ever saw." He said: "Yes, it is, but you must remember that they won the war."

The PRESIDENT. Thank you, Mr. Mays. Will the other members of the Commission please rise?

We have here with us these gentlemen who certainly respond, as does our own Senate, on the question of constitutional government.

I would like you gentlemen to know that I spent a very delightful day with your Governor, J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., and his lovely wife. I enjoyed it very much and I was very much impressed by the kind of government you have in Virginia.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS SENATE

Mr. STIEFEL asked and obtained unanimous consent to address the Senate.

Mr. STIEFEL. Mr. President, the resolution I am about to offer might resurrect some ghosts which plagued this Senate during the Session of 1961. One of the burning questions of that time was the question of the advisability of having a court administrator for the city of Philadelphia and for Allegheny County.

I respectfully submit to the Senate of the General Assembly that a searching analysis and a thorough study of the situation would indicate there is a backlog of untried cases. This problem is probably close to you, Mr. President, as a former Judge of Court of Common Pleas No. 4.

The judiciary in Philadelphia,—by this, I mean the Courts of Common Pleas and the County Court of Philadelphia—time and again, has been accused because of the backlog of untried cases. All kinds of remedies were offered, but the most important, which is to assay the cause of it and why there are backlogs of cases, was never ascertained. It is common knowledge that what we need in Philadelphia is more courtrooms or, probably, a new court building which would be away from the hustle and bustle of the city. In that way, the judiciary would be able to proceed with its work.

I feel it is now high time that the Joint State Government Commission undertakes, within the next few months separating us from the Session of 1963, a thorough, searching study in order to find out the tenability of such a new court building in order to remove the judiciary from the milling crowds around City Hall, from the traffic and from the pandemonium, to a quiet place where they can attend to their work.

Therefore, Mr. President, I now offer this resolution.

SENATE RESOLUTION

DIRECTING THE JOINT STATE GOVERNMENT COMMISSION TO STUDY THE NEED FOR NEW COURT FACILITIES IN PHILADELPHIA

Mr. STIEFEL offered the following resolution (Serial No. 32), which was read as follows:

In the Senate, February 27, 1962.

In recent years, unwarranted criticism has been repeatedly leveled at the Courts of Philadelphia County because of accumulating backlogs of untried cases. Concomitant with this carping and bitter criticism,

totally defying logic and untenable because of faulty analyses, came from many quarters various suggestions of remedies that, if implemented, would have only added to the miasmatic growth of bureaucracy and the resultant failure to reach desired goals.

A careful and thorough investigation of causes of the backlog of untried cases in Philadelphia County would at once ascertain that they are caused by the inadequacy of the number of courtrooms needed for dispatch in handling the trials of cases.

The antiquated City Hall of Philadelphia is not only abounding in noises caused by milling crowds and heavy traffic, but also lacks space needed for the additional courtrooms that would enable the Judges of the Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia County and the County Court of Philadelphia to dispose of more cases than now in their crowded quarters.

The Federal Government is now exploring new locations along Market Street for the Federal Courts in Philadelphia for the same apparent reasons that are indicative of need for a new State Court Building in Philadelphia.

The Independence Mall offers ideally suitable sites along adjacent streets for either one State Court Building or several, in case dispersal of courtrooms would be more desirable than concentrating all functions in one building.

NOW BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, That the Senate of the General Assembly of Pennsylvania, through the Joint State Government Commission, undertake a thorough, searching study of the need for new courtrooms as a minimum and a new Court Building as a maximum for the Courts of Common Pleas and the County Court of Philadelphia.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That such a study be initiated at once so that adequate legislation may be presented to the next Regular Session of the General Assembly of Pennsylvania in January of 1963.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. President, I ask that this resolution be referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDENT. The resolution is referred to the Committee on Rules.

GUESTS OF SENATOR GEORGE N. WADE PRESENTED TO SENATE

Mr. WADE. Mr. President, I have the honor to announce the presence of a rather large class from the Cumberland Valley Junior High School, of Cumberland County. They are here under the leadership of their teacher, Mr. Thomas Helman.

I would very much appreciate it if the Chair would extend the official welcome of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT. Will the young ladies and gentlemen of the Cumberland Valley Junior High School please rise?

Your teacher is Mr. Helman and, of course, that welcome from the Senate was intended to also include you, Mr. Helman.

We are very happy you came here. We hope that in the observation of the government of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania you will find new ideas for your classes in government.

REMARKS CONCERNING REORGANIZATION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Mr. WEINER. Mr. President, last week and this week, we have discussed the resolution that Senator Wade addressed himself to and which I advised him was taken up in the Rules Committee in regard to school reorganization. I would like to make some remarks for the record. I believe Senator Wade might be interested in either responding or by giving it some thought.

We have distributed this small booklet, entitled "The Fourth 'R,'" and I have tried to see that every Member received a copy. I have asked that they look at it very carefully.

I would like to read the following statement into the record if I may:

"One of the gravest problems today is the existence of numerous school districts too small to operate efficiently. Small school systems are wasteful of personnel. They do not provide a sound basis for school finance. And small schools cannot provide an adequate educational program.

Experience has demonstrated that voluntary provisions for school district reorganization do not work. States should pass laws making such reorganization mandatory under the direction of the State Department of Education."

What I have read is in quotes and is written by President Dwight D. Eisenhower's Commission on National Goals.

I have attended a number of seminars which have been held. One of which I was very fortunate to attend was headed by Doctor James B. Conant, President-Emeritus of Harvard University. He has been looking into this problem for approximately ten or twelve years. He has written many tracts and many booklets and has spoken almost everywhere in this Country in regard to this problem. At the meeting which I attended, he stated that a high school should have at least 1,000 students if it is going to operate efficiently and offer the kind of programs and education to the student body that is commensurate with their maintaining a first-class education.

The following quotation was written by Doctor James B. Conant and appeared in "The American High School Today," and also appears in the booklet, entitled "The Fourth 'R.'" I read as follows:

"I should like to record my conviction that in many States the number one problem is the elimination of the small high school by school district reorganization. Such reorganization has been virtually accomplished in a few States. In all others, citizens who wish to improve public education might well devote their energies to mobilizing opinion in behalf of district reorganization directed toward the reduction of small high schools."

These are two groups which have been looking into this problem for many years. I have no expertise in this area whatsoever. I, like many others, believe that I would like to be guided by people who know something about this subject, who have spent their life in education and who are interested in promoting a good climate and good educational processes in this Country. I think we in Pennsylvania can do no less.

We took up Senator Wade's resolution at our meeting and it was unanimously voted down as far as our doing anything about it is concerned. The school districts have a period of five years or more in which to reorganize. In this Legislature, for many years, we have held out the bait; namely, that jointures or mergers were given additional incentive by way of money. We have even paid to many areas money for closed schools to help eliminate some of these schools which really were not schools at all, but merely a manifestation of some sort of an educational process in the community. Even though there are no longer any closed schools which exist, we still con-

time, and it appears in our budget, to give this money to these groups.

I think for us to continue a dialogue on this subject or to continue in this area is a step backwards and retrogression. It may be political to fight this. It also may be political to try to keep people who have these jobs and who are controlling their own little area in these jobs. It might be laudable to have them and these people might be very capable.

However, let me point out to you that in the city of Philadelphia, where we have over 2,000,000 people, we have one school district, we have one school system, we have one board of directors. If it works in that area, I am certain it can work in other areas. Philadelphia is far from a model. There are many things existing in that system which probably could use some changes or could use some betterment in many areas. However, Philadelphia is good I think as compared to some of the makeshift and small areas where we are shortchanging our children. I will not go into a long speech about the battle for men's minds and that this next war will not be fought with guns. However, if the soldiers in the field were asking for arms and ammunition, we would not turn them down because we would be fighting for our lives. I feel that education is the same arms and ammunition that these people will need. We cannot turn them down.

Therefore, if it is important to continue along these lines, we might at least wait until the fourth year arrives to decide whether we have made a mistake in this area or whether it is well nigh impossible for them to reorganize, or whether it is useless to go into this subject. However, to sabotage this program at this very early stage cannot be justified.

Also, in this booklet, the N.E.A. and the P.S.E.A., two organizations dealing in the field of education, were both for this reorganization plan. They came out in favor of it and spoke for it. They are quoted in this booklet and they have never retracted their statements, except they are now taking a different position. That is my understanding, but I may be doing them an injustice. However, this is what I have heard. Some of the things I have read have been more or less a middle of the road type of situation.

I think that we as Legislators and people who conduct the affairs of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, as the board of directors, should lead in this area and not be led.

Mr. WADR. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the comments of the Majority Leader. I also appreciate the impassionate method with which he approaches this very important subject, which is the matter of the resolution which was referred to his committee and which he said just a few moments ago was unanimously turned down. I have no right to question him or any member of the committee publicly regarding their position on the resolution because we here in the Senate, on both sides, have defended the committee system and believe the committee system is good for government and good for each and every Member here.

Therefore, when he says that it was a unanimous decision, I must take his word for it, and I am perfectly willing to do that. However, I would like to object to the use of the word "sabotage." I do not believe there is any Member of this Senate, and I do not believe there is any

Member of the House of Representatives,—in other words, I do not believe there is a single one of the 260 Legislators in Pennsylvania—who intends to sabotage the school system, or to do anything except to make it the finest school system in all of the United States. That is the aim of everybody in this Legislature, both House and Senate, and I am sure of that position.

The mere fact that I was told some few months ago by a prominent newspaperman that thirty per cent of the news space in American newspapers was used for a certain period in discussing the matter of education in America indicates to us the very importance of the entire subject. Then, again, I think every Member of the Senate and House would agree that the Nation which is most successful in training or providing the method by which the young folks learn to think and do—in other words, the public school system—will be the Nation that leads the entire world, which has now become, because of scientific development, a neighborhood. That nation will lead twenty, twenty-five or thirty years from now. We are all intensely interested that America shall be that Nation, as it has been for the last half century.

Now, the resolution merely asks for a waiting period of twelve months so that the people who have helped us so much with the school system—the people who are serving in the position of school director throughout the different counties of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania—will have a chance to survey the situation and see what the teachers and the students, themselves, in the upper classes, and the men, who in other ways help to direct this public school system of Pennsylvania, think about the plan.

The only good thing that I can see in this matter of bigger districts is the fact that schoolmen on both sides of the aisle voted for this legislation. I do not know whether they still enjoy the same opinion they did when they voted for it, but I am sure that the thinking of men like Senator Paul Wagner, Senator Harry Seyler, Senator Jo Hays and Senator Stanley Stroup, who are Members of this Body, was very considerate when they voted for it. However, I am not too sure that the legislation was properly drawn and was inclusive enough that it gave direction to the Department of Public Instruction in order for it to act intelligently on it.

Before I mention the booklet which was referred to us, I might say that I have, in a number of instances, discussed with school men the matter of whether or not this would require less cost to the people who pay the bill in Pennsylvania, the taxpayers. In each and every instance, they came back with the report that it will not and they do not allege that it will. As a matter of fact, Senator Hays attended an open meeting to which the newspapers reported that some 450 people in Camp Hill had attended. That was a very heated discussion and at times I felt sympathetic toward the position of Senator Hays, who was trying to do a good job. However, I am sure he left that meeting with the feeling that he had not accomplished the purpose for which he came; namely, to defend the Department of Public Instruction. He is absent from the Senate for a few moments just now, but I am sure if he were present he would testify to the fact that he did not satisfy or bring the meeting to the feeling that he had hoped he would when he first agreed to attend.

This booklet, which Senator Weiner previously referred

to, seems to me to explain excuses for doing this, rather than reasons for doing it, I read through it yesterday and I read through it again today. If I wanted to extend my remarks, I could find fault with many of the things which the booklet states. For example, on page 1, there appears a statement made by Robert A. Christie, who left the Department of Public Instruction. There are all kinds of rumors why he left, but I do not know why he left the Department and, therefore, I shall make no accusation as to why he left. He says, in part, as follows:

“ . . . for school district size and structure determine the district's wealth behind each pupil and the makeup of the pupil population . . . ”

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, we had the best thinking of current Members and past Members of this Senate and of the House in developing our subsidy system. While it is very complicated, it is intended to do that very thing; to furnish to the poorer districts more funds on a scientific basis. I agree with those who are prominent—the heads of the School Directors Association—that no better method has ever been developed to furnish to the district the money which they should have in comparison to the number of children there and the wealth of the district.

Mr. President, I could go from page to page in this booklet, Gentlemen, when you read this within the four walls of your library, in an impassionate way and make an inclusive study, I think you will agree with me that these are excuses and not reasons for creating bigger districts.

Finally, Mr. President, I want to mention that our system of government we call a democracy and this system where the responsibility is spread out over a large number of our citizens. Over in Cumberland County, where there appear the green hills that you will notice on a clear day, we currently have approximately 200 school directors. They are men who are not paid in money, but are men who are willing to give many of their nights and much of their time and consideration to the matter of running the best public school system that the world has ever observed. Those 200 men will be replaced by a much lesser number. The number of men who will replace them will, no doubt, be just as sincere. However, here, you are eating away at the basis of the foundation of democracy. You are replacing these 200 men—the broad base of democracy—by ten per cent as many. Can we afford to lose their volunteer services so that the matter of education will stand out as it has in Pennsylvania? I say to you that is eating away at the foundations of democracy. It is leeching away so that perhaps we will wake up twenty-five years or fifty years from now and have a different form of government. We, in the legislative halls of Pennsylvania, are undermining democracy and taking away from this broad base the concentrating power.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. President, I just want to make a correction for the record. I was guilty of a misstatement and I do not want that to ever occur while I am here and aware of it.

When I stated to Senator Wade that there was unanimity of opinion, that was my impression. That was not the vote in the committee. I merely wish to make that very clear.

Mr. BERGER. Mr. President, I had intended to request the permission of the Chair to interrogate the Majority Leader on that very subject.

His recollection, of course, like mine, is faulty at times on certain subjects. I wanted to be sure that the record was corrected, although I would question the propriety of reporting any committee action. Nevertheless, the motion, as I recall it, was to table the resolution, to which motion Senator Pechan and I voted “no.”

However, Mr. President, I must make one or two comments concerning this subject. I certainly will not make them at length.

I do want to say that they might be trying to give the impression that there is a monopoly on interest in education by certain Members and certain groups in this Legislature. That is not true. I agree with what Senator Wade has said, in that the interest in education is broad based. Everyone is interested in the subject. The method of approaching the way of getting at the very best caliber of education is the matter which I believe is in question on this resolution, which is not before us, but which deals with the subject of the school reorganization bill.

Senator Weiner recommended that we read this little pamphlet, entitled “The Fourth ‘R.’” I think that recommendation is to be taken very, very seriously. I was not able to finish it, but the impression which I got, to the extent that I was able to read it, was that its title more or less demonstrated the intent of the writer. He was emphasizing the fourth R, which I presume, and I believe it to be a proper assumption, means reorganization. Mr. President, I am awfully afraid that the emphasis put upon the fourth R might lead to a tremendous neglect of the original and the fundamental three R's. The most important thing in education is not, to my mind, the reorganization of the school system into larger units. The whole burden of that argument, based upon the usual propaganda style, giving the arguments and then saying that this is the only possible conclusion there can be drawn, is simply to advance an argument to the way of thinking of the writer. This, apparently, is the thinking of the proponents of this legislation.

Mr. President, as I indicated, the whole burden of it is that larger units made for better education. This is something which I do not believe we are all ready to accept, by any means. Certainly, that has been demonstrated by the action of the school directors and by the very faint approval given to it by the members of the Pennsylvania State Education Association.

There certainly is room for improvement; there always will be room for improvement. However, Mr. President, this is not necessarily the answer set forth in this legislation for the reorganization of our school districts into greatly increased unit size.

Mr. SEYLER. Mr. President, I wish to make a few remarks in reply to some of the statements which were made by previous speakers.

First of all, commenting on the remarks made by Senator Berger, I would certainly agree with him that the interest in education is not limited to a few of us. I think if there is one issue in which we should be and I believe are interested, it is not being satisfied with

anything less than the best that this Commonwealth can do for education.

The "Fourth 'R'" title, as I read it, seemed to indicate that it was the conclusion of the people who have studied this program that a basic thing which needs to be done, in order to improve education, is the creation of rationalized school districts. We are, in effect, taking the resources that we devote to education—I am speaking of money and I am speaking of use of personnel—and, by using them in our present ineffective system, we are not getting the best use of these resources that we need to produce the kind of school system we want.

Senator Wade made several remarks on which I wish to comment. He said that no one to his knowledge, including Senator Hays, was willing to say that financial savings would result from reorganization. I want to tell Senator Wade that I, too, would not want to say that in 1956, when reorganization is completed, the Commonwealth will be spending less money or will need to be spending less money for a good school system. I realize that we are in a rising trend of costs, not only in schools, but in State Government, generally, in business and, I am sure, in Senators Wade's own business. However, I will say that there is a great deal of evidence to indicate that the money we spend in education will go for educational purposes under reorganization, which is now going for unnecessary overhead and duplication. Let me give you a few examples.

Those of you who attended the hearings before the Appropriations Committee heard one of our departments, the Office of the Attorney General, say that between one-half million to \$1,000,000 could be saved by the Commonwealth in school audits, if we reduce the number of school districts. This, Mr. President, is a savings. Maybe one-half million dollars is a contemptible amount and maybe \$1,000,000 is a contemptible amount if you are used to thinking in big numbers. However, to me, it is not contemptible because I have an idea of what \$1,000,000 or one-half million dollars taken from the cost of making audits can do. If this no longer becomes necessary due to the smaller number of districts and if this \$1,000,000 or one-half million dollars can be put into school districts for educational purposes, I have a concept of what this can do.

Another person who appeared before that committee was Doctor Boehm, of the Department of Public Instruction. When he was asked a question, he referred it to his Deputy, Doctor Swan, with whom I am sure Senator Wade and the other gentlemen here are acquainted. He is a gentleman who has been working in the area of transportation in school districts and financing for many, many years. If anyone can be considered in this Commonwealth to be an expert, I would consider him to be one on the contemporary situation with regard to transportation. I think Doctor Swan is qualified by experience and training, as a person who can give us an expert answer. He was asked the question: "What would be the effect of the completion of this reorganization upon the cost of transportation in the school districts of Pennsylvania?" He gave us his opinion, Mr. President, that millions of dollars could be saved by the State and by local districts. This money could be saved, yes, and used for other educational purposes. As I said, I have no illusions about the fact that if we are going to try to keep up in this

world with the educational systems of the countries in this world which are in opposition to us, and if we are going to have the kind of education to help the kind of scientists and the kind of well-educated people we need to keep pace, we are going to have to spend more money.

However, I am interested, Mr. President, in making the best use of that money. Tax money is hard to get. We should not be spending one penny for unnecessary overhead or duplication that we do not need to spend. We should be putting that money to the purpose for which we ask the taxpayer to give it to us; namely, the improvement of the education system.

Let me give you another example. I am not going to name names, in this instance, although I will be very glad, if Senator Wade or any other Senator is curious and approaches me confidentially, to identify these persons. However, I am not going to use names for the obvious reason that comparisons can be invidious. I do not want to embarrass any Senator by naming any part of his district.

The Governor's Committee studied school administration. Incidentally, Doctor Ralph Swan was the person who aided the particular task force that studied school administration. We found that one school district is in a second class city in this Commonwealth. There were 12,000 pupils enrolled in that one school district—12,000 pupils. We found further that they have a very good administrative and supervisory program. This is the program, incidentally, that makes progress in schools. This is the educational statesmanship that goes into the improvement of schools.

We found, Senator, the cost of all the administration and supervision from the superintendent of schools, through all his assistants and supervisory staff, down to and including the principals and assistant principals in the high schools and the elementary schools for 12,000 pupils in that one district was \$90,000 per year.

We studied a county adjacent to this second class school district. In that total county, there are 7,000 enrolled in all of the schools of that county. There we studied the supervisory system and we found, in the opinion of people who seemed to know, their supervision was not as good. However, for that county, for the same amount of supervision, starting with the superintendent of schools and going down through and including the principals and the assistant principals for 7,000 pupils, the cost was \$130,000 a year. Ninety thousand dollars for better supervision and administration for 12,000 pupils on one hand, and for poor supervision and administration on the other hand for 7,000 pupils, \$130,000.

Now you may say: "Well, what is \$40,000 in this picture? That is a trifle." To me, it is not a trifle, because that is payment of money that because of the duplication of unnecessary staff and personnel, due to the existence of small districts, can be avoided and saved for the taxpayers.

If you say again: "Well, does that mean you are going to cut down on the amount of money you are going to spend on schools?" No. I do not think we are. I do not think we can. I do not think national survival will permit us to. It does mean that the money we ask the taxpayers to give us for education will go into education, and not for duplication and unnecessary administrative personnel. This is what you can do with more adequate school districts and elimination of the small school districts.

The Senator from Cumberland always has a manner of saying things which, it seems to me, he perhaps does not intend the way he says them. However, he left a cloud, I would say, on a fine gentleman, Doctor Christie, and on the department when he said that he does not know why Doctor Christie left the department. He sort of implied to me—and I am sure he did not intend it because I know the generous nature of the gentleman from Cumberland, and I am sure he would not cast an innuendo on anyone—and he left the impression in the air that maybe there is something cloudy, mysterious or sinister about this. Let me tell the Senator why the gentleman left. Let me say first of all that Doctor Christie came to State Government from university teaching. He is a teacher in the field of political administration, and he came to Pennsylvania from a teaching position at Syracuse University. That clears up how he got here.

Doctor Christie served in several capacities. He started, I believe, in the Office of Administration. When this project developed, since he was an educator, he was moved into the executive directorship of the Governor's Education Committee.

Why did he leave State government? For a very simple reason, and the reason that makes a lot of us change our employment. He was offered a better job. He left to take an administrative position at the University of Long Island. For that reason, since it carried more money and an advancement in his professional field, there is no mystery, there is nothing sinister, and that is the story. I want to put that into the record, because I would not have any shadow cast either on the department or Doctor Christie.

Now Senator Wade says that we have the best equalization program in Pennsylvania that he knows of, and I agree with him. I will say that all of the studies of the Governor's committee show that our equalization program results in the spending—now follow me on this—of about an equal amount of money per pupil over this Commonwealth. Now, not perfectly. There is a range because in some places they put in more local money than others. However, the effect of giving more money from the State to the weaker financial districts and less money to the more wealthy does result, we have found, in a kind of equalization; that is, in the equalization of the amount of money spent.

Now, if you investigate what that money buys, you will find that we are not providing equalization at all. We provide about, generally speaking, an equality in the amount of money a school district is given to spend. We do not provide equality in what they buy with it. Why? Well, because it is obvious that a small district is very inefficient from an economic point of view. For example, if you have in a school three people who need German because they are going to a college where German is required,—three bright people who sign up for German—and maybe you have twenty-five or thirty sign up for French because French is the most usually desired language, the school directors in that little district face a hard choice. They either have to say, "We are going to give German, even though there are only three people who want it," and if they say that, then you have one teacher to three pupils, and that, gentlemen, is expensive. On the other hand, they have to say: "We are sorry but we cannot afford one teacher to three pupils, and, therefore, it is

impossible for us to allow those students to take German." Thereby, those students are deprived of something which they need. I am speaking of a language here. However, you can apply this to other programs and other services.

What I am saying is this: Unless the school is big enough to have an adequate supply of pupils taking the various courses, a school district is unable to offer them unless they offer them at a very high cost. That is another reason why you will save taxpayers' money by having districts which are large enough to have the number of pupils enrolled so that you will not need to have a very bad teacher-pupil ratio for the standpoint of cost.

Finally, let me say this: I am as appreciative as Senator Wade is of the patriotic duty performed by the school directors of this Commonwealth. It is in many respects a thankless job. The only rewards are the kind of rewards that come to you from doing a public service. I certainly appreciate and I am grateful for the time and interest that the many school directors over this Commonwealth give to this cause.

I do not think, however, it is fair to have a situation where increasingly, year by year, those school directors are faced with the proposition that they cannot do a good job because of the limitations of the size of the school district they have to work with. Believe me,—and I am convinced that this is the case—I believe we should create a condition so that good professional people and good lay people in school boards have the opportunity to do the kind of job and provide the kind of educational opportunity that can be provided if you have a school district with the financial strength and the size that is necessary to do a good job. I am in favor of creating a better condition so that local school boards can do a good job.

I would say to you that this is an important matter that we are talking about today. We are talking about the children of this Commonwealth. We are talking about the future citizens of this Commonwealth. We are talking about the health and growth of our State because unless we keep up with the educational needs of modern contemporary living, we are not going to keep up as a State.

Finally, we are dealing with the question of national survival. Unless the young people of America can be educated to the level that is necessary to produce the leadership we need in science and all of the other pursuits in our national life, we are not going to be able to keep up in the international struggle in which we are engaged.

I say to you that if this Nation ever goes down—God forbid, and I do not believe it ever will—but if it does, it will not be because we do not have the great resources that nature has given us. It will not be because our people are inadequate. We have a great people. It could be because we do not furnish the kind of education which will produce the kind of people in this world that we need to stand first in the world.

Therefore, I say, let us not take this lightly. Let us not now, at this point, stop what has been begun so well all through this Commonwealth. I wonder if you gentlemen realize that one county has already completed its new plan under this law. It has reduced forty school districts to six districts. I wonder if you realize that in all sixty-seven counties, as far as I know, a beginning has been made, and many of them are far along. Many

of them have engaged staffs—people from the universities—to come in and help them study the programs in their particular districts. What they are doing this year, in effect, is simply studying their school systems to see where they are strong, to see where they are weak, and devise a plan which will continue their strength, and attempt to remedy their weaknesses.

This law is no panacea. It will not solve all of the problems. However, it is a tool which good professional educators and good school districts can use, if we give it to them, to have a better school system. Let us not break in now and interrupt what they are doing. I believe in the light of what they are doing,—I am quite sincere and I said this in reply to Senator Stroup several weeks ago—and I believe in the light of those experiences the school board members and the professional people who are working together in counties are having, we are going to discover some things in this law that can be improved. If I am fortunate enough to be present, I will join with all the rest of you in making those changes. Few laws have been passed in my experience here which did not need some change in the light of what we discovered in working with them. I am sure this law will be no exception. At that time, I will certainly join with everybody else who is here in doing our best to make this law better than it is.

Therefore, I think we need this year's experience. I think we should profit by it. I congratulate the Rules Committee, of which I am not a member, on having taken what seems to me a very sensible step.

Mr. STROUP. Mr. President, I think we have gone rather far afield in our discussion here on this particular resolution, and the attitude of the Rules Committee upon it.

It certainly could be considered without any question that most of the philosophical statements of attitudes toward education, enriched curriculum, reduction of costs, and so forth are important to all our thinking. This is merely a question of how it is going to be done. That is the reason the resolution was sponsored by me and other Members on this side of the floor, in order to stay the operation of the Department of Public Instruction at the present time until alterations and changes could be made in this particular legislation.

In order to point out wherein we are at fault in what we are doing, I shall refer to the booklet which has been provided for us. I draw your attention to item 6 therein, which says as follows:

"An administrative unit shall be planned to include the largest feasible pupil population . . ."

That was not the thinking of many of us at the time when this legislation was written and considered by this Body. We tried to write into this bill restrictions in size in so far as pupil population was concerned. We reduced it from the Governor's Committee Report of 10,000 to 4,000, and from the Governor's Committee Report of 4,000 finally to 2,500, purely in order to try to give, particularly rural Pennsylvania, an opportunity to maintain a smaller sized administrative unit because of the difficulties that are entailed in trying to merge into large units.

Now, the attitude of the Department of Public Instruction under this particular legislation is that it has a mandate from the Legislature to set up the largest feasible

pupil population. That was not our intent at all. We were trying to restrict from the really large units of 10,000, and keep it down. Nevertheless,—and this is the crux of the entire matter, and the particular item that is causing so much disturbance throughout the Commonwealth, and the reason there is such a hue and cry and resistance to this legislation and the implementation by the department—the department now has taken this Act as a mandate to do whatsoever it sees fit in the last analysis in so far as the size of administrative units is concerned regardless of the attitude of the local areas. County school boards and local school directors can make their representations but, in the final analysis, it will be the Department of Public Instruction which will determine what shall be done.

Let us read the language:

"In the event that no plan of organization of administrative units is approved by the State Council of Education for a county prior to January 1, 1964, the Department of Public Instruction shall prepare and place upon the agenda of the State Council of Education a plan of organization of administrative units for the county . . ."

Therefore, whatever the local people do, whatever they want and whatever they think fits their particular, peculiar, specific situation, a generalization in so far as the department is concerned is that which will become the fact accomplished and, in the end, local effort, local attitudes, local desires and local requests are being completely ignored.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, at the present time, while we have exempted in the bill seventh and eighth class counties from a pupil population problem as such specifically, the department is coming out with county plans for the seventh class and the eighth class units in full county organization. That is the administrative unit there. While we have tried to curtail the particular size in rural areas of the administrative unit, the department will determine exactly what that size will be, taking into consideration certain factors, of course. However, in the last analysis, they are the determination of it.

This is the problem. This particular piece of legislation has been in derogation of local control and of local effort, and we are creating here, within the Commonwealth, a purely statism agency, which dominates and supersedes everything else that may be desired by our people and their representatives on the local level. Here is the crux of it.

Now on this side of the floor, we tried, when the bill came before us, to submit amendments. We did submit amendments, but they were defeated by a vote of 25-25. Every one that we offered, in order to try to accomplish some resolution on the local level and some authority there, was defeated.

Now we bring you a resolution, and we ask the Rules Committee to give this serious consideration, and we hope you will bring it out in response to the attitude of so many of our people throughout the State. However, you say: "No, we will not do it." Yet we continue going on in the Department of Public Instruction, publishing booklets and spending hundreds of thousands of dollars for something which, it would seem from the grass roots expressions, will not be implemented as it presently exists at all. That is a waste of taxpayers' money. If we did the

right thing here,—and we should do the right thing—we would hold this in abeyance until we can get a correction to this particular law.

It is an error, Mr. President. It is an error in so far as the way it is written in section 283 and Section 284.

All plans submitted by the county board and the board of school directors, in accordance with these very broad standards, will be refused. These standards are set up by the Council. No body else has anything to say about it. There is nothing specific in it. As a matter of fact, these plans do not even consider what the tax situation will be at the local level. They do not consider what will happen to the subsidy situation presently existent. They do not consider what will occur to this tremendous debt, which many of our school districts have, and how it is going to be handled.

There are so many ramifications in the implementation of this act that it should be held until further thorough study can be made and a proper, realistic and considerate program can be laid out, which will be more acceptable to the people back home. This is where the fault lies and this is the crux. It is not all of our explanations and oratory on education, and what it means to our children and what it means to our State. We are all in accord with that. We face the issue. Most of the comments on the other side have been irrelevant on this particular issue. We have not faced up to it, and the fact that we have not faced up to it must be the burden of the Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (William Z. Scott) in the Chair.

Mr. PECHAN. Mr. President, perhaps it would be better if I yielded to Senator Sesler. I want to make some remarks with reference to some that were made by Senator Seyler. I do not see him in the room and, therefore, I will yield to the gentleman from Erie.

Mr. SESLER. Mr. President, I have been very much interested in this whole question since the inception of this legislation last August, 1961. During the time before and after the enactment of this legislation, I have attempted to make myself familiar with some of the issues and to read additionally. I have read, for example, books and publications by the American Society of School Administrators and numerous other committees, such as the Committee on National Goals, and, of course, the eminent James Conant, et cetera.

I think we can say briefly that the little book which was put out today—"The Fourth R" it is called—is hardly more than a very brief summary of the arguments in favor of school reorganization.

Senator Seyler has spoken at length on some of the merits and some of the economics behind this bill. I think there is another side, too, that should be discussed. It certainly is apparent, since I have been in the Senate, that a bill seems to be like a small ship on the sea. The merits of the bill might be considered to be the ship itself. Sometimes it is a raft and sometimes it is a well constructed craft, but in all cases they seem to float on a political sea.

What are the politics here, aside from the merits of the question? Is there really a political question? Should it really be a political question?

I think that first of all it can be said that this side

of the aisle has not conceived of this program as a political move, nor should it ever be considered as such. I have noticed, since I have been in State Government, a dearth of long-range planning in many subjects. Because of the changes of Administration, no one has ever committed himself or is willing to adopt the programs of others. I think this approach we are taking is the right approach, not only in this field but in many other fields.

It has been said, for example, that this program is undemocratic. Why? Is it because we have 12,000 school directors, which is more than any other State in the Nation? Does this mean, for example, that we should have several hundred or 1,000 representatives? We seem to have effected and continued a representative government here. In the House of Representatives, there are 260 representatives. Some may compare it to the old days, for example, when you could go around the corner and speak to your local school director, or people have alluded to the one-room schoolhouse as being the place where good educations were given. Let me tell you, without question, an examination of the facts indicates that the good, old days are entirely insufficient for today's problems. Do you realize, for example, that in 1895, only seven per cent of the population between the ages of fourteen and seventeen went on to high school. This, today, would be intolerable.

I think, too, that it has been said that the Department of Public Instruction is trying to impose its will upon these people. How is this so? Actually, we have set minimum standards, and they are the most vague. In fact, they have just been criticized by our last speaker as being most vague. Actually, if we were to have done the other thing and made them most specific, we would have been accused of running a dictatorship from Harrisburg, and so they would impale us on the horns of a dilemma.

I think the approach that was taken was the course most reasonable, because it leaves the entire matter open to the local school directors and leaves some mandate to bring together districts of certain sizes.

We can go on politically and say: "Who is it that wants to preserve these districts?" I know one group of people, and let us be frank about it. There is one set of school districts who are comfortable. In fact, comparatively speaking, they have money, they have an educated populace, they have a high market value per pupil, and they want to keep it that way. They are not prepared to share. They are not prepared to co-operate.

Let us be realistic, too. At the school directors meeting,—with all deference to those directors, those men, who have given freely of their time and talents to promote the cause of education—nevertheless, there was a small cadre of those who are inherently opposed to this aim, and who stayed on until the last day of that convention to gather together and to put this amendment across to less than one-quarter of the total number of directors.

I know many directors, and they are human. There are some who are well-informed on these issues. There are others who are totally ignorant, and who appear to equate this bill with changes in the size of attendance areas.

This bill, ladies and gentlemen, is a beginning. It is a commencement. We are not going to change buildings, we are not going to destroy them, and we are not going to use them. We are not going to change violently the size

of attendance areas overnight. We are making a start. It is primarily an administrative bill, designed to resolve some of the overlapping and some of the appendages that we have in regard to the administration of education. Those who have studied conscientiously and carefully, and compared the progress made in other States, know that Pennsylvania has been woefully short in this progress.

I think those districts which will oppose this will make a mistake. Those who oppose it have done so not in the spirit of being confused by the bill or confused by the directions, but because they do not want to in spirit. If there is a will, and it is done with a purpose to enable our school districts to become better, they will find a way to consolidate these school districts in such a way that will be for the benefit of the people. It is a matter of the spirit in which they want to progress. It is a matter of the spirit in which they want to interpret the bill.

Finally, I will say this, with all deference to some of the former speakers who talked as if we should simply hold up and study this program: Let us call a spade, a spade. This moratorium would continue, if they were to have their will, until next year; and if next year they can have their way, let us be assured of one thing. School reorganization in Pennsylvania would not be temporarily held up, but it would be permanently held up.

Mr. HAWBAKER. Mr. President, the gentleman from Erie County just made the statement that this is not a political question.

I would like to suggest, Mr. President, that this is a very definite political question. Of course, it is not political in regard to partisan politics between Republicans and Democrats in this body. However, it certainly is political in the sense that it involves the very basis of American democracy; that is, a form of government based upon local self-determination.

I am not an expert in the field of education, and I do not profess to be. I am not here to say that we would not have better schools under the system of compulsory school reorganization. However, I am here to say that the question before us is not one of whether or not this will enable us to have better schools, but it is rather a question as to whether or not this will enable us to have better schools within the framework of our democratic system. The thing that concerns me very much is the question as to whether, in the field of education, we have gotten to a point where we are willing to assume that the end justifies the means. This, I do not think is appropriate.

I think it could be well said that flexibility has been the strength of our American democracy. The problems that exist in one neighborhood are not the same as the problems that exist in another neighborhood. Traditionally, our democracy has succeeded and been phenomenally successful because of the fact that people at the local level worked out their own problems as they presented themselves in that locality.

There is another thing about this matter of local responsibility. Some mention has been made of the fact that we can eliminate a lot of school directors without losing this local self-determination. However, it seems to me that we need more people participating in local government, not less, because we witness a growing tendency in these days to find people regarding governmental organizations as something administered by some-

body else. I think the greatest threat to our American democracy is this very threat, when people have a tendency to assume that government represents them instead of we. For this reason, I feel this is a very definite political question, because it involves the very fundamentals of our democratic society.

I think it can be well said and we will all admit that any governmental organization, speaking in terms of pure efficiency, administered from the top down will be more efficient than an organization administered from the bottom up. This I think, is something that is obvious. The question that concerns me is: Are we willing to let this apply to our democratic system of government? If we were to pursue this to its logical conclusion, then we would decide that since we cannot efficiently administer our schools in a democratic way from the bottom up, we cannot efficiently administer any of our local government, and we would soon discover that if we were successful in saving a few dollars by school reorganization, we would have established a precedent whereby it would be advisable to reorganize our local government. If we were to pursue this far enough, the only governmental agency left in this Country would be the Federal Government. If we were to pursue it even further, we would find that, in the interest of efficiency, we would even abolish the Congress. So, in that regard, I say this is tremendously a political question.

There is one other point made by the previous speaker that I think should be mentioned. That is this matter of the wealthy districts sharing their wealth with the poorer districts. Here again, we are getting back to that old philosophy of share the wealth. I think if we adopt this philosophy, we will have killed the very stimulus that has made this Country what it is, because certainly if there is no need for people to support themselves, if they can rely on others, then the initiative for being self-sufficient will have been abolished. This will sow the seeds of decay in our entire society.

Therefore, I think this is definitely a political question of the utmost importance.

Mr. PECIAN. Mr. President, I previously yielded the floor, thinking that perhaps Senator Seyler would return. He has not done so, and I think he has left the building. However, I would like to take issue with him.

It seems to me that larger units are the present theme for better education. I disagree with that very much. Senator Seyler mentioned the fact that perhaps there would be three students who would want to take German and, rather than deny them German, they would have to employ a teacher who would just teach three students.

I want to give you an example of what happened in my own community about three weeks ago. The University of Pittsburgh's Vice Chancellor for expansion came to Kittanning with the possibility of setting up a branch of the University of Pittsburgh. One of the statements that he made was that the people in the smaller classes get more out of the subject than they would if they were in big classes.

For instance, we have among our high school graduates—I have one school particularly in mind which has grown so very rapidly—boys and girls who were honor students and who were outstanding students in high school. However, this very semester, I had a report from this university that five of my scholarship students have

failed. This is disheartening, but more disheartening is the fact that all five of these students were good students in high school. A couple of them were exceptional students. Now they are all on probation. I think one of the main reasons is because they are taught in amphitheatres, where there are 250 students in a class in an amphitheater. If any of that material soaks in, O.K. If it does not, they do not get the subject.

I remember when I was in high school, we had a Latin class I think of about fifteen or sixteen. I certainly did not take Latin. Latin took me, because I never got any credit for it. I passed it one year, but in order to get high school credit, you had to pass it two years. It was a dry subject. I did not like it and I did not apply myself. Nevertheless, I learned some Latin because of the small class that we had, and some of it rubbed off on me. I say that if I were in a Latin class with 200 or 250 pupils, unless I had a deep desire to learn that subject, it would mean absolutely nothing to me. For that reason, I think so many of our students are failing when they leave home.

Senator Seyler mentioned the fact about three students taking German. I am sure for any popular subject,—whether it were German, French or Spanish—they would have no difficulty in getting more than three students. If it were some Arabic language that is not used very much, they might have some difficulty. Every school cannot teach every subject and teach it well.

One of the mistakes that I think we make in our school system—and I am speaking from experience since I spent thirty years as a member of a board of education—is that we allow boys and girls who are thirteen and fourteen years of age, who have not fully matured, to pick their courses. Naturally, at that age, they pick the softest courses they can take. That is perhaps the fault of the administration or perhaps the fault of our present school system. I am the last person in the world to say that we do not need something done in so far as reorganization of our school system is concerned. However, I do think it ought to be worked out and we ought to know where we are going, because there is no rhyme or reason to any of this.

As somebody mentioned awhile ago, the Department of Public Instruction is going to have the last say. They say: "Allow the county school boards to set up this plan." We had the five-year plan when I was there. We moved into this thing cautiously. As you have heard me say before, after we went into a school union by a vote of all of the people, and we did it in a democratic way, our school system—there is my friend, Harry Seyler, who just came in—just went down in so far as efficiency is concerned and in so far as the pupils getting the most out of these classes. Why? Because we had to assume the responsibility for maintaining a lot of teachers who had seniority. They were not the caliber of teachers we had been used to in the past when we were an outstanding school district. We were wealthy in that we had a lot of real estate that was taxable. Now we have a lot of children, and no real estate. Consequently, the school districts are hurting for more State-aid.

I do not think that larger school districts—just somebody arbitrarily saying, "We are going to have a school district of 2,500, 4,000 or 10,000"—are the answer. I think it ought to be worked out. I think each school district—each county—should have its own plan. Certainly, they know

better than somebody here in Harrisburg who looks at a map on the wall and says: "We are going to cut Armstrong County into four districts, and that is the way it is going to be." That is wrong.

Talking about trying to save taxpayers' money, you are just going to throw millions and millions of dollars away for a poor grade of education.

Certainly, we have people here in Harrisburg who are good administrators. However, we have too many specialists. We have too many people in the area of buildings and too many people in the area of curriculum, and they are not co-ordinated properly.

It is not a political question, Republican or Democrat, so far as that is concerned. I think everyone of us in this room has one purpose in mind, and that is to give that boy or girl a better education. Even moneywise, I do not think any of us begrudge spending more money for education if we get our money's worth.

I do not think I quite finished saying what I wanted to when I started out by talking about the Vice Chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh coming up and explaining to us that he thought in these community colleges, with smaller classes, the boys and girls would derive more not only from the standpoint of more for their money because they could live at home and would not have as far to travel, but because the classes would not be as large, thereby giving them more personal attention. When you have a classroom of fifteen to twenty students, you are certainly going to get a lot more out of the subject than when you are going to have an amphitheater filled with 200 to 250 people listening to some lecture.

Mr. STASEY. Mr. President, at the time Senate Bill No. 887 was presented here on the floor, I opposed it. I opposed it because I was not convinced that it addressed itself to the mission of American education. I thought it was overly preoccupied with administrative efficiency and economic costs. I do not think good education necessarily comes from good bookkeeping. I do not think large expenditures necessarily guarantee good education.

In my District, we are in the process of evolving a reorganization plan. At this time, you cannot make a considered or sensible judgment on it. However, in the weeks to come, I am going to work with the school districts in my area. In my judgment, it is going to be based on these considerations: First, whether or not reorganization of the school districts is going to improve the quality of our education. Secondly, whether or not it is going to provide a curriculum which has built within it the ability to grow. Thirdly, whether or not it is going to give to each of our youngsters the maximum opportunity to attain his maximum potentialities.

I am going to be very careful in order to be certain that form does not influence substance. I am going to be extremely careful to make certain that mere organization does not squeeze out basic and fundamental values which have made of our society a free people and a thinking people. I would not like to think that we would commit ourselves to a program on paper that would squeeze out and destroy or in any way limit those values that made a John Glenn possible. I should like to think that throughout this Commonwealth of ours, every youngster will be touched, personally and deeply, by education.

If reorganization is going to give us education in greater depth and greater opportunities for the development of

our children's talents and abilities and the other gifts which God has granted them, then, indeed, it will render a good service.

On the other hand, if the touchstone is to be how much money we expend or how efficient we are in keeping track of students, then, indeed, we have gained little and contributed nothing to the education of our people.

This morning, at the Governor's Prayer Breakfast, I thought to myself that one thing which I gained from the breakfast was an observation of our society. We Americans have built a society which has recognized its problems and not resigned itself to them. Indecision at this time in this program would lead us nowhere. It is much wiser that some decision be made and we proceed, and then make a judgment upon it. I thought that morning, as I sat at the Governor's Prayer Breakfast, that one of the great qualities our people have had and which has been built in our education is that we have the ability to realize that for any door which God closes, he opens another. All you need is the courage and faith to walk through them.

I do not mean to be maudlin, but I am speaking about fundamental values which I think are urgently necessary. I do not think education is a matter of numbers and I do not think it is a matter of figures. I think it is a matter of basic, timeless values which we have preserved in our educational system.

Therefore, Mr. President, it seems to me, in this whole problem of reorganization, the thing to be watched and considered is: Are we providing a platform on which these basic values will be preserved? Are we laying the foundation for opportunities for our youngsters to obtain their maximum potentialities or are we going to do a good job of merely bookkeeping?

Mr. SEYLER. Mr. President, I want to join Senator Pechan and Senator Staisey in saying that my concern, too, is with quality. I am only in favor of reorganization because I believe it will enable us to get more quality for the present expenditure of money and other resources which we put into education.

Let me recommend to Senator Staisey, in pursuing with his county board the study of what effect size may have upon quality, and let me suggest to Senator Pechan as well, that they get a publication of the Joint State Government Commission. The Joint State Government Commission, in 1959, issued a publication called, "The Study of Pennsylvania High School Seniors." The following year, in 1960, they put out a supplement to that. I do not have the supplement with me because it is a thing which is in great demand. I have loaned it to a lot of people because of the impressive study that they made. I think Senator Pechan and Senator Staisey will both admit that the Joint State Government Commission is an agency which can be depended upon to make a thorough, unbiased and impartial study. They are not educators; they are legislators working with a good staff.

In that 1960 supplement, Senators, you will find a very careful study which they made. They took quality criteria and studied it in different sized schools. I would like you to get this yourselves and examine it. They found that everyone of the quality criteria which they selected—they selected things like preparation of teachers, particularly mathematics teachers because that was a critical thing, the number that went to college from the

high schools and a lot of things which I think you would agree are valid criteria of quality in education. We are not talking about money now, but we are talking about what youngsters get in education in the classrooms. That study revealed that as you go up the scale in size, you will also find an increase in quality. This is not due to mere size. As Senator Staisey said, mere size does not do it. However, size gives the opportunity for the good brains of the professional educators and the lay members of boards, working together, to afford, at a price the community can afford to pay, to put more quality into education.

I wish you would both get a copy of that study. In fact, I wish every Senator would read it. It is the 1960 supplement to the report originally made in 1959 on Pennsylvania High School Seniors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Paul W. Mahady) in the Chair.

REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

Mr. DEVLIN, by unanimous consent, from the committee on Executive Nominations, reported the following nominations, made by his Excellency, the Governor, which were read by the Clerk as follows:

MEMBERS OF THE STATE BOARD OF OSTEOPATHIC EXAMINERS

February 26, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate the following for reappointment as members of the State Board of Osteopathic Examiners, for the term of four years, and until their successors shall have been appointed and qualified:

David Rothman, D.O., 169 Pine Street, Oxford, Chester County.

Harvey C. Orth, D.O., 211 Lambardy Circle, Lewistown, Mifflin County.

Ben J. Agresti, D.O., 263 West Eighteenth Street, Erie, Erie County.

Charles S. W. Rickolt, D.O., 114 South Main Street, Muncy, Lycoming County.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

JUSTICE OF THE PEACE

February 27, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate L. Fred Klosterman, R. D. 2, Gettysburg, Adams County, for reappointment as Justice of the Peace in and for the Township of Highland, Adams County, to serve until the first Monday of January 1964.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

JUSTICE OF THE PEACE

February 19, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate Mrs. Mary M. Wood, Box 232, Lopez, Sullivan County, for appointment as Justice of the Peace in and for the Township Colley, Sullivan County, to serve until the first Monday of January 1964, to fill a vacancy.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

JUSTICE OF THE PEACE

February 26, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate Robert E. Fetcko, 326 West College Street, Canonsburg, Washington County, for appointment as Justice of the Peace in and for the Borough of Canonsburg, Washington County, to serve until the first Monday of January 1964, vice John T. Fetcko, deceased.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE

EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

EXECUTIVE SESSION

A motion was made by Mr. DEVLIN and Mr. CAMIEL, that the senate do now resolve itself into Executive Session for the purpose of considering certain nominations made by the Governor.

Which was agreed to.

NOMINATION TAKEN FROM THE TABLE

Mr. DEVLIN, Mr. President, I now call from the table for consideration the nomination of Albert D. Milani for appointment as a Member of the State Board of Chiropractic Examiners, which was reported from committee on February 26, 1962 and laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will read the nomination.

The nomination was read by the Clerk as follows:

January 2, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate the following person:

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

MEMBER OF THE STATE BOARD OF CHIROPRACTIC EXAMINERS

January 2, 1962.

Albert D. Milani, Pittsburgh, from December 28, 1961, until July 15, 1965, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

CONSIDERATION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

Mr. DEVLIN asked and obtained unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the nominations made by His Excellency, the Governor, and reported from committee today, together with the nomination of Albert D. Milani.

On the question,

Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations?

The yeas and nays were taken agreeably to the provisions of the Constitution, and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—50

Bell,	Hays,	Murray,	Stevenson,
Berger,	Katman,	Peahan,	Stiefel,
Cantel,	Keller,	Propert,	Stroup,
Chapman,	Kessler,	Ripp,	Taylor,
Confair,	Kramer,	Rooney,	Van Sant,
Devlin,	Lane,	Sarrat,	Wade,
DiSivestro,	Madigan,	Scott,	Wagner,
Donohew,	Mallery,	Seiler,	Ware, III,
Ehrgood,	McCreech,	Seyler,	Weiner,
Flack,	McGinnis,	Snafel,	Wolfe,
Fleming,	McMonamin,	Silvert,	Yatron,
Haluaka,	Miller,	Staisey,	Manady,
Kawbaker,	Mullin,		Presiding Officer

NAYS—0

Two-thirds of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Governor be informed accordingly.

EXECUTIVE SESSION RISES

Mr. DEVLIN, Mr. President, I move that the Executive Session do now rise.

Mr. STAISEY, Mr. President, I second the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

NOMINATIONS BY THE GOVERNOR REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

The Secretary to the Governor being introduced, presented communications in writing from His Excellency, the Governor of the Commonwealth, which were read as follows, and referred to the Committee on Executive Nominations:

MEMBER OF THE ADVISORY BOARD ON PROBLEMS OF OLDER WORKERS

February 27, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate Joseph H. Britton, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Centre County, for reappointment as a member of the Advisory Board on Problems of Older Workers, for the term of four years, or until his successor is appointed and qualified.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON LIBRARY DEVELOPMENT

February 27, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate the following for reappointment as members of the Advisory Council on Library Development, until the third Tuesday of January 1966, or until their successors have been appointed and have qualified:

Mrs. Catherine Roberts Bard, 326 Penn Street, Huntingdon, Huntingdon County.

Benjamin L. DuVal, 210 Jefferson Avenue, Scranton, Lackawanna County.

Herbert B. Anstactt, 1125 West New Street, Lancaster, Lancaster County.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY HEALTH BOARD

February 27, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate the following for reappointment as members of the Advisory Health Board, until the third Tuesday of January 1966, or until their successors have been appointed and have qualified:

Theodore F. Hatch, School of Public Health, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Allegheny County.

Lawrence X. Sullivan, M.D., 1466 Greystone Drive, Pittsburgh 6, Allegheny County.

Edward F. Kunde, 47 Glen Ridge Lane, Mt. Lebanon, Allegheny County.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

**MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF
ALLENTOWN STATE HOSPITAL**

February 27, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate the following for reappointment as members of the Board of Trustees of Allentown State Hospital, until the third Tuesday of January 1967, and until their successors are appointed and qualified:

R. Jean Fleckenstine, 2152 Chew Street, Allentown, Lehigh County.

Wilbert N. J. Wicand, 509 North Seventh Street Allentown, Lehigh County.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

MEMBER OF THE BANKING BOARD

February 27, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate W. Carlton Harris, 3125 West Penn Street, Philadelphia, Philadelphia County, for reappointment as a member of the Banking Board, until September 1, 1969, and until his successor is duly appointed and has qualified.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

**MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE
COMMONWEALTH MENTAL HEALTH RESEARCH
FOUNDATION**

February 27, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate Warren K. Hess, 1312 Farr Road, Reading, Berks County, for reappointment as a member of the Board of Trustees of the Commonwealth Mental Health Research Foundation, until December 31, 1963, and until his successor shall be duly appointed and qualified.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

**MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF
EASTERN PENNSYLVANIA PSYCHIATRIC INSTITUTE**

February 27, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate the following for reappointment as members of the Board of Trustees of Eastern Pennsylvania Psychiatric Institute:

Harold A. Taggart, Hahnemann Medical College, Philadelphia, Philadelphia County, until May 13, 1964, and until his successor shall have been appointed and qualified.

Charles S. Cameron, Hahnemann Medical College, Philadelphia, Philadelphia County, until May 13, 1963, and until his successor shall have been appointed and qualified.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

**MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF
EMBREEVILLE STATE HOSPITAL**

February 27, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate

W. Ernest Williams, Russellville, P. O. Oxford, Chester County, for reappointment as a member of the Board of Trustees of Embreeville State Hospital, until the third Tuesday of January 1965, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

**MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF
FAIRVIEW STATE HOSPITAL**

February 27, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate John D. Carmody, 514 Ridge Street, Honesdale, Wayne County, for reappointment as a member of the Board of Trustees of Fairview State Hospital, until the third Tuesday of January 1967, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

**MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF
HAZLETON STATE GENERAL HOSPITAL**

February 27, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate Earl J. Smith, 1 Highland Avenue, Jeddo, Luzerne County, for reappointment as a member of the Board of Trustees of Hazleton State General Hospital, until the third Tuesday of January 1965, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

**MEMBERS OF INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE
POTOMAC RIVER BASIN FOR THE COMMONWEALTH
OF PENNSYLVANIA**

February 27, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate the following for reappointment as members of the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, for the term of two years, or until their successors are appointed:

Maurice K. Goddard (Pennsylvania Commission on Interstate Cooperation), 211 North Nineteenth Street, Camp Hill, Cumberland County.

Harold B. Rudisill (General Assembly), 418 Baltimore Street Hanover, York County.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

**MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF
LAURELTON STATE SCHOOL AND HOSPITAL**

February 27, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate the following for reappointment as members of the Board of Trustees of Laurelton State School and Hospital, until the third Tuesday of January 1967, and until their successors are appointed and qualified:

Park L. Huffman, 212 Broad Street, West Milton, Union County.

Mrs. Marie S. Funnell, 401 Market Street, Mifflinburg, Union County.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

**MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF
LOCUST MOUNTAIN STATE GENERAL HOSPITAL.**

February 27, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate the following for reappointment as members of the Board of Trustees of Locust Mountain State General Hospital:

Israel D. Gray, Frackville, Schuylkill County, until the third Tuesday of January 1963, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

James Scott, Norwegian Street, Pottsville, Schuylkill County, until the third Tuesday of January 1963, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

Victor J. Bindic, 615 West Penn Street, Shenandoah, Schuylkill County, until the third Tuesday of January 1963, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

Raymond Troy, Gordon, Schuylkill County, until the third Tuesday of January 1963, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

Joseph V. Navitsky, Shenandoah Heights, Shenandoah, Schuylkill County, until the third Tuesday of January 1965, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

Peter J. Chaplinsky, Shenandoah, Schuylkill County, until the third Tuesday of January 1965, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

Joseph T. Kershetsky, 415 East Center Street, Mahanoy City, Schuylkill County, until the third Tuesday of January 1967, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

Peter J. Swoboda, 649 Altamont Boulevard, Frackville, Schuylkill County, until the third Tuesday of January 1967, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

Stephen J. Engle, 607 West Mahanoy Avenue, Mahanoy City, Schuylkill County, until the third Tuesday of January 1967, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

**MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF
MAYVIEW STATE HOSPITAL.**

February 27, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate the following for reappointment as members of the Board of Trustees of Mayview State Hospital:

Mrs. Janet B. Schlesinger, 3420 Dauphin Street, Pittsburgh 27, Allegheny County, until the third Tuesday of January 1965, and until her successor is appointed and qualified.

Mrs. Margaret Lee Walgren, 29 Terrace View Drive, Mt. Lebanon, Allegheny County, until the third Tuesday of January 1967, and until her successor is appointed and qualified.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

**MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF
NANTICOKE STATE GENERAL HOSPITAL.**

February 27, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate Francis H. Loughran, 83 Price Street, Kingston, Luzerne County, for reappointment as a member of the Board of Trustees of Nanticoke State General Hospital, until the third Tuesday of January 1967, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

**MEMBER OF THE PENNSYLVANIA AERONAUTICS
COMMISSION**

February 27, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate Leonard W. Bughman, Cross Hills, R. D. 2, Ligonier, Westmoreland County, for reappointment as a member of the Pennsylvania Aeronautics Commission, until June 2, 1965, and until his successor shall be duly appointed and shall have qualified.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

**MEMBER OF THE PENNSYLVANIA INDUSTRIAL
DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY**

February 27, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate Asbury W. Lee, III, 913 Old Town Road, Clearfield, Clearfield County, for reappointment as a member of the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority, until July 24, 1967, and until his successor shall be duly appointed and qualified.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

**MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF
PHILADELPHIA STATE HOSPITAL**

February 27, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate Leon C. Nurock, 324 Radcliff Street, Bristol, Bucks County, for reappointment as a member of the Board of Trustees of Philadelphia State Hospital, until the third Tuesday of January 1967, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

**MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF
POLK STATE SCHOOL AND HOSPITAL**

February 27, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate the following for reappointment as members of the Board of Trustees of Polk State School and Hospital, until the third Tuesday of January 1965, and until their successors are appointed and qualified:

Boyd N. Park, 406 Fourteenth Street, Franklin, Venango County.

Terence C. Hartwell, 118 Moran Street, Oil City, Venango County.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

**MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF
RETREAT STATE HOSPITAL**

February 27, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate the following for reappointment as members of the Board of Trustees of Retreat State Hospital, until the third Tuesday of January 1967, and until their successors are appointed and qualified:

Chester J. Korpusik, 230 Main Street, Duryea, Luzerne County.

John Mondlak, 25 Thompson Street, Port Griffith, Pittston, Luzerne County.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF
SOMERSET STATE HOSPITAL

February 27, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate John Philson, Jennerstown, Somerset County, for reappointment as a member of the Board of Trustees of Somerset State Hospital, until the third Tuesday of January 1965, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

DAVID J. LAWRENCE.

MEMBERS OF THE STATE BOARD OF FUNERAL
DIRECTORS

February 27, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate the following for reappointment as members of the State Board of Funeral Directors:

Norman P. Casher, 233 Keystone Avenue, Cresson, Cambria County, until August 31, 1964, or until his successor is appointed and qualified.

William H. Sweeny, 307 Lackawanna Avenue, Olyphant, Lackawanna County, until August 31, 1966, or until his successor is appointed and qualified.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

MEMBER OF THE STATE PLANNING BOARD

February 27, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate Alfred H. Williams, 218 New Providence Road, Wallingford, Delaware County, for reappointment as a member of the State Planning Board, until December 13, 1964, and until his successor is appointed and has qualified.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF
WARREN STATE HOSPITAL

February 27, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate George J. Fehrenbach, 172 Maurus Street, St. Marys, Elk County, for reappointment as a member of the Board of Trustees of Warren State Hospital, until the third Tuesday of January 1965, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF
WERNERSVILLE STATE HOSPITAL

February 27, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate Ronald J. Ulmer, 413 Carbon Street, Minersville, Schuylkill

County, for reappointment as a member of the Board of Trustees of Wernersville State Hospital, until the third Tuesday of January 1967, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF
WOODVILLE STATE HOSPITAL

February 27, 1962.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate the following for reappointment as members of the Board of Trustees of Woodville State Hospital:

Robert A. Foley, 247 Dell Avenue, Pittsburgh 16, Allegheny County, until the third Tuesday of January 1965, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

Charles Harmuth, Washington Avenue, Bridgeville, Allegheny County, until the third Tuesday of January 1965, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

Mrs. Rosemary Plessct, 5815 Northumberland Street, Pittsburgh 17, Allegheny County, until the third Tuesday of January 1967, and until her successor is appointed and qualified.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

HOUSE MESSAGE

HOUSE RESOLUTION FOR CONCURRENCE

The Clerk of the House of Representatives being introduced, presented for concurrence House Concurrent Resolution, Serial No. 56, which was read by the Clerk as follows:

SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

In the House of Representatives, February 27, 1962.

RESOLVED (if the Senate concur), That this 1962 Regular Session of the General Assembly adjourn sine die on the 28th day of February 1962 at 4:30 o'clock p.m., Eastern Standard Time.

Mr. WEINER asked and obtained unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of this resolution.

On the question,

Will the Senate concur in the resolution?

SENATE CONCURS IN HOUSE CONCURRENT
RESOLUTION, SERIAL No. 56

Mr. WEINER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate do concur in this resolution.

Mr. DISILVESTRO. Mr. President, I second the motion.

The motion was agreed to and the resolution was concurred in.

Ordered, That the Clerk inform the House of Representatives accordingly.

SENATE RESOLUTION

URGING THE PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC
BRIDGES IN PENNSYLVANIA

Messrs. SESLER, STIEFEL, STAISEY and YATRON, by unanimous consent, offered the following resolution (Serial No. 33), which was read, considered and adopted:

In the Senate, February 27, 1962.

Pennsylvania was once known as the "State of Bridges" because of the large number of bridges in the Commonwealth, most of which were covered timber bridges.

Modern highway improvement is threatening the destruction of many of these historic landmarks which are not only reminders of the history of our transportation system but also of great interest to the visiting tourist; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Senate urges the Department of Highways, the Department of Commerce, and the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission to use every means at their command to take steps to preserve or assist in the preservation of as many of these remaining landmarks as is possible within their financial means and legal powers; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Senate of Pennsylvania commends The Theodore Burr Covered Bridge Society of Pennsylvania for the valiant work it is doing to aid in the preservation of the remaining covered bridges of the Commonwealth.

HOUSE MESSAGE

HOUSE INSISTS UPON ITS NONCONCURRENCE IN AMENDMENTS TO HB 15, AND APPOINTS COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The Clerk of the House of Representatives being introduced, informed the Senate that the House insists upon its nonconcurrence in Senate amendments to **HB 15**, and has appointed Messrs. **POLEN**, **DOUGHERTY** and **WOOD** as a Committee of Conference to confer with a similar committee of the Senate (already appointed) to consider the differences existing between the two houses in relation to said bill.

SENATE RESOLUTION

URGING THE SUPERIOR STEEL COMPANY TO RECONSIDER ITS DECISION TO MOVE FROM PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. **STAISEY**, by unanimous consent, offered the following resolution (Serial No. 34), which was read, considered and adopted:

In the Senate, February 27, 1962.

WHEREAS, Superior Steel Company is located in Scott Township, Allegheny County, and

WHEREAS, The said Superior Steel Company employs 850 men who live in and around Scott Township, and

WHEREAS, The management of the said Superior Steel Company is considering withdrawing their business from the present location, and

WHEREAS, Such withdrawal will create an economic vacuum which cannot be easily filled since this firm is a dynamic and integral part of the economy of the area, and

WHEREAS, Such withdrawal will result in extensive hardship through unemployment since there is no readily available employment for these men, and

WHEREAS, Through the loss of the operation of this plant a very substantial reduction in the flow of periodic wage payments will result in a substantial reduction in the total trade and commerce within and around Scott Township areas and the resulting economic distress is incalculable at this time; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the Department of Commerce and all other departments of the Commonwealth shall use their good offices and resources to urge the Superior Steel Company to reconsider its decision to move from Pennsylvania and to urge them to continue their productive operations at their present location in Scott Township, Allegheny County, and be it further

RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the Secretary of the Senate to the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to the Secretary of Commerce and to the Superior Steel Company, in Scott Township, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE SUBMITTED

Mr. **SEYLER** submitted the Report of Committee of Conference on **HB 15**, which was laid over for printing under the rules.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. **WEINER**. Mr. President, I move that the Senate do now adjourn until Wednesday, February 28, 1962, at 4:00 p.m., Eastern Standard Time.

Mr. **McGINNIS**. Mr. President, I second the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate adjourned at 2:42 p.m., Eastern Standard Time.