

REMARKS BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

ANNUAL CONFERENCE

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES

MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN

JULY 21, 1971

Two weeks ago, the Senate Subcommittee on Rural Development of which I am privileged to be the Chairman, held field hearings in the South. We went to Georgia and Alabama to examine firsthand what local people were doing to solve their problems.

And, we found out.

We saw progressive and exciting child development centers, bold and beautiful recreational areas, business and industry reviving. We were told about jobs, about opportunities, and about good wages.

And, when we asked how these things have come about, invariably the answer was People, Resources, and driving, committed Leadership.

The two areas we visited -- Alma-Bacon, Georgia, and Decatur, Alabama are success stories of rural renewal.

We need similar success stories in other parts of our Nation, because we are faced with an overpowering sense of urgency that envelopes our cities and counties and frustrates our way of living.

We know the problems. Urbanologists can recite a litany of urban ills.

They see smog, and they say it is bad.

And, it is.

They see slum housing, and they say it is bad.

And, it is.

They see congestion; they see poor schools; and they say these are bad.

And, they are.

But beneath all of these is one inescapable fact: We have not yet learned that as a nation we must begin to plan and to understand our own growth.

Two hundred years ago, this country dedicated itself to national independence.

Now, two hundred years later, this country must dedicate itself to balanced national growth.

To live as a free people with free political institutions requires freedom of residence -- to be able to choose where we want to live.

That freedom is being denied today -- by technology, by confused national policies that have permitted our rural areas to deteriorate and our cities to decay, but most importantly by the lack of a National Growth Policy:

-- Does it make sense for the outmigration from rural areas to continue at the rate of 600,000 a year?

-- Is it right that more than one-half of all the counties in the United States lost population last year?

-- Does it make sense for 73 per cent of the people to live on 2 per cent of the land?

-- Is it sound national policy for a nation of our size, our wealth, and our potential to be without a transportation policy, an understandable energy policy or a program for long-term financing of public facilities?

I say it is not sound national policy; it makes no sense.

And, it is time to come face to face with reality: We have been asking the wrong questions and seeking the wrong answers.

We should ask not are we going to grow, but, "How are we going to grow?" Where are we going to grow?" and "What kind of life will we have?"

We could continue on the same course, with the continuing migration to the cities. But it is breaking the backs of the taxpayers and still the cities cannot provide adequate services.

We can continue to have a total national welfare burden of some \$20.9 billion dollars. We can continue to see welfare costs increase -- as they have in Los Angeles, for example, rising in just two years from \$700 million to \$1.3 billion.

We can continue to spend huge amounts for basic services -- services that seldom get better but always get worse.

We can continue as before -- or we can define and follow a balanced national growth policy.

We can decide what we must do in transportation, in housing, in education, in land use, in health and welfare, and in population distribution.

And we can begin immediately to implement balanced national growth programs.

But, any programs we propose and any changes we make will fail unless we have a healthy, booming economy.

This nation's economy is floundering badly and all of us know it.

Inflation has boosted food prices, housing costs, clothing costs and medical expenses.

The consumer price index has increased at an annual rate of about 6 per cent.

Unemployment totals over 5.5 million workers -- and the so-called "hidden unemployment" -- people so discouraged because they can't find a job that they have dropped out of the labor force altogether -- may make the total as high as 7 million.

And, by the end of this year, the recession will have cost state and local governments \$6 billion in lost revenues. It will cost the Federal government over \$30 billion. And, it will cost the economy over \$150 billion.

We simply cannot continue with a high rate of unemployment with high interest rates, with climbing inflation, and a sluggish economic growth.

I have called for an effective national incomes policy to curb inflation, to build confidence in the dollar and to stimulate the economy.

I repeat that call today. I invite you to join with me.

\* \* \*

I believe that the 1970's should be the decade of domestic development.

In the 1950's, we ignored problems.

In the 1960's, we defined problems and began to solve them.

In the 1970's, we must make the breakthroughs that lead to real solutions.

This is a decade in which we must correct the imbalance that has made our Nation privately wealthy but publicly poor.

And we can begin by implementing a national growth policy.

When I spoke to your Legislative Conference in April, I endorsed the idea of general revenue sharing.

I want to reiterate my support. And I urge both the Congress and the Administration to put aside partisanship and individual pride of authorship to pass an acceptable revenue sharing bill this session.

But I want a revenue sharing bill not just for the big cities but for all units of government. I cannot support a revenue sharing plan that omits states and cuts off counties under 50,000 population.

To do so would be to make over 40 per cent of our people second-class fiscal citizens.

And, I will not be a part of it.

We must also federalize the entire cost of welfare. And, we can make a beginning this year.

Welfare is a national problem. It demands national answers and national financing.

A third program that I believe is essential is the National Domestic Development Bank -- legislation I recently introduced to help cities, states, and towns finance vitally needed public projects.

My legislation is based on accepted principles of international finance. I propose that we now apply them at home by providing long-term loans at low interest rates and couple the financial help with technical assistance.

This plan will allow cities, counties, towns, school districts and other government jurisdictions to move ahead on a wide range of urgently needed public construction.

It will provide an alternative source of funds for new schools, for medical and hospital centers, for day care centers, parks, waste disposal plants, playgrounds, mass transit systems, and much more.

It can provide jobs and stimulate the economy.

It can remove the reliance of local governments on the ever-increasing property tax.

And, it can help promote better balanced urban-rural growth.

We have used this approach successfully overseas. I say if we can help build a better Rio de Janeiro, then we can build a better Milwaukee or Detroit, or McKean or Erie County.

Next, we can and must enact the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act of 1971.

This legislation can help stem the tide of outmigration before it becomes a flood.

It recognizes that much of the urban crisis is due to the deterioration of rural America.

This proposal is fundamental to a National Growth Policy.

The legislation is designed explicitly for communities under 35,000 population. It creates a Federal Rural Development Credit Agency to be an expeditor of community programs.

This is a bill to help small communities and rural counties to conserve their most basic resource -- people -- people who can build and revitalize their communities.

But development and financial proposals are only part of achieving a viable balanced national growth.

If we are really serious about understanding national growth . . . if we really want to help the cities . . . if we really want to renew rural America and make a better life for all of our citizens . . . then we must take a hard look at the structure of government at all levels. For all levels of government must play a role, working together, putting aside narrow self-interest and jurisdictional jealousies to promote a better life for people -- because that is what government is all about.

County government is coming into its own. There has been a lot of talk about the place and about the future of county government.

I say it has a place and an important future.

But I also believe it can do better than it has been doing.

And reorganization can help make county government more effective. It can make it more understandable, more sympathetic and more responsive.

Let me give you my views:

First, counties must have the option of home rule. They must have the power to restructure the way they deliver services. They must have the flexibility to change their methods.

Second, we must reduce the proliferation of autonomous and overlapping jurisdictions.

In Los Angeles county, for example, there are over 3000 separate units of government. In Watts alone, there are over 80 different jurisdictions.

Counties should have control over this infrastructure -- the special districts of an area. Counties should be able to supervise the activities of these districts and make certain that one district does not work against the interest of the others.

Third, counties need the authority to transfer and consolidate functions between the municipalities and county governments. There can be a "two level" approach to serving people, if the authority to rationalize functions is provided.

Fourth, counties should have adequate taxing power.

Fifth, counties need the authority to coordinate and evaluate municipal zoning priorities in order to use available land wisely for planned, balanced growth.

Sixth, county governments must become more professional. They should utilize advanced technology and management experts. I believe they should hire out-of-work aerospace engineers, research associates and other trained personnel.

But at the same time, political responsibility should be centralized in the hands of an elected official and his council.

Experts should be kept on tap -- not on top.

County reorganization is only one aspect, though, of effectively implementing a national growth policy.

What is also needed is the transformation of single purpose planning commissions into comprehensive planning and development agencies on a multi-county basis.

Multi-county units can deal more effectively and more efficiently with the economy, migration, poverty, underemployment, governmental cooperation, citizen participation and balanced growth.

These organizations are a natural link between the counties, the states and Federal agencies. They can provide the administrative and communication channels between the various governmental levels.

They can be mechanisms for policy determination on a regional scale.

But if they are to be effective, they must be granted area-wide responsibilities.

Multi-county bodies should not be isolated -- they should be duplicated over the entire states.

They must have professional staff.

County membership must be mandatory.

And these agencies must be adequately funded.

\* \* \*

Development Banks, credit services, governmental reform, and comprehensive planning can take us a long way toward balanced national growth.

The urban and rural crises are real and urgent and challenging.

If we are going to do anything about how we live, and where we are going to live -- if we are going to have true freedom of residence, then we must act now.

Tomorrow is too late.

Today is the first day of the rest of our life.

# # # # #

NACO

Check-at-Su ē

- President Cleon Chikassey (Iowa)  
Int'l. Pres. ~~Wally~~ Wally (Bill) Corner  
(Louise)

x Bernie Hillenbrand Exec Director

(X) Bill Konē-askē Konarski - Pres. Minn County  
REMARKS BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY  
(Recycling) ANNUAL CONFERENCE  
Officials - Scott County

- San Diego  
- Report 1972

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES

MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN

JULY 21, 1971

3 conferences sponsored during my V.P. years

V.P.'s  
- Stan Smith  
- Shady Spelman  
- Mel Barrett

I art saw <sup>natl</sup> Legis. Conference in  
you = D.C. Marriott Hotel

(1969-70. absent)

1968 - Wash D.C. - all 3 Presidential Candidates 201-1455

1967 - Detroit - 1966 - N. Orleans / 1965 - San Diego

# Recycling

TWO WEEKS AGO, THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT OF WHICH I AM PRIVILEGED TO BE THE CHAIRMAN, HELD FIELD HEARINGS IN THE SOUTH. WE WENT TO GEORGIA AND ALABAMA TO EXAMINE FIRSTHAND WHAT LOCAL PEOPLE WERE DOING TO SOLVE THEIR PROBLEMS.

AND, WE FOUND OUT — learned a great deal.

WE SAW PROGRESSIVE AND EXCITING CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTERS, BOLD AND BEAUTIFUL RECREATIONAL AREAS, BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY REVIVING.

WE WERE TOLD ABOUT JOBS, ABOUT OPPORTUNITIES, AND ABOUT GOOD WAGES.

AND, WHEN WE ASKED HOW THESE THINGS HAVE COME ABOUT, INVARIABLY THE ANSWER WAS PEOPLE, RESOURCES, AND DRIVING, COMMITTED LEADERSHIP. !

L THE TWO AREAS WE VISITED -- ALMA-BACON, GEORGIA,  
AND DECATUR, ALABAMA ARE SUCCESS STORIES OF RURAL RENEWAL!  
*Renewal with Planning.*

L WE NEED SIMILAR SUCCESS STORIES IN OTHER PARTS OF  
OUR NATION, BECAUSE WE ARE FACED WITH AN OVERPOWERING  
SENSE OF URGENCY THAT ENVELOPES OUR CITIES AND COUNTIES  
AND FRUSTRATES OUR WAY OF LIVING.

L WE KNOW THE PROBLEMS! URBANOLOGISTS CAN RECITE A  
LITANY OF URBAN ILLS.

L THEY SEE SMOG, AND THEY SAY IT IS BAD.

AND, IT IS!

L THEY SEE SLUM HOUSING, AND THEY SAY IT IS BAD.

AND, IT IS!

↳ THEY SEE CONGESTION; THEY SEE POOR SCHOOLS; AND THEY  
SAY THESE ARE BAD.!

AND, THEY ARE.!

↳ BUT BENEATH ALL OF THESE IS ONE INESCAPABLE FACT:  
WE HAVE NOT YET LEARNED THAT AS A NATION WE MUST BEGIN  
TO PLAN AND TO UNDERSTAND OUR OWN GROWTH,

↳ TWO HUNDRED YEARS AGO, THIS COUNTRY DEDICATED ITSELF TO  
NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE.

↳ NOW, TWO HUNDRED YEARS LATER, THIS COUNTRY MUST DEDICATE  
ITSELF TO BALANCED NATIONAL GROWTH.!

↳ TO LIVE AS A FREE PEOPLE WITH FREE POLITICAL  
INSTITUTIONS REQUIRES FREEDOM OF RESIDENCE -- TO BE ABLE

*freely*  
TO CHOOSE WHERE WE WANT TO LIVE. - *yes freedom of*  
*choice - not ~~forced~~ compelled by*

Economic or Social forces that  
leave no choice but to move

- 4 -

↳ THAT FREEDOM IS BEING DENIED TODAY -- BY TECHNOLOGY, by  
economic forces,

BY CONFUSED NATIONAL POLICIES THAT HAVE PERMITTED OUR

RURAL AREAS TO DETERIORATE AND OUR CITIES TO DECAY, BUT also

and MOST IMPORTANTLY BY THE LACK OF A NATIONAL GROWTH POLICY:

Some functions -

- DOES IT MAKE SENSE FOR THE OUTMIGRATION FROM RURAL

AREAS TO CONTINUE AT THE RATE OF 600,000 A YEAR?

-- IS IT RIGHT THAT MORE THAN ONE-HALF OF ALL THE

COUNTIES IN THE UNITED STATES LOST POPULATION LAST YEAR?

-- DOES IT MAKE SENSE FOR 73 PER CENT OF THE PEOPLE TO

LIVE ON 2 PER CENT OF THE LAND?

Does it make sense, to have no plan, no long term program ~~for~~ that faces up to the needs of the next 100 million

Educ  
Housing  
Health

-- IS IT SOUND NATIONAL POLICY FOR A NATION OF OUR

SIZE, OUR WEALTH, AND OUR POTENTIAL TO BE WITHOUT A national

TRANSPORTATION POLICY, AN UNDERSTANDABLE ENERGY POLICY OR

A PROGRAM FOR LONG-TERM FINANCING OF PUBLIC FACILITIES?

L I SAY IT IS NOT SOUND NATIONAL POLICY; <sup>and,</sup> IT MAKES NO

SENSE!

~~AND, IT IS TIME TO COME FACE TO FACE WITH REALITY~~ <sup>we</sup>

HAVE BEEN ASKING THE WRONG QUESTIONS AND <sup>getting</sup> ~~ASKING~~ THE WRONG

ANSWERS.

L WE SHOULD ASK NOT ARE WE GOING TO GROW, BUT, "How

ARE WE GOING TO GROW?" "WHERE ARE WE GOING TO GROW?" AND

"WHAT KIND OF LIFE WILL WE HAVE?"

Ⓧ We should seek not only a higher standard of living - things goods - income but a better quality of life -

- wholesome environment, good educ.,  
health care, recreation etc.

- 6 -

↳ ~~numbers~~ WE COULD CONTINUE ON THE SAME COURSE, WITH THE CONTINUING

MIGRATION TO THE CITIES, BUT, IT IS BREAKING THE BACKS OF

THE TAXPAYERS AND STILL THE CITIES CANNOT PROVIDE ADEQUATE

SERVICES,

↳ WE CAN CONTINUE TO HAVE A ~~REAL~~ NATIONAL WELFARE

BURDEN OF SOME \$20.9 BILLION DOLLARS, ~~pressing!~~ WE CAN CONTINUE TO

SEE WELFARE COSTS INCREASE -- AS THEY HAVE IN LOS ANGELES,

FOR EXAMPLE, RISING IN JUST TWO YEARS FROM \$700 MILLION

TO \$1.3 BILLION,

↳ WE CAN CONTINUE TO SPEND HUGE AMOUNTS FOR BASIC

SERVICES -- SERVICES THAT SELDOM GET BETTER BUT ~~often~~

GET WORSE.

OR  
ye L

or

WE CAN CONTINUE AS BEFORE -- OR WE CAN DEFINE AND

FOLLOW A BALANCED NATIONAL GROWTH POLICY,

Planning

L WE CAN DECIDE WHAT WE MUST DO IN TRANSPORTATION, IN

HOUSING, IN EDUCATION, IN LAND USE, IN HEALTH AND WELFARE,

AND IN POPULATION DISTRIBUTION

L AND WE CAN BEGIN IMMEDIATELY TO IMPLEMENT BALANCED

NATIONAL GROWTH PROGRAMS.

and we must!

Economy

BUT, ANY PROGRAMS WE PROPOSE AND ANY CHANGES WE MAKE

WILL FAIL UNLESS WE HAVE A HEALTHY, BOOMING ECONOMY.

L THIS NATION'S ECONOMY IS FLOUNDERING BADLY AND ALL OF

US KNOW IT.

L INFLATION HAS BOOSTED FOOD PRICES, HOUSING COSTS,

CLOTHING COSTS AND MEDICAL EXPENSES

and government costs.

THE CONSUMER PRICE INDEX HAS INCREASED AT AN ANNUAL  
RATE OF ABOUT 6 PER CENT. *+ continuous -*

UNEMPLOYMENT TOTALS OVER 5.5 MILLION WORKERS -- AND THE  
SO-CALLED "HIDDEN UNEMPLOYMENT" -- PEOPLE SO DISCOURAGED  
BECAUSE THEY CAN'T FIND A JOB THAT THEY HAVE DROPPED OUT  
OF THE LABOR FORCE ALTOGETHER -- MAY MAKE THE TOTAL AS HIGH

AS 7 MILLION *~ 8%* *Impact =*

*L* AND, BY THE END OF THIS YEAR, THE RECESSION WILL HAVE  
COST STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS \$6 BILLION IN LOST

REVENUES. *L* IT WILL COST THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OVER \$30

BILLION. AND, IT WILL COST THE ECONOMY OVER \$150 BILLION.

and it won't do any good  
to redefine words-

Parity = income ratios

Unemployment = 'statistical  
adjustments  
or work force ratios'

Poverty = income levels

(Task force)

Poverty groups increased  
1/2 million last  
2 years

L

WE SIMPLY CANNOT CONTINUE WITH A HIGH RATE OF UNEMPLOYMENT

WITH HIGH INTEREST RATES, HIGH CLIMBING INFLATION, AND

A SLUGGISH ECONOMIC GROWTH

~~This is not going to get better by~~

I HAVE CALLED FOR AN EFFECTIVE NATIONAL INCOMES POLICY

TO CURB INFLATION, TO BUILD CONFIDENCE IN THE DOLLAR AND

TO STIMULATE THE ECONOMY

Wage-Price Board  
Tax cut  
Public Service Emp  
Public works  
Release funds  
Full Funding  
Productivity  
Growth

I REPEAT THAT CALL TODAY. I INVITE YOU TO JOIN WITH

ME.

~~Jimmy Carter~~

I BELIEVE THAT THE 1970'S SHOULD BE THE DECADE OF

DOMESTIC DEVELOPMENT.

L

IN THE 1950'S, WE IGNORED PROBLEMS.

L

IN THE 1960'S, WE DEFINED PROBLEMS AND BEGAN TO

SOLVE THEM.

IN THE 1970's, WE MUST MAKE THE BREAKTHROUGHS THAT  
LEAD TO REAL SOLUTIONS.

THIS IS A DECADE IN WHICH WE MUST CORRECT THE  
IMBALANCE THAT HAS MADE OUR NATION PRIVATELY WEALTHY BUT  
PUBLICLY POOR.

AND WE CAN BEGIN BY IMPLEMENTING A NATIONAL GROWTH  
POLICY.

WHEN I SPOKE TO YOUR LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE IN APRIL,  
I ENDORSED THE IDEA OF GENERAL REVENUE SHARING.

I WANT TO REITERATE MY SUPPORT. AND I URGE BOTH  
THE CONGRESS AND THE ADMINISTRATION TO PUT ASIDE PARTISANSHIP  
AND INDIVIDUAL PRIDE OF AUTHORSHIP TO PASS AN ACCEPTABLE  
REVENUE SHARING BILL THIS SESSION.

*Revenue  
Sharing*

*New  
name!*

~~Call it~~

*(Congress) Revenue Sharing - manuscript*

BUT I WANT A REVENUE SHARING BILL NOT JUST FOR THE

BIG CITIES BUT FOR ALL UNITS OF GOVERNMENT. ~~I CANNOT SUPPORT~~

A REVENUE SHARING PLAN THAT OMITTS STATES AND CUTS OFF ~~CITIES +~~

COUNTIES UNDER 50,000 POPULATION.

*with is not good enough.*

~~To~~ ~~it~~ WOULD ~~be~~ MAKE OVER 40 PER CENT OF OUR

PEOPLE SECOND-CLASS FISCAL CITIZENS

*and that isn't fair or right*

~~AND I WILL NOT BE A PART OF IT.~~

*Welfare*  
*Second*

WE MUST ALSO FEDERALIZE THE ENTIRE COST OF WELFARE.

AND, WE CAN MAKE A BEGINNING THIS YEAR.

WELFARE IS A NATIONAL PROBLEM. IT DEMANDS NATIONAL

ANSWERS AND NATIONAL FINANCING. !

~~third Release Funds~~  
~~fourth Public Works.~~

Bank

A THIRD PROGRAM THAT I BELIEVE IS ESSENTIAL IS THE  
NATIONAL DOMESTIC DEVELOPMENT BANK -- LEGISLATION I RECENTLY  
INTRODUCED TO HELP CITIES, STATES, AND TOWNS FINANCE VITALLY  
NEEDED PUBLIC PROJECTS.

MY LEGISLATION IS BASED ON ACCEPTED PRINCIPLES OF  
INTERNATIONAL FINANCE. I PROPOSE THAT WE NOW APPLY THEM  
AT HOME BY PROVIDING LONG-TERM LOANS AT LOW INTEREST  
RATES AND COUPLE THE FINANCIAL HELP WITH TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

THIS PLAN WILL ALLOW CITIES, COUNTIES, TOWNS, SCHOOL  
DISTRICTS AND OTHER GOVERNMENT JURISDICTIONS TO MOVE AHEAD  
ON A WIDE RANGE OF URGENTLY NEEDED PUBLIC CONSTRUCTION.

↳ IT WILL PROVIDE AN ALTERNATIVE SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR  
NEW SCHOOLS, FOR MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL CENTERS, FOR  
DAY CARE CENTERS, PARKS, WASTE DISPOSAL PLANTS, PLAYGROUNDS,  
MASS TRANSIT SYSTEMS, AND MUCH MORE.

↳ IT CAN PROVIDE JOBS AND STIMULATE THE ECONOMY.

↳ IT CAN REMOVE THE RELIANCE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS ON THE  
EVER-INCREASING PROPERTY TAX.

↳ AND, IT CAN HELP PROMOTE BETTER BALANCED URBAN-RURAL  
GROWTH.

↳ WE HAVE USED THIS APPROACH SUCCESSFULLY OVERSEAS. I  
SAY IF WE CAN HELP BUILD A BETTER RIO DE JANEIRO, THEN  
WE CAN BUILD A BETTER MILWAUKEE OR DETROIT, OR McKEAN  
OR ERIE COUNTY.

Rural

NEXT, WE CAN AND MUST ENACT THE CONSOLIDATED FARM  
AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1971.

THIS LEGISLATION CAN HELP STEM THE TIDE OF OUTMIGRATION  
BEFORE IT BECOMES A FLOOD. - Hood Control

IT RECOGNIZES THAT MUCH OF THE URBAN CRISIS IS DUE TO  
THE DETERIORATION OF RURAL AMERICA.

THIS PROPOSAL IS FUNDAMENTAL TO A NATIONAL GROWTH  
POLICY.

THE LEGISLATION IS DESIGNED EXPLICITLY FOR COMMUNITIES  
UNDER 35,000 POPULATION. IT CREATES A FEDERAL RURAL  
DEVELOPMENT CREDIT AGENCY TO BE AN EXPEDITER OF COMMUNITY  
PROGRAMS.

THIS IS A BILL TO HELP SMALL COMMUNITIES AND RURAL  
COUNTIES TO CONSERVE THEIR MOST BASIC RESOURCE -- PEOPLE --  
PEOPLE WHO CAN BUILD AND REVITALIZE THEIR COMMUNITIES.

BUT DEVELOPMENT AND FINANCIAL PROPOSALS ARE ONLY PART  
OF ACHIEVING A VIABLE BALANCED NATIONAL GROWTH.

IF WE ARE REALLY SERIOUS ABOUT UNDERSTANDING NATIONAL  
GROWTH . . . IF WE REALLY WANT TO HELP THE CITIES . . . IF  
WE REALLY WANT TO RENEW RURAL AMERICA AND MAKE A BETTER LIFE  
FOR ALL OF OUR CITIZENS . . . THEN WE MUST TAKE A HARD LOOK  
AT THE STRUCTURE OF GOVERNMENT AT ALL LEVELS. FOR ALL  
LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT MUST PLAY A ROLE, WORKING TOGETHER,  
PUTTING ASIDE NARROW SELF-INTEREST AND JURISDICTIONAL  
JEALOUSIES TO PROMOTE A BETTER LIFE FOR PEOPLE -- BECAUSE  
THAT IS WHAT GOVERNMENT IS ALL ABOUT.

↳ COUNTY GOVERNMENT IS COMING INTO ITS OWN, THERE HAS  
BEEN A LOT OF TALK ABOUT THE PLACE AND ABOUT THE FUTURE  
OF COUNTY GOVERNMENT.

↳ I SAY IT HAS A PLACE AND AN IMPORTANT FUTURE.

BUT, I ALSO BELIEVE IT CAN DO BETTER THAN IT HAS BEEN

DOING.

~~AND REORGANIZATION CAN HELP MAKE COUNTY GOVERNMENT MORE  
EFFECTIVE. IT CAN MAKE IT MORE UNDERSTANDABLE, MORE  
SYMPATHETIC AND MORE RESPONSIVE.~~

↳ LET ME GIVE YOU MY VIEWS:

↳ FIRST, COUNTIES MUST HAVE THE OPTION OF HOME RULE. THEY  
MUST HAVE THE POWER TO RESTRUCTURE THE WAY THEY DELIVER  
SERVICES. THEY MUST HAVE THE FLEXIBILITY TO CHANGE THEIR  
METHODS.

SECOND, WE MUST REDUCE THE PROLIFERATION OF  
AUTONOMOUS AND OVERLAPPING JURISDICTIONS.

~~IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY, FOR EXAMPLE, THERE ARE OVER  
3000 SEPARATE UNITS OF GOVERNMENT. IN WATTS ALONE, THERE  
ARE OVER 80 DIFFERENT JURISDICTIONS.~~

*Keep*

COUNTIES SHOULD HAVE CONTROL OVER THE ~~INFRASTRUCTURE~~ <sup>the proliferation</sup> ---

THE SPECIAL DISTRICTS OF AN AREA. COUNTIES SHOULD BE ABLE  
TO SUPERVISE THE ACTIVITIES OF THESE DISTRICTS AND MAKE  
CERTAIN THAT ONE DISTRICT DOES NOT WORK AGAINST THE INTEREST  
OF THE OTHERS.

*Keep*

#3 THIRD, COUNTIES NEED THE AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER AND  
CONSOLIDATE FUNCTIONS BETWEEN THE MUNICIPALITIES AND COUNTY  
GOVERNMENTS.

THERE CAN BE A "TWO LEVEL" APPROACH TO SERVING PEOPLE, IF

THE AUTHORITY TO RATIONALIZE FUNCTIONS IS PROVIDED.

↳ FOURTH, COUNTIES SHOULD HAVE ADEQUATE TAXING POWER.

↳ FIFTH, COUNTIES NEED THE AUTHORITY TO COORDINATE

AND EVALUATE MUNICIPAL ZONING PRIORITIES IN ORDER TO USE

AVAILABLE LAND WISELY FOR PLANNED, BALANCED GROWTH

↳ SIXTH, COUNTY GOVERNMENTS MUST BECOME MORE PROFESSIONAL.

THEY SHOULD UTILIZE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY AND MANAGEMENT

EXPERTS. I BELIEVE THEY SHOULD HIRE "OUT-OF-WORK" AEROSPACE

ENGINEERS, RESEARCH ASSOCIATES AND OTHER TRAINED PERSONNEL.

(Public Service Employee Act)

Prepar for efficient + responsive Govt

set up to date

BUT AT THE SAME TIME, POLITICAL RESPONSIBILITY SHOULD  
BE CENTRALIZED IN THE HANDS OF AN ELECTED OFFICIAL AND  
HIS COUNCIL.

L EXPERTS SHOULD BE KEPT ON TAP -- NOT ON TOP. !!

L COUNTY REORGANIZATION IS ONLY ONE ASPECT, THOUGH, OF  
EFFECTIVELY IMPLEMENTING A NATIONAL GROWTH POLICY.

L WHAT IS ALSO NEEDED IS THE TRANSFORMATION OF SINGLE  
PURPOSE PLANNING COMMISSIONS INTO COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING  
AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES ON A MULTI-COUNTY BASIS.

L MULTI-COUNTY UNITS CAN DEAL MORE EFFECTIVELY AND MORE  
EFFICIENTLY WITH THE ECONOMY, MIGRATION, POVERTY,  
UNDEREMPLOYMENT, GOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION, CITIZEN  
PARTICIPATION AND BALANCED GROWTH.

THESE ORGANIZATIONS ARE A NATURAL LINK BETWEEN THE  
COUNTIES, THE STATES AND FEDERAL AGENCIES. THEY CAN  
PROVIDE THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND COMMUNICATION CHANNELS  
BETWEEN THE VARIOUS GOVERNMENTAL LEVELS. and they work

THEY CAN BE MECHANISMS FOR POLICY DETERMINATION ON A  
REGIONAL SCALE.

BUT IF THEY ARE TO BE EFFECTIVE, THEY MUST BE  
GRANTED AREA-WIDE RESPONSIBILITIES.

~~MULTI-COUNTY BODIES SHOULD NOT BE ISOLATED -- THEY  
SHOULD BE DUPLICATED OVER THE ENTIRE STATES.~~

THEY MUST HAVE PROFESSIONAL STAFF.

COUNTY MEMBERSHIP MUST BE MANDATORY.

AND THESE AGENCIES MUST BE ADEQUATELY FUNDED.

DEVELOPMENT BANKS, CREDIT SERVICES, GOVERNMENTAL REFORM,  
AND COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING CAN TAKE US A LONG WAY TOWARD  
BALANCED NATIONAL GROWTH.

THE URBAN AND RURAL CRISES ARE REAL AND URGENT AND  
CHALLENGING.

IF WE ARE GOING TO DO ANYTHING ABOUT HOW WE LIVE, AND  
WHERE WE ARE GOING TO LIVE -- IF WE ARE GOING TO HAVE TRUE  
FREEDOM OF RESIDENCE, THEN WE MUST ACT NOW.

↳ TOMORROW IS TOO LATE.

TODAY IS THE FIRST DAY OF THE REST OF OUR LIFE.

Reconciliation, Reconstruction  
Reaffirmation!



# Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



[www.mnhs.org](http://www.mnhs.org)