

Stewart L. Udall, Speech at Flagstaff, 10/28 (For release Thur. night)

I have wanted during this campaign to discuss our national educational policies and problems--and, not surprisingly, I have chosen your community as the forum for this speech. I have always been convinced that the money we invest in education is our surest insurance of future progress (for example, the so-called GI Bill of Rights has not only opened the door of opportunity to millions of young Americans, but has given us a skilled work force that is second to none in the world.) If our teachers and educators--who perform their duties for a very modest stipend--are not the unsung heroes of our society, they are at least its most valuable citizens.

The financing of our school programs is currently a paramount national, and local, problem. The commissioner of education, Mr. Brownell, reports that we are short 340,000 classrooms; and our teacher shortage is becoming more acute each year.

At risk of arousing your indignation, I want this evening to tell you how the 83rd congress passed up an opportunity to create a great national school-building fund without increasing your taxes one cent. I refer, of course, to the action of this congress in quit-claiming away title to a vast national resource--the oil-rich offshore lands. Let me explain the essentials of this controversy. In essence, this dispute was a lawsuit between four states (California, Texas, Louisiana and Florida) and the federal government to determine title to the undersea lands lying beyond the low-tide mark. Our Supreme Court held that these lands were owned by all of the people, but these coastal states were not content to leave the matter in this posture and they besieged the congress to "give the land to us anyway". At this point, the pro-education forces entered the fight with a proposal that the royalties from

these lands be placed in a national school fund to benefit all of the 48 states--a bill which became known as the oil-for-education amendment. Under this measure the coastal states which border on the undersea oil beds would have received a generous 37½% of all revenues, the other states the balance. However, this concession was not enough, and the Republicans kept a principal 1952 campaign pledge and ramrodded through a bill giving exclusive title to the coastal states.

Let us see what this cost Arizona and her school system.

The three leading estimates of the worth of the offshore petroleum are as follows:

\$50 billion -- U. S. Geological Survey  
\$125 billion -- L. G. Weeks, noted petroleum expert  
\$300 billion -- Wallace Pratt, former v.p. Standard Oil of N. J.

Using the Pratt figure and a royalty rental rate of 20%, the sum of money available to our state to build classrooms (perhaps over a period of 40 to 50 years) would be in the neighborhood of \$325 million. *and ZIP*

How, you ask, do our Republican friends (Goldwater and Rhodes) justify this bounty--of whom the chief beneficiary was our western neighbor, California. It's easy, no trouble at all. As my opponent says, "It was a bureaucratic attempt of the Truman administration to deprive the states of their rights." Forget that the coastal states had their day in Court to present their claims; forget about classrooms; forget about school children -- just close your eyes and give all to California, one of the wealthiest states in the union. I say to you that if California had been half as generous to Arizona, we would have had the Central Arizona project long ago!

The "tidelands" are gone, but if a school-minded congress is elected this fall, it is not too late to still preserve the continental

shelf lands for a national school fund. This is a minimum program which must, in my opinion, be accomplished.

With our rapid growth in this state, we will have cause in the future to regret many times the action of the 83rd congress in relinquishing title to the "tidelands", a vast national asset. This wasteful action was perhaps best summarized by the Washington Post, one of our best newspapers: "It was a giveaway of the most profligate sort, endowing a few favored states with a tremendous national asset which should have been conserved and developed for the protection and benefit of the entire American people."

Let me discuss with you <sup>rather</sup> ~~one~~ of the vital school programs <sup>initiated by our party</sup> which has been endangered by action of the present administration. I refer, of course, to the Federal Aid to Education program which was initiated after the war to promote construction of new schools. Under the protests of President Eisenhower's commissioner of education, Mr. Brownell, this entire program was put on the shelf by the 83rd congress. The only reason given for this action is that conferences and studies of the problem are needed before further action is taken. However, as Sen. Lister Hill of Alabama pointed out, there have already been seven national conferences on this question going back to the Hoover administration, and 7 million dollars have already been spent on a school survey. The essence of this program is that the wealth of the entire nation should be used to build classrooms and to help ~~Arizona~~ areas where facilities are substandard or Federal activity has imposed an undue burden on <sup>a</sup> ~~the~~ community. Your own community has benefited from this program in the past and I noticed in the press this Monday that one of your school districts has just received a grant of \$66,000 for

-Page Four-

school purposes. The Democratic party believes that the wealth of the entire state should be used to pay the cost of educating our children, and it further believes that the wealth of the entire nation should, in at least a limited way, be used to assist in constructing school buildings. These are programs and policies in which we can justly take pride.