H. 1272.—DEBATE ADJOURNED

The following Bill was taken up:

H. 1272.—Messrs. NELSON, ROGERS, YARBOROUGH, HOLLAND and ELTZROTH: A Bill to amend Item (18) of Section 65-1404, Code of Laws of South Carolina, 1952, exempting gross proceeds of the sale of railroad cars, locomotives and certain vessels from the sales tax, so as to include the gross proceeds of sales of certain trucks, tractors and trailers, and the parts thereof, within this provision.

On motion of Mr. ELTZROTH, debate was adjourned upon the Bill.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. LEE, from the Committee on Judiciary, submitted a favorable report on:

H. 2035.—Messrs. McNAIR, LEE and SAMS: A Bill to amend Section 19-111, Code of Laws of South Carolina, 1952, as amended, relating to renunciation of dower, so as to delete therefrom the requirement of an official seal and to provide that the absence of a seal in renunciations heretofore or hereafter made shall not invalidate any renunciation of right of dower.

H. 2055.—100 EXTRA COPIES ORDERED PRINTED

On motion of Mr. BELSER, with unanimous consent, it was ordered that 100 extra copies of H. 2055 be printed.

HOUSE STANDS AT EASE

Mr. ALLEN moved that the House reconvene until 11:55 A.M., which motion was adopted.

THE HOUSE RESUMES

At 11:55 A.M. the House resumed, the Speaker in the Chair.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

The following was introduced:

H. 2056.—RICHLAND DELEGATION: A Concurrent Resolution authorizing the introduction of a Bill providing for the restoration of the charter of Green Harvester Company.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 10, 1962

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

That permission be granted for the introduction in the General Assembly of a Bill authorizing and providing for the restoration of the charter of Green Harvester Company upon payment of any fees which may be due to the Secretary of State as provided by law.

The Concurrent Resolution was agreed to by a vote of 91 to 0 and having received the necessary two-thirds vote was ordered sent to the Senate.

COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO ESCORT THE GOVERNOR

The SPEAKER appointed Messrs. LeaMond, Love and Nelson of a Committee to escort the Governor.

JOINT ASSEMBLY ADDRESSED BY GOVERNOR ERNEST F. HOLLINGS

At 12:00 noon the Senate appeared in the Hall of the House. The President of the Senate called the Joint Assembly to order and announced that it convened under a term of a Concurrent Resolution adopted by both Houses.

The Clerk of the Senate read the Concurrent Resolution:

H. 2011.—Mr. BLATT: A Concurrent Resolution inviting His Excellency, Ernest F. Hollings, Governor, to address the General Assembly in Joint Session at 12:00 noon on Wednesday, January 10, 1962.

Governor Hollings was escorted into the Hall of the House by a committee composed of Senators Bristow, Scurry and Waddell and Messrs. LeaMond, Love and Nelson.

The President of the Senate introduce Governor Hollings who then addressed the Joint Assembly as follows:

The young year we began two weeks ago promises to be our best. It starts in the wake of major breakthroughs in every significant area. Our crops are up 11%; our industry expands to another record. Our people are caught up in the restlessness of progress. Responding to every alert on the domestic front, the leadership has come. Unselfishly, our people are working as a team. Their call is for improvement. And now we must answer
with total effort. On an election year some will say, take it easy—let's not rock the boat. But the speed of developments, the intensity of competition, the great unfinished job demand otherwise. And the call is clear. We will not rest—we will work. We will cut loose the weight of mediocrity, the drug of self-satisfaction. We will move.

Our drive forward has been cleared by fiscal foresight. Three years ago you adopted the budget plan I recommended and today instead of outlining a program of new taxes we are able to calmly and deliberately provide for the state's needs. The only obstacle now is low per capita income. And yet the only way to raise the income level of any is to raise the education level of all.

Plato said: "The direction in which education starts a man will determine his future life." And the direction in which the Assembly starts education will determine education's future. Each year the goal is for teachers' pay, but this is only the fifty yard line. To score, we must move into the other territory, i.e., local leadership, local support, local responsibility. Our real goal is quality education, and the way to reach it is to let the localities carry the ball. The responsibility for current development and educational improvement should rest with the local districts. The state's job is to provide assistance. That assistance should be primarily in three categories: (1) giving to education all the money we can afford; (2) insuring to the best of our ability that our teachers are qualified; and (3) establishing a minimum education program. A minimum program would comprise more than teachers' pay. It would constitute, in addition to teachers' salaries, standards for teachers, supervisors, librarians, textbooks, television, construction, transportation, and other educational guidance factors. Aid to the counties should be on this basis. At present the state's grant in aid to the counties is based largely on a minimum teacher salary schedule. There is no responsibility on the county to supplement these funds. The responsibility for establishing the cost of education is not fixed. There is no incentive for local improvement. Salaries are depressed and the incentive or enthusiasm that may show is swept up in the annual march on Columbia for increased teachers' salaries. Each year the great debate in the General Assembly is for a new schedule. "The beginning teacher should get more." "The experienced teacher should get more." "They are paid by a chart, not by ability." And so goes the chant—and the new schedule. In 1951, as chairman of a committee for a new schedule, I was told by education's leadership that the schedule we adopted was the best—it was final. Instead, this schedule has been changed no less than seven times by seven legislatures and eleven special study committees. We are spinning our wheels. We have headed education in the direction of a circle. The leadership and incentive for education are lost in frustration.

If the state were to assume its role of establishing a minimum education program with teacher standards—and appropriate on this basis—any move on Columbia would necessarily be for upgrading the minimum program. In turn, if the locality were to assume its role for curriculum, teachers' pay, and other improvements, the people would have at their finger tips the schools they want. The county that wanted to move ahead would not be held back. The effort, the interest, the enthusiasm for quality education by our people at home would be brought immediately to bear on the local authorities. And education would begin to move to the goal of quality.

A sharing of the financial burden between the state and locality will bring the quickest results. The locality must assume its fair share. At present South Carolina is spending an average of $180 per pupil in average daily attendance. Of this amount the state is supplying $123, the local district $52, and the federal government $5. In comparison, the state is making a far greater contribution than local governments. This is proper, for education is our responsibility. But in relation to ability to pay, the state is making a far greater contribution than states of similar economic status, and the local government is failing to adequately support the schools. This must be corrected. It can only be corrected if the state bases its grants to the counties on the county's compliance with the minimum education program and in accordance with its local support ability. Such a program must be premised on certain cardinal principles:

1) No county will receive less money from the state than it is presently receiving.

2) No county will pay more than it can afford to pay.
3) The upgrading of local support must be realistic—with the increase not to exceed 10% more than their present contribution.

In the light of these principles, we must select a proven index of local support ability and adapt it to South Carolina. The factors of such a formula recommended by Cresap, McCormick and Paget are (a) value of public utilities; (b) value of farm products; (c) registration of passenger cars; (d) retail sales, (e) value of manufacturing and merchandising. Using these factors in a formula, the index of local support ability will show how much each county should pay in comparison with the other counties. I have placed at each Member’s desk the Cresap Study Report on the Organization and Role of the State Department of Education. The report used the increase in cost per pupil, from $179 to $210. It also adjusted the ratio of contribution by the state and local from 71.1% state and 28.9% local, to 65% state and 35% local. The report calls for an average of 48% increase in the expenditure of local funds from 59-60 to 62-63. This is too ambitious a program to be instituted by one legislature in one year. The General Assembly should work on the principle. At this Session I hope at a bare minimum for the adoption of the principle. I would suggest that no county receive less than it is presently receiving and that no county be called upon to increase its local support more than 10% over the present local contribution.

South Carolina will continue to provide for her schools. We will not shun our duty. We are only trying to improve education by asking the local communities to pay in accordance with their ability and giving them the reins of leadership. The state will continue to spend more money for education. This year I recommend for education appropriations to the limit of the budget—an 11% increase in teachers’ pay. This is substantial considering the increase we have made the past ten years. This sets a record in financial attention by a state to a group of its loyal servants. With this commendable effort, we hope the General Assembly will move on to other elements of our crusade of “Fifty to First.”

The other elements are:

1) The State Board of Education should be representative of the entire population. I urge you to provide for a lay board of 14 members, one from each judicial circuit, and allow this board to choose its own administrative officer. In this new role, the Department should be designed to promulgate a minimum program, to engage in research, assist the local districts, coordinate educational effort, and evaluate educational achievements by each district.

2) The State Department should be reorganized. At present there are 16 boards, commissions and agencies dealing with some phase of our state educational programs. Eight of these are appointed by the governor, six by the General Assembly, and two are largely independent and self-perpetuating. This means that four separate levels of government are concerned with our educational system, resulting in a strange set of organizational relationships, conflicting duties and responsibilities, and yet no one of them with a mandate to provide the educational leadership required for improvement. We can no longer afford to burden our educational system with this diffusion of responsibility, and I urge a prompt consolidation of all state educational agencies concerned with primary and secondary education under the reconstituted Board of Education.

3) If we are to avoid the tragic economic waste of the students who fail to finish high school, we need to improve drastically the holding power of our schools. A substantial improvement would be the modernization of our high school industrial arts program. Rather than obsolete arts as woodwork, instruction in technical and industrial skills must be provided. Today, many a student realizes his parents cannot afford college. He knows he is wasting his time and he is ready to quit and go to work. However, if he is taught something he can do, he will take this course, rather than drop out. And we would give him two additional years of English and mathematics, making him a better citizen.

This change in the role of the State Department, this assumption of responsibility by the locality, will give impetus to education. Minimum standards will be set, the quality of the teacher certified, and we will make pressure effective where it should be—at the local level.

Turning to higher education, I recommend a 10% increase in the salaries for college faculties. The report of the Governor's
Advisory Committee on Higher Education will be ready approximately March 1, and I will complete my education recommendations at that time.

The great break-through last year was the creation of a pilot program for industrial and technical training. It was just in time. The competition of Georgia and North Carolina, each with a $25 million program was stultifying. We needed diversified industry, but we couldn’t furnish the skill—or the skill training. Our industrial drive was grinding to a halt, but you cleared the way. The six member committee authorized has obtained the most competent director and they have been working with you around the clock. Already 14 state-local training programs are under way. Five heavy metals industries are having their workers instructed by this program. But this is just a beginning. Our 70% rural population in 1950 will become a 67% urban population by 1975. A complete reversal. Mechanization, automation, and competition with the Common Market will require better trained workers and in many instances a different skill for the already proficient. The blunt fact is that ten years from now there will be a very few unskilled jobs in America. South Carolina must prepare. We have made the beginning. But now the committee must be given commission status and permanent authority. The sum of $1,206,000 should be provided immediately for this and the next year’s fiscal operation.

We must catch up. We must compete. Our youth and citizenry deserve the opportunity. Bringing new jobs to South Carolina is only half the battle. We will win completely when we equip our people to handle the job with skill, with confidence.

For three years, we have made a concerted effort for our farmer. The need of jobs for South Carolina is largely the need of the farmer for a job. Our development program has met this need with 40,000 new jobs. The marginal farm operation has caused under-employment. To this we have committed a rural development program. Four outstanding farmers serve on our Development Board and an Agricultural Division has been instituted to develop new income for our farmers such as the food processing industry. A grain elevator is being constructed for the soy bean farmer. Additional monies for agricultural research have been appropriated. The development of dairy farming has been assured with the new Dairy Commission Act. The untied tobacco problem, the crown rot and blast disease for our peach farmer have been attacked. The first atomic agricultural seminar in the nation has been held at Clemson. But we must do more.

Self-help programs, initiated, devised, and operated by producer groups, must be supported. These groups should be authorized to select or organize their own representative organization. The legislation must be permissive, not mandatory. It should permit these groups to engage in research, promotion, advertising, merchandising, and other marketing practices. And all should be subject to the rule of the ballot of each producer group, safeguarded by the alternatives and limitations provided in the enabling legislation. This will go to the heart of the farm problem in South Carolina, i.e., processing and marketing. This is the unanimous recommendation of the Governor’s Advisory Council on Agriculture.

Every section of the farm community, every agricultural interest is represented on the Governor’s Advisory Council on Agriculture. They have travelled, studied, and worked all summer and fall to develop a truly comprehensive purpose and plan for the South Carolina farmer. Their report is available and I commend their conclusions to you for action where necessary.

The individual farmer in South Carolina cannot hope to compete with the agricultural complex of a state like California. The future of agriculture lies in voluntary cooperation among our farmers. The future of our state lies in an appreciation for, and maintenance of our farm economy. The energy, independence and wisdom of South Carolina’s farmer is indispensable to South Carolina’s tradition of conservative government.

Fifty years ago, a program was started to map the soil resources of South Carolina. Last Friday I was presented an inventory of soil needs. It shows that with an additional $15,000 we can complete the soil mapping program in 1962. I recommend this. No more valuable survey can be made for the development of our state.

Two years ago I emphasized that the greatest natural resource we have is water. We still do not have a water policy, nor do we have an agency to deal fully with this resource. I recommend that our present Water Pollution Control Authority
be resolved into a Water Resources Commission so that we can
develop fully and equitably the water resources of this state for
industrial, municipal, agricultural, recreational, and other users.

An additional $800,000 is recommended for our mental health
facilities. The residency program for psychiatrists at the State
Hospital is developing. At Whitten Village a rehabilitation
center and two additional dormitories will be built this year.
This will bring this fine institution to a maximum operational
size. Already additional facilities are needed, including a school
for mentally retarded children. This facility should be located
near the medical training center to facilitate the availability and
assistance of trained personnel. Your Mental Health Committee
has been working in this direction, and I commend its study and
finding to you.

As I tell of capital improvements at Whitten Village, I think of
the bonds necessary to be issued and the interest to be paid.
I think again of the hot and cold running government that we
fiscally provide—and the recommendation that went wanting
last year of a capital improvement fund. The $8 million surplus
that we lost could well have been expended for these dormitories
at Whitten Village, improvements at the State Hospital, dental
school, a state office building, penitentiary facilities, or part of
the $14 million construction program of our institutions of
higher learning that was committed in 1961. The industrial
development program continues to provide new revenues. But
this will level off, and we will want to maintain the AAA rating
of our bonds. Legislatures in later years will be compelled to
raise taxes unless a capital improvement fund is instituted. You
and I as public servants owe not only a duty to today but a
responsibility to tomorrow.

The status of our senior citizens must be recognized. They
must be looked upon not as a problem but as an opportunity.
There is no greater wealth of talent available than their accumu-
lated experience and knowledge. South Carolina needs their
counsel and wisdom. They need our recognition. We must give
them an organization and a forum. For an investment of $25,000,
we can create a working commission to represent, coordinate,
and develop their programs and opportunities. I commend this
to your attention and action.
removal to another state of the only wide-range television station in central South Carolina. I urge your vigorous opposition so our citizens may retain adequate communications with their state capital.

Our Sunday work law should be strengthened, not to control an economy, but to prohibit economy from controlling our Sundays.

Additional dormitories at the Denmark Area Trade School should be provided.

The Broad River Farm should be authorized to be sold by the Board of Corrections and the proceeds applied to the purchase of land suitable for truck farming and development of a youthful offenders camp.

The Adoption Bill now before your House Judiciary Committee, with minor changes, should be adopted by this General Assembly.

The staff of the State Fire Marshal is inadequate. The inspection of school buildings alone would take the two members seven years. I recommend six additional inspectors who can also assist the fire departments in our cities and towns.

The South Carolina Retirement System is doing an exceptional job. Every member of the System should be comforted in the knowledge that it is operated on the soundest of financial principles. We should always be alert for any opportunity to liberalize and expand this excellent coverage. At my request, the Director is making a review to determine that those participating are receiving the maximum benefit allowable under approved actuarial practices. I commend his recommendations to you. I have also requested that he work with you to institute a retirement fund for peace officers of South Carolina. The Highway Patrol and all other law enforcement groups would be eligible. The benefits and age of retirement could be set separately for this fund.

South Carolina has the lowest number of dentists per thousand of population of any state. This year 143 young men left South Carolina to receive their dental education. Acclimated to communities in other states, many will not return. The Dental School authorized in 1952 should now be constructed.

The recommendations of the South Carolina Forestry Committee should be implemented.

Our Educational TV system should be extended.

This—is the state of our state. Good, getting better. Moving and moving faster. When once our challenge was to ignite the fires of a faltering economy—our challenge today is to stay out in front of a surging and soaring one.

Our problems may grow, but so will our capability to solve them. Working together we will solve them. Let history show to a later generation that 1962 was a year of legislative wisdom—that progress was a partner and defeat a stranger. In your deliberations and in your actions, you have unsurpassed opportunity. It is then with trust and with confidence that I—and all the people of South Carolina—leave with you our hopes, our needs—our prayers.

ELECTION OF A MEMBER OF THE SUPREME COURT

The President announced that nominations were in order for a member of the Supreme Court to succeed Hon. Joseph R. Moss. Senator Hayes, on behalf of the York Delegation, nominated Justice Moss of York.

Mr. GENTRY on behalf of the Pickens Delegation, Mr. ELTZROTH on behalf of the Hampton Delegation, Mr. AMICK on behalf of the Saluda Delegation, Senator Grant on behalf of the Chester Delegation, Senator Brown on behalf of the Barnwell Delegation, Mr. LEPPARD on behalf of the Chesterfield Delegation, Mr. THOMASON on behalf of the Greenville Delegation, Senator M. B. Williams on behalf of the Orangeburg Delegation, Mr. WEATHERFORD on behalf of the Cherokee Delegation, Senator Smoak on behalf of the Colleton Delegation, Mr. MCELVEEN on behalf of the Richland Delegation, seconded the nomination of Justice Moss.

On motion of Mr. MCELVEEN nominations were closed and with unanimous consent, the vote was taken by acclamation, resulting in the election of the nominee.

Whereupon, the President announced that Justice Moss was duly elected for the term prescribed by law.

ELECTION OF A JUDGE FOR THE FIRST JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

The President announced that nominations were in order for a judge for the First Judicial Circuit to succeed Judge James...