

REMARKS BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

WOODROW WILSON CENTER FOR SCHOLARS

WASHINGTON, D. C.

MAY 2, 1973

FEDERALISM IS A PHRASE USED TO DESCRIBE THE WHOLE ARRAY OF COOPERATIVE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE FEDERAL AND STATE GOVERNMENT; BETWEEN CITIES, COUNTY, AND OTHER LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, BETWEEN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND UNIVERSITIES, HOSPITALS, VOLUNTARY AGENCIES, PROFESSIONAL AND TRADE ASSOCIATIONS, AND THE REST OF PRIVATE ASSOCIATIONS.

IT IS NOT SO MUCH A DELINEATION OF POWER AS IT IS A SHARING OF POWER, A SHARING OF RESPONSIBILITY, AND A SHARING OF FISCAL RESOURCES.

SOME VIEW FEDERALISM AS ONE GREAT SYSTEM; ACTUALLY WE ARE A SY ARE A SYSTEM OF SYSTEMS. WITHIN EACH LEVEL AND THROUGHOUT EACH LAYER ARE INTERACTING NETWORKS OF PUBLIC AUTHORITIES AND PRIVATE INTEREST.

AND, TO SORT OUT THE FEDERAL ROLE IN SUCH AN ARRANGEMENT HAS BEEN A CONTINUOUS QUESTION THROUGHOUT THE HISTORY OF OUR COUNTRY.

IT HAS ALSO BEEN A PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT FOR ME -- AS MAYOR, SENATOR, AND VICE-PRESIDENT.

FROM EARLY DAYS OF THE KATSENBAUM COMMISSION, TO MY SPONSORSHIP OF THE ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS, THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION ACT, AND TO MY VICE-PRESIDENTIAL ACTIVITIES ON PART OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, I HAVE WRESTLED CONTINUOUSLY WITH THE THORNY PROBLEMS OF FEDERALISM.

OTHERS HAVE BEEN INVOLVED, TOO. GOVERNOR NELSON  
ROCKEFELLER HAS BEEN AND CONTINUES TO BE A LEADING SCHOLAR  
AND PRACTITIONER OF FEDERALISM.

IN NEW YORK, GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER HAS RECENTLY BEGUN  
A WIDE-RANGING INQUIRY INTO THE ROLE OF STATE AND LOCAL  
GOVERNMENTS IN THE CHANGING FEDERAL SYSTEM AS WE ENTER THE  
THIRD CENTURY OF OUR COUNTRY'S EXISTENCE.

I APPLAUD THE GOVERNOR IN THIS EFFORT. AND, I STAND  
READY TO JOIN WITH HIM.

DURING THE 1960'S THE FEDERAL ROLE AND THE WHOLE  
CONCEPT OF FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY TOOK ON NEW MEANING UNDER  
THE ACTIVIST LEADERSHIP OF JOHN KENNEDY AND LYNDON JOHNSON.

BEFORE THE 1960'S FEDERAL GRANT IN AIDS WERE SEEN  
PRIMARILY AS AN ASSET TO LOCALITIES THAT LACK THE WHEREWITH-  
ALL TO SOLVE THEIR OWN PROBLEMS. THE MONEY -- AND SOMETIMES  
THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CAME FROM WASHINGTON, BUT THE  
POLICY-MAKING REMAINED IN THE COMMUNITY.

THE LEGISLATION OF THE 1960'S CONTAINED BROAD STATEMENTS  
OF NATIONAL PURPOSE. NEW FEDERAL PROGRAMS WERE BEING  
DESIGNED TO MEET NATIONAL NEEDS, AND THE STATE AND LOCAL  
GOVERNMENTS WERE BEING ASKED TO SERVE AS A COOPERATIVE  
PARTNER IN THE EXECUTION OF THOSE PROGRAMS.

IN THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964, IN THE VOTING RIGHTS OF 1965, IN THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964, IN THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, IN THE MODEL CITIES ACT OF 1966, AND IN THE HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION OF 1968, THE LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE EXPRESSED A NATIONAL CONCERN WITH STRONG EMPHASIS ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO DELIVER THE ACTUAL PROGRAM TO THE PEOPLE.

THE 1960'S SAW THE DEMISE OF THE FEDERALISM THAT RESTRICTED OR RESTRAINED THE POWER AND OUTREACH OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. THE FEDERALISM OF THE 1960'S WAS NOT A NEGATIVE CONCEPT; IT WAS A POSITIVE EXPRESSION OF NATIONAL CONCERN, NATIONAL GOALS, AND NATIONAL PROGRAMS TO BE ACHIEVED.

WHAT CAUSED THIS CHANGE OF DIRECTION IN FEDERALISM?

AND, HAVE THESE CAUSES ALTERED AS TO SUPPORT A MASSIVE  
REDIRECTION AND ABDICATION OF FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY -- THE  
KIND ASKED FOR BY THE NEW FEDERALISM?

ONE OF THE CHIEF CAUSES FOR THE EXPANDED FEDERAL ROLE  
IS THE MIGRATORY HABITS OF OUR POPULATIONS. WE HAVE BECOME  
A MOBILE NATION, WITH THIN LOYALTIES TO STATES AND CITIES.  
WE ARE A NATION ON THE MOVE.

THIS MOBILITY HAS MADE THE HEALTH, WELFARE, AND EDUCA-  
TION, ECONOMIC AND PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT OF STATES AND  
LOCALITIES A MATTER OF NATIONAL RATHER THAN STRICTLY LOCAL  
CONCERN.

THE GREAT POPULATION CHANGES OF OUR NATION AND THE  
RECOGNITION THAT MANY OF THE ROOT CAUSES TO OUR PROBLEMS ARE  
NOT INDEMIC JUST TO ONE LOCALITY CONTINUES TO THIS DAY. THESE  
CONDITIONS HAVE NOT CHANGED.

BUT, OUR PUBLIC AWARENESS OF THEM HAS, ALONG WITH A  
PUBLIC DEMAND FOR MORE EFFECTIVE GOVERNMENTAL ACTION ON  
THEM.

AS A RESULT, THE FOCUS OF FEDERALISM HAS CHANGED FROM  
SIMPLY PASSING LEGISLATION TO DEVELOPING EFFECTIVE  
ADMINISTRATIVE MECHANISMS THAT WILL IMPROVE THE DELIVERY  
SYSTEM OF PROGRAMS.

IN THIS CONTEXT, THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD BECOME THAT OF ESTABLISHING WITH STATES AND LOCALITIES PRIORITY POLICY OBJECTIVES, NORMS AND FISCAL ASSISTANCE WHILE WORKING WITH STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO ADMINISTRATIVELY SIMPLIFY AND COORDINATE THE PROGRAM DELIVERY SYSTEM.

IT IS WITH THIS CONCEPTION OF FEDERALISM THAT I HAVE ADVOCATED, FOR EXAMPLE, THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT EXERCISE ITS RESPONSIBILITY TO ESTABLISH MINIMUM LEVELS OF PUBLIC SERVICE FOR ALL LOCALITIES IN THIS NATION -- MINIMAL LEVEL OF SERVICE IN WATER AND SEWER TREATMENT, IN PUBLIC EDUCATION, IN AIR POLLUTION STANDARDS, IN WELFARE PROGRAMS, AND OTHER AREAS OF SOCIAL POLICY RELATED TO THE QUALITY OF LIFE IN OUR NATION.

AND, IT IS FOR THIS REASON THAT I HAVE SUPPORTED  
GENERAL REVENUE SHARING AND INCREASED DECISION MAKING  
AUTHORITY FOR FEDERAL REGIONAL OFFICIALS -- SUCH ACTIONS  
FIT WELL INTO MY CONCEPTION OF FEDERALISM AS AN EVOLVING  
CONCEPT.

TO ME, GENERAL REVENUE SHARING WAS THE FEDERAL  
GOVERNMENT ACTING IN A RESPONSIBLE MANNER. GENERAL REVENUE  
SHARING WAS DESIGNED TO BE A SUPPORT PROGRAM -- TO SHARE  
FISCAL RESOURCES WITH STATES AND LOCALITIES SO THAT PUBLIC  
SERVICES COULD BE IMPROVED.

THAT MAY OR MAY NOT TURN OUT TO BE THE ACTUAL CASE  
OF WHAT GENERAL REVENUE SHARING DOES . . . BUT THAT IS THE  
THEORY AND PURPOSE, AS I SEE IT.

AGAIN, THE IMPORTANT FEATURE OF GENERAL REVENUE  
SHARING IS THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, COOPERATIVELY WITH  
STATES AND LOCALITIES, SETTING THE OVERALL PRIORITIES AND  
SHARING WITH THE STATES AND LOCALITIES THE FISCAL RESOURCES  
TO ACCOMPLISH THE NATIONAL TASK OF AUGMENTING SERVICES  
AND BUILDING THE CAPABILITIES OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS  
TO ACCOMPLISH PROGRAM DELIVERY.

I DO NOT BELIEVE, HOWEVER, THAT SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING PROPOSALS FIT THE MOOD OF "EVOLVING FEDERALISM" AS I SEE IT.

THESE PROPOSALS DO NOT SERVE THE PURPOSES OF PARTNERSHIP FEDERALISM.

THEY REPRESENT INSTEAD AN ABDICATION OF FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY TO SET PRIORITIES.

SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING REALLY AMOUNTS TO A SECOND GENERAL REVENUE SHARING WITH THE END RESULT THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BECOMES LITTLE MORE THAN A TAX COLLECTOR AND NOT A DEFINER OF NATIONAL PURPOSE.

THE RHETORIC OF SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING CAN, AT TIMES,  
BE ESPECIALLY ATTRACTIVE.

THE STORY GOES THAT "MANY FEDERAL PROGRAMS ARE SO  
NARROWLY FOCUSED THAT IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO RATIONALIZE THEM  
IN TERMS OF INDIVIDUAL COMMUNITY NEEDS WHILE AT THE SAME  
TIME THE PROGRAM RESTRICTIONS AND RED TAPE FRUSTRATE STATE  
AND LOCAL DECISION MAKING."

THUS, "POWER MUST BE RETURNED TO THE PEOPLE, PROGRAM  
!  
STRUCTURE MUST REORGANIZED, AND GOVERNMENTAL FUNCTIONS MUST  
BE DECENTRALIZED."

I AGREE WITH SOME OF THESE POINTS. ADMINISTRATIVELY,  
MANY DEPARTMENTS AND PROGRAMS ARE TOO HEAVY.

I WOULD REMIND THIS AUDIENCE OF THE CONDITION IN THE  
PENTAGON -- TOO MANY GENERALS AND NOT ENOUGH PRIVATES.

IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE BUREAUCRACIES, WE FACE A SIMILAR  
SITUATION.

BUT SOLVING THIS PROBLEM DOES NOT MEAN ABDICATING  
FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY. IT DOES NOT MEAN THAT WE GIVE UP ON  
DEFINING NATIONAL NEEDS AND DESIGNING THE PROGRAMS TO MEET  
THOSE NEEDS.

IT DOES NOT MEAN THAT POLICY SETTING AT THE FEDERAL  
LEVEL IS TO BE REPLACED BY DISPARATE LOCAL POLICIES, COMPOSED  
OF THOUSANDS OF INDEPENDENT DECISIONS WITHOUT ANY  
CONCEPTION OF OVERALL RESOURCE ALLOCATIONS.

IT DOES NOT MEAN THAT PLANNING EFFORTS SHOULD CEASE,  
JUST SO MONEY CAN BE SPENT IN A MORE EXPEDITIOUS MANNER,

THIS IS MY CONCERN ABOUT SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING -- THAT  
IN OUR OVERWHELMING DESIRE TO DECENTRALIZE AND REORGANIZE,  
SERIOUS NATIONAL GOALS WILL BECOME LITTLE MORE THAN GRAB  
BAGS OF LOCAL ACTIVITY, TOTALLY UNRELATED TO ONE ANOTHER,  
WITHOUT ANY PLANNING, WITHOUT ANY CONSIDERATION OF GOALS,  
AND WITHOUT BEING PLACED IN A COMPREHENSIVE FRAMEWORK OF  
NATIONAL POLICY TO MEET NATIONALLY DEFINED NEEDS.

AT THE SAME TIME, I DO NOT FEEL, AND I HAVE NEVER FELT  
COMPLETELY TIED TO ONE PROGRAMMATIC APPROACH.

I HAVE NEVER OPPOSED EFFORTS TO SIMPLIFY AND BETTER  
COORDINATE THE CATEGORICAL SYSTEM.

AND, I HAVE SAID TIME AND TIME AGAIN WHEN CONFUSION  
AND DUPLICATION SERIOUSLY INTERFERE WITH THE SUCCESSFUL  
ACHIEVEMENT OF PRIMARY OBJECTIVES, THEN IT IS TIME TO  
RE-EVALUATE THE PROGRAM DELIVERY SYSTEM.

I MUST INSIST, THOUGH -- AND THIS IS WHAT I BELIEVE  
SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING LACKS -- THAT THE FEDERAL PRESENCE  
IN TERMS OF SETTING NATIONAL GOALS BE RETAINED, AND THAT  
STATES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS HAVE A CLEAR PERSPECTIVE AS TO  
THE PURPOSES OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE.

AT A MINIMUM I BELIEVE THAT APPLICATIONS FOR GRANTS MUST CONTINUE, THAT LOCAL COMMUNITIES BE ASSURED OF ADEQUATE MULTI-YEAR FUNDING, AND THAT AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN GRANTING AGENCIES AND THE LOCAL AGENCIES BE EXECUTED CONCERNING THE GOALS OR DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES TO BE ACHIEVED WITHIN A CERTAIN AGREED-UPON TIME FRAME.

WHAT I AM SUGGESTING, IN SUM, IS A GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURE THAT ALLOWS FOR THE CREATION AND COORDINATION OF NATIONAL POLICY AT THE HIGHEST LEVELS -- IN THE PRESIDENCY, THE CABINET, AND THE CONGRESS -- TO INSURE THAT IT IS UNDER THE EFFECTIVE CONTROL OF ELECTED OFFICIALS, BUT AT THE SAME TIME DECENTRALIZED ADMINISTRATION AND REORGANIZED PROGRAM

FUNCTION SO THAT DECISIONS WITHIN POLICY GUIDELINES ARE  
MADE IN LOCAL COMMUNITIES WITH A CLEAR DEFINITION AS TO  
WHAT SHOULD BE ACCOMPLISHED AND WHAT PEOPLE CAN EXPECT FROM  
A PROGRAM.

GOVERNMENT IN SUCH A SYSTEM BECOMES A TOOL TO BE USED;  
NOT A TOOL TO BE ABUSED.

GOVERNMENT BECOMES A COOPERATIVE ENTERPRISE -- FLEXIBLE  
ENOUGH TO CONSIDER LOCAL NEEDS, YET STRONG ENOUGH TO  
ENSURE NATIONAL PURPOSE.

IN SUCH AN ATMOSPHERE, NEITHER STATE, LOCAL, OR FEDERAL  
GOVERNMENT WILL BE ISOLATED FROM ONE ANOTHER.

IN OUR GROWING AND DEMANDING UNITED STATES, WE NEED  
THE WIDSOM TO CREATE, CONTROL, SUPPORT AND EVALUATE THE  
FORMS OF FEDERALISM.

PROTECTING THE LIBERTIES OF OUR CITIZENS, AND MEETING  
THEIR NEEDS IS TOO GREAT A CHALLENGE AND TOO GREAT A GOAL  
TO BE FOREVER CONTENT WITH WHAT WE HAVE.

THAT IS WHY WE MUST CONTINUE TO SEARCH FOR MEANING  
IN OUR FEDERAL SYSTEM, TO EXAMINE ITS FAULTS AND ASSESS ITS  
STRENGTHS.

AND THAT IS WHY I WILL CONTINUE MY PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT  
IN QUEST FOR A MORE EFFECTIVE FEDERALISM -- IT IS A GREAT  
CAUSE. IT IS THE CAUSE OF OUR NATION'S PEOPLE.



# 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)