



Tuesday PM's

May 14, 1968

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
JOINT SESSION OF THE MICHIGAN STATE LEGISLATURE
LANSING, MICHIGAN
MAY 14, 1968

For one critically important day late this year . . . less now than six months away . . . America will convene as a Committee of the Whole.

For a single moment that day, each participating American will assume . . . in the absolute freedom of complete privacy . . . the responsibilities of the President of his . . . or her . . . country, of a member of the Congress, of the holder of the highest State and local office.

It is our business and our responsibility . . . those of us in government and politics . . . to make that moment of critical truth effective . . . to make democracy's central process work. We count it . . . all of us here . . . the proudest business, the highest calling, in the world.

I want to try to say here today what I see as the responsibilities of political stewardship in this year of America's decision.

I speak not in preachment, but in the taking of common counsel.

I speak in partisan terms -- for we are all here strong partisans . . . for democracy.

Our first responsibility is in the drawing up of the Agenda for America: 1968.

It has to be a people's -- and not the politicians' -- agenda.

The vote on November 5 must be on a people's problems and aspirations -- and on no lesser ambitions.

This agenda is already being drawn up -- in many different ways and places:

-- In the debates in chambers such as this one in which we meet today . . .in the Congress of the United States . . . at city council meetings . . .at political rallies and conventions;

-- In union halls and at meetings of corporate executives . . . and at collective bargaining tables;

-- At the conference table at Paris -- where the archangels of war sit at the negotiators' elbows -- but where the room is packed with the heavenly hosts of people's one overpowering hope -- which is for peace.

-- And then most of all in those places where the human heart beat is strongest and clearest: around supper tables in people's homes . . .on college campuses where most young people search eagerly for reason's guidance, but others turn to excesses of protest . . .in mule-drawn wagons converging on Washington . . .wherever people act directly, and not through representation.

It is our responsibility to sense all of this honestly and accurately -- so that November's ballot can be an expression of human and individual purpose.

I speak first, then, for all of us here . . .people who have won other people's political trust . . .our purpose this year to gather "the sense of the meeting" -- to listen until we are sure we hear that true human heartbeat -- so that America can vote in November on a people's . . .and on no lesser political . . .agenda.

I suggest, second, the responsibility to reduce the infinitely many questions in people's minds to the fewest possible fundamentals.

Not by oversimplification.

Not with slogans.

Not with epithets.

But thoughtfully . . .openly . . .carefully . . .responsibly.

The specific issues are vitally important: war and peace . . . the urban crisis . . . poverty . . . economic growth and stability . . . civil rights . . . education . . . health . . . farm and labor policy . . . social security . . . dollar balances . . . intergovernmental relations . . . and many more.

But these issues, in this form, will not be on November's ballots.

Our responsibility is to find and make clear the central elements that are common to these issues -- and the hinges of disagreement regarding them.

Only as we do this can cross-marks in squares and circles on ballots become a chart and charter for a nation's moving ahead according to humanity's intent.

Third, there is the responsibility to include on the agenda of decisions some matters of essential importance which are nevertheless not the subject of great "popular" concern.

This is particularly true of the subject of intergovernmental relations -- which is of special interest to you, as it is to me.

This has long since become much more than an argument "in principle" about "states' rights."

We have come a long way since Jay Gould could tell a Congressional committee, 50 years ago, that he used his own money to form the legislatures of four states because he "found it was cheaper that way."

We have come a long way in the 35 years since Luther Gulick wrote: "It is a matter of brutal record. The American State is finished. I do not predict that the States will go, but affirm that they have gone."

The growing capacity to conduct their affairs well, to provide staff and research facilities to their legislatures, to recruit more qualified employees and to bring ferment and innovation to the public scene in America -- all these are signs of the new and welcome pride that befits an American state.

The invigoration of state government is contributing greatly to reconciling real and imagined conflicts of interest between the state and federal agencies.

As Governor Terry Sanford writes in his sensitive book, *STORM OVER THE STATES*: "The opponents of measures to reform state and local governments are usually the chief complainants about federal intrusion."

But despite all this progress, the vitality of American federalism still is an urgent concern in 1968. Our federal constitution has proved over and over again to be a living document -- and a framework for orderly change.

Today, as ever, it gives us the flexibility to "establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty."

The same cannot be said, however, of some of our state constitutions and city charters.

And at a time when our most urgent tasks -- jobs . . . housing . . . urban renewal . . . law enforcement -- are essentially local, although national in the aggregate, our federal structure can hardly be more effective than the state and local governments which are so important a part of it.

We don't want our lives planned from the top in America. So initiative and action at the bottom -- and every step upward -- are a necessity.

That brings me to an important consideration which belongs on this year's election agenda -- federal revenue sharing with states and localities.

There is of course already a substantial sharing of federal revenue with state and local governments. In fact, they derived about 17 percent of their total revenues from the federal government last year.

This is not to reject proposals for further revenue-sharing.

But they require a long and careful look.

Federal aid is clearly worse than useless if the political and social environment in which it is to be used is more conducive to procrastination than to action.

There are problems that have to be faced about methods of distribution, and problems of allocation among the states, and among the various levels of government.

Tax sharing is not a panacea. It should not be oversimplified. It is worth serious consideration and thorough debate, and I propose to add to it in the dialogue of the next few months.

Fourth, and finally, there is the responsibility to so conduct the election year debate and dialogue that it is itself a strengthening -- and not a weakening -- force in democracy's process.

I am not interested, and neither are you, in soft or sentimental politics.

They are never any good, and they would be particularly bad -- and dangerous -- now.

There is war in Vietnam.

We are entitled to hope -- which is sentiment, I suppose -- that at least the first part of the answer to that war...the first step toward ending it...may be found in Paris.

But so long as there is war, or the threat of war, there is special need for the hardest and most responsible searching for the elusive answer to mankind's most insistent dream... which is peace.

Responsibility excludes deliberate devisiveness.

It includes responsible disagreement.

It must also include conscientious preparation for the time when war will be over -- as it will be -- and additional resources become available for use in meeting other national priorities.

Thousands of citizens have come now to Washington this week...not in the usual manner, because they are proud of their capital and want to show it to their children...but because they are poor and want food and jobs and education for their children which they have not had for themselves.

The fact of their being there mocks soft answers. It demands hard answers to hard questions.

Why has a huge, unprecedented growth in the gross national product left so many people so far out of its benefits?

Why must people from states and cities all over the country come to the national capital to protest?

We must decide this year, the hard way -- with no quarter asked and no holds barred -- how to make civil rights into civil results.

We must decide this year -- in the toughest give and take a political campaign permits -- what to do about a federal, state and local welfare system that is not conserving or recovering, but wasting both human and national resources.

We talk about getting a bigger band out of every dollar we spend for the hard-ware of defense. It is time for efficiency and humanity in the heart-ware department.

We must argue through until we get the right answers whether the march of poor people from all over the country into Washington means that something about states rights has contributed to a national wrong.

* * * *

This is no year -- and there is never a year -- for national complacency or for pulling political punches.

This is no year, either, for arguing from weakness or fear.

It is a year for leading from strength and from confidence.

This is no year -- and there is never a year -- for trying to divide this country along any artificial lines -- of age, of race, or of false fears.

Anybody reads America wrong if he rejects the ideal of unity -- and encourages division and dissension -- on the false notion that in disunity there is **strength**.

Anybody reads America wrong if he fails to see that the best way to meet our weaknesses is to call up and mobilize our strengths.

Anybody reads America wrong if he doesn't know and recognize what is right in America -- as the greatest force for moving in on those parts of America that are wrong.

What a magnificent, strengthening thing it will be if this election year can bring a marshalling...an effective, forceful marshalling...of the true spirit of this nation.

That spirit does need mobilization...partly because things have gone so well for so many people.

But that spirit is a warm, generous, magnanimous spirit.

It is a spirit of wanting greatly to get on with democracy's job.

Americans want greatly to do something for their country -- which means for each other.

But they want to know how to do it.

There is plenty of room for partisanship -- for party politics -- in arguing out those ways and means.

So I have tried to say to you what seem to me our special responsibilities this year as holders of the public trust -- many of us as applicants for renewal...some even for enlargement...of that trust:

- That we catch the true purposes of the people;
- That we set out clearly, above particular issues, whatever central elements of disagreement there may be about those purposes;
- That we include on the agenda the special concerns of the governmental process;
- And that we use democracy's process to implement people's purposes.

We don't need a new politics, or a new system, or a new America.

We need a regeneration of democracy...a refocusing of America's goals and skills and resources...a revitalizing of America's greatness.

America is restless -- yes, discontented.

But it is the restlessness of new reason for higher hopes. It is the discontent of new realization, new possibilities, the seeing of new horizons, the sensing of new dimensions of quality and equality in human life.

America's dreams are changing -- and so are her ideas about making those dreams possible.

And if we who would lead a people meet these challenges not as obligations **but** as opportunities -- not with the corners of our mouths down but with the smile of confidence on our lips -- with a heartiness and a joy of leading,

--then a people will gain in that leadership.

That's what this election, and this year, are all about.

#

Gov Romney

- Rubber Stamp

- Patriot

- Lt. Gov. Milliken

- Mr Speaker - Robert Waldron

- Representative Wm Ryan

Cong. Wm Ford
Cong. Martha Griffiths

REMARKS

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

JOINT SESSION OF THE MICHIGAN STATE LEGISLATURE

LANSING, MICHIGAN

MAY 14, 1968

For one critically important day late this year ... less now
than six months away ... America will convene as a Committee
of the Whole.

For a single moment that day, each participating American
will assume ... in the absolute freedom of complete privacy ...
the responsibilities of the President of his ... or her ... country,
of a member of the Congress, of the holder of the highest State
and local office.

It is our business and our responsibility ... those of us in government and politics ... to make that moment of ~~political~~ truth effective ... to make democracy's central process work. We count it ... all of us here ... the proudest business, the highest calling, in the world.

I want to try to say here today what I see as the responsibilities of political stewardship in this year of America's decision.

I speak not in preachment, but in the taking of common counsel.

I speak in partisan terms -- for we are all here strong ^{Partisan} partisans ... for democracy.

Our first responsibility is in the drawing up of the Agenda for America: 1968.

↳ It has to be a people's -- and not the politicians' --
agenda.

↳ ~~The vote on November 5 must be on a people's problems
and aspirations -- and on no lesser ambitions.~~

↳ This agenda is already being drawn up ... in many
different ways and places:

- In the debates in chambers such as this one in
which we meet today ... in the Congress of the United
States ... at city council meetings ... at political
rallies and conventions;
- In union halls and at meetings of corporate executives ...
and at collective bargaining tables;
- At the conference table at Paris -- where the archangels
of war sit at the negotiators' elbows -- but where the
room is packed with the heavenly hosts of people's
one overpowering hope -- which is for peace.

-- And then most of all in those places where the human heart beat is strongest and clearest: around supper tables in people's homes ... on college campuses where ~~most~~ ^{most} young people search eagerly for reason's guidance, but others turn to excesses of protest ...

↳ in mule-drawn wagons converging on Washington ... *Yes the agenda of democracy business is being prepared*
wherever people act directly, and not through representation.

↳ It is our responsibility to sense all of this honestly and accurately -- so that November's ballot can be an expression of human and individual purpose.

I speak first, then, for all of us here ... people who have won other people's political trust ... our purpose this year to gather "the sense of the meeting" -- to listen until we are sure we hear that true human heartbeat -- so that America can vote in November on a people's ... ~~and on no lesser political~~ ... agenda.

I suggest, second, the responsibility to reduce the ~~infinitely~~ many questions in people's minds to the fewest possible fundamentals.

⌞ Not by oversimplification.

⌞ Not with slogans.

⌞ Not with epithets.

⌞ But thoughtfully ... openly ... carefully ... responsibly.

The specific issues are vitally important: war and peace ...
the urban crisis ... poverty ... economic growth and stability ...
civil rights ... education ... health ... farm and labor policy ...
social security ... dollar balances ... intergovernmental relations ..
and many more.

⌞ But these issues, in this form, will not be on November's
ballots.

Our responsibility is to find and make clear the central elements that are common to these issues -- and the hinges of disagreement regarding them.

Only as we do this can cross-marks in squares and circles on ballots become a chart and charter for a nation's Program moving ahead according to humanity's intent.

Third, there is the responsibility to include on the agenda of decisions some matters of essential importance which are nevertheless not the subject of great "popular" concern.

This is particularly true of the subject of intergovernmental relations -- which is of special interest to you, as it is to me,

This has long since become much more than an argument "in principle" about "states' rights."

↳ We have come a long way since Jay Gould could tell a Congressional committee, 50 years ago, that he used his own money to form the legislatures of four states because he "found it was cheaper that way."

↳ We have come a long way in the 35 years since Luther Gulick wrote: "It is a matter of brutal record. The American State is finished. I do not predict that the States will go, but affirm that they have gone."

↳ The growing capacity to conduct their affairs well, to provide staff and research facilities to their legislatures, to recruit more qualified employees and to bring ferment and innovation to the public scene in America -- all these are signs of the new and welcome pride that befits an American state.

∟ The invigoration of state government is contributing greatly to reconciling real and imagined conflicts of interest between the state and federal agencies.

∟ As Governor Terry Sanford writes in his sensitive book, Storm Over the States: "The opponents of measures to reform state and local governments are usually the chief complainants about federal intrusion."

∟ But despite all this progress, the vitality of American federalism still is an urgent concern in 1968. Our federal constitution has proved over and over again to be a living document -- and a framework for orderly change.

∟ Today, as ever, it gives us the flexibility to "establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty."

The same cannot be said, however, of some of our state constitutions and city charters.

And at a time when our most urgent tasks -- jobs...
housing ... urban renewal ... law enforcement --- are
essentially local, although national in the aggregate, our
federal structure can hardly be more effective than the state
and local governments which are so important a part of it.

We don't want our lives planned from the top in America.
So initiative and action at the bottom -- and every step upward --
are a necessity. I mean initiative by all parts -- public and
private -- of our federal system.

For there are -- there have to be -- two kinds of
"government" in a democracy with 200 million members: public
government -- federal, state and local; and the "private
government" of economic and social organizations.

∟ The interests and the responsibilities of public and private government are different -- but they overlap.

∟ The difference -- and the independence that goes with it -- are vitally important. ^{but} There has to be a partnership between government and business -- a partnership with certain limitations and obligations.

∟ It is a new federalism -- with private institutional rights kept clearly marked out -- like states' rights.

It is a balance -- and a separation -- of powers.

But it lets us work together on common interests for common objectives.

∟ Our system of representative government and free enterprise are once again demonstrating the qualities of growth, flexibility, vitality and resilience. The social revolution taking place in America is not the special property of a minority or an ethnic group. It is the common property of the American system -- a system which has as its goal full and equal opportunity for every American.

a system based on incentive, profits, rewards for service and ability, and, above all, a respect for the human being.

and In our desire for change, we must not abandon or destroy the institutions and the principles that have provided so much for so many. Our responsibility is to build, to extend the application of these principles and institutions. Our challenge is to open the American society, political and economic, to an ever-increasing number of participants. Meaningful jobs, developed skills, private property and ownership, education and a decent neighborhood are not to be looked upon as privileges for the few, or even for most, but as the hope and the reality for all.

That brings me to an important consideration which belongs on this year's election agenda -- federal revenue-sharing with states and localities.

There is of course already a substantial sharing of federal revenue with state and local governments . In fact, they derived about 17 percent of their total revenues from the federal government last year.

∠ This is not to reject proposals for further revenue-sharing.

∠ But they require a long and careful look.

~~Federal aid is clearly worse than useless if the political and social environment in which it is to be used is more conducive to procrastination than to action.~~

∠ There are problems that have to be faced about methods of distribution, and problems of allocation among the states, and among the various levels of government.

∟ Tax sharing is not a panacea. It should not be oversimplified. It is worth serious consideration and thorough debate, and I propose to add to it in the dialogue of the next few months.

Fourth, ~~and finally~~, there is the responsibility to so conduct the election year debate and dialogue that it is itself a strengthening -- and not a weakening -- force in democracy's process.

∟ I am not interested, and neither are you, in soft or sentimental politics.

∟ They are never any good, and they would be particularly bad -- and dangerous -- now.

∟ There is war in Viet Nam.

We are entitled to hope -- which is sentiment, I suppose -- that at least the first part of the answer to that war ... the first step toward ending it ... may be found in Paris *at the*

conference table

↳ But so long as there is war, or the threat of war, there is special need for the hardest and most responsible searching for the elusive answer to mankind's most insistent dream ... which is peace.

↳ Responsibility excludes deliberate devisiveness.

↳ It includes responsible disagreement.

We think ahead and prepare
↳ It must also include conscientious preparation for the time when war will be over -- as it will be -- and additional resources become available for use in meeting other national priorities. *What are our plans.*

↳ Thousands of citizens have come now to Washington this week ... not in the usual manner, because they are proud of their capital and want to show it to their children ... but because they are poor and want food and jobs and education for their children which they have not had for themselves.

∠ The fact of their being there mocks soft answers. It demands hard answers to hard questions.

∠ Why has a huge, unprecedented growth in the gross national product left so many people so far out of its benefits?

∠ Why must people from states and cities all over the country come to the national capital to protest?

∠ We must decide this year, ~~the hard way~~ -- with no quarter asked and no holds barred -- how to make civil rights into civil results. !

∠ We must decide this year -- in the toughest give and take a political campaign permits -- what to do about a federal, state and local welfare system that is ^{not} conserving or recovering, but wasting both human and national resources.

∠ We talk about getting a bigger bang out of every dollar we spend for the hard-ware of defense. It is time for efficiency and humanity in the heart-ware department too.

~~We must argue through until we get the right answers whether the march of poor people from all over the country into Washington means that something about states rights has contributed to a national wrong.~~

* * *

↳ This is no year -- and there is never a year -- for national complacency or for pulling political punches.

↳ This is no year, either, for arguing from weakness or fear.

↳ It is a year for leading from strength and from confidence.

This is no year -- and there is never a year -- for trying to divide this country along any artificial lines -- of age, of race, or of false fears.

↳ Anybody reads America wrong if he rejects the ideal of unity -- and encourages division and dissension -- on the false notion that in disunity there is strength.

↳ Anybody reads America wrong if he fails to see that the best way to meet our weaknesses is to call up and mobilize our strengths.

↳ Anybody reads America wrong if he doesn't know and recognize "what is right in America" -- as the greatest force for moving in on those parts of America that are wrong.

↳ What a magnificent, strengthening thing it will be if this election year can bring a marshalling ... an effective, forceful marshalling ... of the true spirit of this nation.

That spirit does need mobilization ... partly because things have gone so well for so many people.

But that spirit is a warm, generous, magnanimous spirit.

It is a spirit of wanting greatly to get on with democracy's job.

Americans want ~~greatly~~ to do something for their country -- which means for each other.

But they want to know how to do it.

and There is plenty of room for partisanship -- for party politics -- in arguing out those ways and means.

So I have tried to say to you what seem to me our special responsibilities this year as holders of the public trust -- many of us as applicants for renewal ... some even for enlargement ... of that trust:

-- That we catch the true purposes of the people;

- That we set out clearly, above particular issues, whatever central elements of disagreement there may be about those purposes;
- That we include on the agenda the special concerns of the governmental process;
- And that we use democracy's process to implement people's purposes.

↳ We don't need a new politics, or a new system, or a new America.

↳ We need a regeneration of democracy ... a refocusing of America's goals and skills and resources ... a revitalizing of America's greatness. — a new democracy.

America is restless -- yes, discontented.

↳ a new democracy where the people's business is the business of every person.

But it is the restlessness of new reason for higher hopes. It is the discontent of new realization, new possibilities, the seeing of new horizons, the sensing of new dimensions of quality and equality in human life.

America's dreams are changing -- and so are her ideas about making those dreams possible.

And if we who would lead a people meet these challenges not as obligations but as opportunities -- not with the corners of our mouths down but with the smile of confidence on our lips -- with a heartiness and a joy of leading,

-- then a people will gain in that leadership.

That's what this election, and this year, are all

about.

This is what John Adams called the Spirit of Public Happiness -- a spirit which is reflected in the life, in Participation of Public Discussion and Public Action. This Spirit of Public Happiness is a joy in American citizenship, in self control, in self discipline, in dedication.

Duplicate

Vice-President Hubert H. Humphrey visit to
Michigan Legislature - May 14, 1968

Introduction by Rep. William A. Ryan

Thank you, Governor Milliken.

It is my honor this morning to introduce to this joint convention of the Michigan Legislature the Vice-President of the United States.

It is especially appropriate, I believe, that we should be honored by an address from the Vice-President at the very time when our energies are concentrated on the American promise of full rights for all citizens.

No man in public life has dedicated his life's work more to the fulfillment of this promise than our honored guest. He has pursued this goal of human advancement with the same enthusiasm which distinguished every office in which he has served--an enthusiasm which magnifies his love of country--an enthusiasm of compassion for all--and an enthusiasm which radiates success, confidence and achievement.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to present the person who served his country so well as a teacher in his school district, as Mayor of his city, as a Senator from his state and as Vice-President of his country, the Vice-President of the United States, the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey.

Vice-President Hubert H. Humphrey

Thank you.

Governor Romney and Lt. Gov. Milliken and Speaker Waldron, my friend, Rep. Ryan, members of this great legislative assembly, members of the House and Senate, my fellow Americans.

First, Governor, may I express my personal thanks for your courtesy, your hospitality in receiving me this morning. But more importantly, may I as a fellow public servant, a fellow American, extend to you my congratulations on service well done for your country and your state and in so saying to recognize that you have symbolized in our country the qualities of civic leadership of men who come from private life into public life, a Governor who is a dedicated public servant and great patriot. I am honored by your friendship and all of us are honored by your public service. And to the Representatives and Senators, I guess it's rather hazardous for an outsider, particularly a Vice-President, to offer any suggestions or advice. So what I have to say will be in the form and let me say of just a friendly visit. You can take it seriously if you so desire, but if you'd prefer not to, I will understand.

I come to this joint meeting of the Michigan State Legislature as another public servant and I want to talk to you about where we are in our country and hopefully where we may be going.

For one critically important date late this year, less now than six months away, America will convene as a Committee of the Whole. It'll be a massive town meeting. For a single moment that day each participating American will assume in the absolute freedom of complete privacy the responsibilities of the President of his or her country, or the Member of the Congress, or of the holder of the highest state and local office. That will be the election day--the day of popular sovereignty.

Now it is our business and our responsibility, those of us who are in government and politics, to make that moment of truth effective--to make democracy's central process work. We count it, all of us here, the proudest business, the highest calling in the world. And indeed it is.

I want to try to say here today what I see as the responsibilities of political stewardship in this year of America's decision. Now, as I've indicated to you, I speak not in preachment, but in the taking of common counsel as one of you, with you, not above you, but of you. I speak, too, in partisan terms, for we all here are very strong partisans--that is, partisans for democracy.

Now, our first responsibility is in the drawing up of the agenda for America 1968. And it has to be a people's, not a politician's agenda. In fact, this agenda is already being drawn up in many different ways and places. Even as I've heard here this morning. It's being drawn up in the debates in chambers such as this one in which we meet today - in the Congress of the United States - at city council meetings - at political rallies and conventions. People are hammering out, refining the great issues and delineating the problems. And that agenda is being drawn up in union halls and in meetings of corporate executives, and at collective bargaining tables. It's being drawn up at the conference table at Paris where the archangels of war sit at the negotiators' elbows and where the room is packed literally with the heavenly hosts of people's one overpowering hope which is their hope for peace. And then most of all, that agenda is being designed in those places where the human heart beat is the strongest and the clearest: around supper tables in people's homes; on college campuses where most young people search eagerly for reason's guidance. But others, a minority, turn to excesses of protest. And that agenda is also being drawn up in the mule-drawn wagons converging on Washington even now. Yes, the agenda of democracy's business, which is our business, is being prepared wherever people act directly and not through representation.

It is our responsibility to sense all of this honestly and accurately so that November's ballot can be an expression, not of partisan purpose, but of human and individual purpose.

I speak first, then, for all of us here--people who have won other people's political trust. And if you look around, that's who you are. Our purpose this year is to gather the sense of the meeting of which I have already described, to listen until we are sure we hear the true human heart beat so that America can vote in November on a people's, and on no lesser political, agenda.

Now, I suggest, secondly, the responsibility to reduce the many questions in people's minds to the fewest possible fundamentals and I don't suggest it by over simplification, nor can it be done with slogans, nor with epithets, but thoughtfully, openly, carefully, responsibly.

The specific issues--I think you know them--they're vital and they're vitally important: war and peace, the urban crisis, poverty, economic growth and stability, civil rights, education, health, farm and labor policy, social security, dollar balances, intergovernmental relations and many more.

Those are the issues as we see them, as I say, and many more. But these issues that we know here in this form as I have discussed them will not be on November's ballot. Our responsibility is to find and to make clear the central elements that are common to these issues and the hinges of disagreement regarding them.

Thirdly, there is the responsibility to include on the agenda of decisions some matters of essential importance which are, nevertheless, not the subject of great popular concern. Now, this is particularly true of the subject of inter-governmental relations, which is of special interest to you as it is to me, but, frankly, doesn't have a great popular constituency. This has long since become much more than an argument in principle about states' rights. That's old hat and it really doesn't make much sense.

We've come a long, long way since Jay Gould could tell a congressional committee, as he did 50 years ago, that he used his own money to form the

Legislatures of four states, because, as he put it, he found it cheaper that way, blatantly speaking of the power of one man.

We've come a long way, too, in the 35 years since Luther Gulick, a great political scientist, wrote: "It is a matter of brutal record. The American state is finished. I do not predict that states will go, but I affirm that they have gone." I might make an aside here to say that when you're so sure of anything you might hesitate a moment, because I'm sure that Dr. Gulick would wish he'd never said that.

The growing capacity to conduct their affairs well, to provide adequate staff and research facilities to their Legislatures, to recruit more qualified employees and to bring ferment and innovation to the public scene in America--all of these are signs, not of the state that is dying, but of the new and welcome pride that befits the American state and state government.

The invigoration of state government is contributing, contributing greatly, to reconciling real and imagined conflicts of interest between the state and ^{the} federal agencies. A friend of yours and of mine, Governor Terry Sanford, former Governor of North Carolina, writes in his sensitive book, "Storm Over the States", these words: "The opponents of measures to reform state and local governments are usually the chief complainants about Federal intrusion." I think he summarized an old argument in a few words with devastating effect.

But, despite all of the progress that you and I could list out this morning in state governments, the vitality of the American federalism, our governmental system, is still an urgent concern in 1968. Because this country will be governed no better than its system permits. I keep remembering what Winston Churchill said about democracy, which should not leave us without our sense of responsibility. He said democracy is the worst possible form of

government except all others that have ever been tried, which is one way of telling ^{that} us/it is difficult. It requires a great sensitivity to people's needs, but it does not remove from us the responsibility to perfect its mechanism. So, I repeat that our concern over the federal system is an urgent one, because of the very nature of our society and the problems that beset us.

Now, our Federal Constitution has proved over and over again to be a living document, and a framework for orderly change. I remind this Assembly, as I have others, and I was once a teacher of American government, I must say that I've always felt and I've said publicly again and again that I, after having been in some government activity for 20 years, feel that I owe my students a refund for what I taught them. But I reminded my students then and I remind my contemporaries now that our Federal Constitution is not a historical document. It is a living instrument. It was written today for tomorrow, because it says, "We, the people of these United States, do establish and ordain." It does not say we, the Founding Fathers, did establish and ordain. It is a living instrument sensitive to our times and to the needs of our times. It is a framework for orderly change which is another way of saying that whatever needs to be done in this country can be done orderly, can be done with the democratic process.

Today, as ever, it gives us the flexibility to establish justice, to insure domestic tranquillity, to provide for the common defense, to promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty. It not only recites that this is its purpose--it states that this is our command and this is why I have always said that the requirements of democracy are never completed, that we seek yet to complete the full house of democratic living. Therefore, every legislative assembly, every session of Congress years yet to come, will be fulfilling the requirements to establish justice, to insure domestic tranquillity and the other

requirements of our constitutional framework. Now, if our Federal Constitution is a living document, and I think it is, at least we, the people, can make it so. It may be said with equal candor that some of our state constitutions and city charters are not. Some of them are old, obsolete, unrelated to the times in which we live. As a mayor of a city, a former mayor, I had to live with a charter that was designed some 75 years before my time with restrictions that had no relationship at all to the facts of life. So the federal system cannot be an active, responsive system unless all of its members are within the spirit of the present with the tools for fashioning the future.

And, at a time when our most urgent tasks--jobs and housing, urban model cities renewal, and law enforcement are essentially local, although national in the aggregate, our Federal structure can hardly be more effective than the state and local governments which are so important a part of it. What I am trying to say is, we're not enemies. In fact, we're not even on opposite sides. We are members of a great national chorus, a great national symphony that is supposed to bring about a harmonious relationship for the common good. I think I speak for most of us when I say that we don't want our lives planned from the top in America. And accepting that then, initiative and action at the bottom and every step upward are a necessity. I mean initiative by all the parts of our national establishment--public and private--all the parts of our federal system, for there are and there have to be two kinds of government in a democracy with 200,000,000 members. Public government, federal, state and local and private government of economic and social organizations--generally referred to as the private sector.

Now, the interests and the responsibilities of the public and the private government are sometimes different, but they overlap. The difference and the independence that goes with it are vitally important, but there must be a partnership between government and the private sector. Indeed, a partnership that recognizes common responsibilities with certain limitations and obligations on the performance of the respective groups. This is a new federalism, not merely the

federalism of federal, state and local government, but the federalism, if you please, of public government and private concern, of public government and private institutions, with private institutional rights kept clearly marked out so as not to be downgraded or dominated by public power. It is a balance that I speak of. Yes, in a sense, a separation of powers. But I submit that in our pragmatic way of doing things in this country, a pragmatism of trial and error rather than dogma and doctrine, it lets us work together on common interest for common objectives. Every great city today has its own urban coalition and every great state needs one, too. It's only in this way that you are able to fashion the private resources of America to be a part of the great public concern and public interest and at the same time to preserve the rights of both public and private institutions.

Our system of representative government and free enterprise, and this is our system, are once again demonstrating the qualities of growth, flexibility, vitality and resilience. These characteristics make it a living system.

The social revolution taking place in your and my America is not the special property of a minority or an ethnic group. It is the common property of the American system. It belongs to all of us. An American system which has as its goal full and equal opportunity for every American. And this is a system not based so much on directives, as it is on incentive, profits, rewards for service and ability, and above all, a respect for the human being. And might I add, in our desire for change which is inevitable, hopefully change for the good, we must not abandon or destroy the institutions and the principles that have provided so much for so many. Our responsibility is to build, to extend the application of these principles and institutions, to increase the participation in our democracy. Our challenge is to open the American society, political and economic, to an ever-increasing number of participants. Meaningful jobs

develop skills, private property and ownership, education and a decent neighborhood. All of these people want, and none of them are to be looked upon as the privileges for the few or even for most, but, indeed, as the hope and the reality for all. That's where we stand in this year 1968, an expanding new democracy in which there must be an ever increasing participation. And my fellow legislators, either we're going to recognize this as a fact, or the very institutions that we say we're preserving we will destroy by our own apathy and our own indifference and our own obstinacy. Democracy grows or perishes. It does not stand still.

Now, let me be more mundane for a moment and yet, in a sense, I hope relevant to some of the problems that beset you. One of the more important matters on this year's election agenda which will merit, I think, consideration and at least a broad context of our debate is the federal revenue sharing with states and localities. Your Governor has taken a great interest in this, much to his credit, and so has this Legislature. There is, of course, already a substantial sharing of Federal revenue with state and local governments. In fact, we're told that the state and local governments derived about 17 percent of their total revenues from Federal government resources last year. Now, this is not, however, to be interpreted to reject proposals for further and better revenue-sharing. I don't like to see us get our feet stuck in the mud of defending what we've done as if it were perfection and others of attacking what we've done as if it were all wrong. We are a wiser men and women than that. I do think that these proposals require a long and yet a careful look, but not a look to kill them off. There are problems that have to be faced about revenue-sharing of methods of distributions and problems of allocation among the states and amongst the various levels of government. What is important is that we must improve this revenue-sharing concept and it must be done.

I know and you know that tax sharing is not a panacea and it should not be oversimplified and I seek not to do it. It is worth serious consideration,

thorough debate, and I propose whether it be interesting or not to add to it in the dialogue of the next few months simply because I think it is an item on the agenda long overdue for resolution.

Fourth, there is the responsibility to so conduct the election year debate and dialogue that it is, in itself, a strengthening and not a weakening force in democracy's process.

I am not interested, and neither are you, in soft or emotional, sentimental politics. They are never any good, seldom solve anything, and they would be particularly bad and dangerous now.

We know there is a war in Vietnam and we know that it is a dangerous situation. We are, I think, however, today and tomorrow and the days ahead entitled to hope, which, if you want to call it sentiment, I suppose you can, that, at least, the first part of the answer to that war, the first step toward ending it may be found in Paris at the conference table. This, at least, is our hope. And it seems to me that during this critical period when the peacemakers are at work we might find some way to unite our common effort to support them in the work of peace-seeking. A nation can do its job much better when it seeks to do it together.

You see, responsibility, as I see it, excludes devisiveness. It includes responsible disagreement, but not devisiveness for the purpose of ambition, power or just an argument. One thing is certain that some day, prayerfully, early, hopefully, soon, but some day this tragic war will be over. I think, therefore, that legislatures, private institutions, private business, Congress, the Executive branch of state and federal government, cities, must think ahead and prepare for the time when that war is over and think ahead about what will be done with the additional resources that will be available for use in meeting our national priorities.

What are your plans? What are our plans? Will we do as we did once before when a tragic war came to an end? Close the book on it? Refuse to use the available resources? Or will we have learned a lesson? Will we say that the war on poverty, the war on slumism, the war on discrimination, the war on deprivation has the same priority and the same hold on our resources as the war in Vietnam, or will we say we won the prize of peace, but we don't know what to do with it? Peace is like time. Time is neutral unless it is used. And peace can be something but a page in a history book unless it is used. Peace should mean development. Pope Paul VI said that development is the new name for peace.

My fellow Americans, if peace is our prize, if it should come, I ask this Legislature what are we ready to do with it. What is the Congress ready to do with it? What is the American people ready to do with it? Will it be retrenchment or advancement? Will it be investment or self-indulgence? Will it be development or will it be the status quo? We're deciding those things now, not after it's all over. Because unless we prepare the way for peace, peace will come and it will not be a blessing, it will be but another problem challenging us, dividing us, causing us distress and pain. Thousands of citizens have now come to Washington this week--not in the usual manner, because they're proud of their Capitol and want their children to see it, but because they're poor, because they want food and jobs, an education for their children which they themselves have never had.

The fact of their being there, whatever may be your thoughts about it, mocks soft answers. The fact of their being there demands hard answers to hard questions.

Let me lay it on the line. Why has a huge, unprecedented growth in the gross national product left so many people so far out of its benefits?

Why is it that a nation today that still needs jobs filled, still finds itself with a number of jobless?

Why is it that a nation today that proudly talks of the trillion dollar economy in the next few years still has in its midst hunger, still has in its midst, filthy, rotten tenements and slums, still has in its midst people who have never been privileged to have an education?

I think these are moral questions as well as political questions. They're not even Republican or Democratic questions. They're the questions before the people and they are the questions that will ultimately decide the fate of this nation as to how they're to be answered. Why must people from states and cities all over the country come to the National Capitol to protest. We must decide this year with no quarter asked and no holds barred how to make these so-called civil rights that we've legislated in such abundance into civil results. That's the question. Fair employment practices for a man that has no skill, no incentive, no motivation is not equality in employment. It's another law and laws in civil rights do not make for human rights until human beings accept the moral responsibilities of brotherhood.

Oh, there are so many things to talk of and we must decide this year, and I think it will be this year, in the toughest give and take a political campaign permits with honor.

What to do about a federal, state and local welfare system that you and I know is not conserving or recovering, but is wasting both human and national resources. It's time to come to grips with this problem, ladies and gentlemen. Queen Elizabeth of the 16th Century is long gone, but the Elizabethan system of relief and welfare still is with us. This nation doesn't/need social security. It needs social opportunity and let's understand there is a great difference. We ought not to be only thinking about the minimums of protection. We ought to be thinking about the maximums of opportunity. Our inwardness, our sense of fear from the depression years has cast upon us the spell of welfare, relief and security,

all of which has its place for compassionate reasons. But, my fellow Americans, we're in a new age. We're in a new time of science and technology and innovation. We have actually created an economy that has built in within it tremendous growth. We ought to be thinking about social opportunity, maximum opportunity, full opportunity. We ought to rid ourselves of the concept of the welfare state and be thinking and planning and exercising our judgment and our intellectual capacities in forming what I call the state of opportunity in this land for the least of these. For everyone to do less is to fail. A big assignment, I know. But that's why we ought to do it. We're the only ones that have enough to do it and if we fail, who do you think can succeed?

We talk about getting a bigger bang out of every dollar that we spend for the hardware of defense. You remember that slogan: a bigger bang for a buck. Well, I think it's time for efficiency and humanity, not only in efficiency and humanity in the heartware department as well as efficiency in the hardware department. These are my concerns and I know they are yours.

This is no year for national complacency or for pulling our political punches. The American people rightfully deserve a frank and honest debate. And this is no year either for arguing from weakness or fear. I have never been one of the nation's pessimists. It's over-crowded. That's a precinct that has too many workers in it for me. I am not unaware of our problems, but to me every problem is a challenge. I am not unaware of our difficulties. I couldn't be. One is reminded of them every day. But to me every difficulty ought to be an opportunity.

This is a year for Americans to lead from strength and from confidence. This is no year for trying to divide this country along any artificial lines of age or of race or of false fears. Anybody reads America wrong if he rejects the ideal of unity and encourages division and dissension on the false notion that in disunity there is strength. Anybody reads America wrong if he fails to see that the best way to meet our weaknesses is to call up and mobilize our strength. Anybody reads America wrong if he doesn't know and recognize what is

right in America as the greatest force for moving in on those parts of America that are wrong. And I call upon responsible legislators and public officials not to ignore our concerns, not to ignore our problems, not to even minimize them. I don't ask you to stop reciting what's wrong with America, but give equal time, will you, with what's right in America.

What a magnificent, strengthening thing it will be if this election year can bring a marshalling, an effective, forceful marshalling, of the true spirit of this nation. And that spirit does need mobilization partly because things have gone so well for so many people. One of our most difficult assignments is how to keep spirit in prosperity. But that spirit, I repeat, is warm. It's here and it's generous and magnanimous if we but find it, touch it. It is the spirit of wanting greatly in this country to get on with democracy's job. There is a welling-up in this nation of conscience. There is even a welling-up in this nation of pragmatism, for those who are, so to speak, in charge know that they must perform, they must meet the responsibilities. Americans want to do something for their country. They want to. And I submit they're going to listen to the voices who call upon them to do something for their country, which simply means doing something for each other. But they want to know how to do it. There's plenty of room for partisanship, for party politics in arguing out these ways and means. That's what it's all about. The two political parties do not basically disagree on the kind of America they want. They're arguing how to get to the common goal. And that's the way it should be.

So, I've tried to say to you what seems to me our special responsibility this year as holders of public trust. Not telling you about your own legislative measures--you know them better than I--not bringing you a bill of particulars, you know that--but I think possibly that we have a special responsibility this year as holders of public trust, many of us as aspirants or applicants for renewal and some even for enlargement of that trust.

I've tried to say to you that we must catch the true purposes of the people, tune in to what they're saying: That we set out clearly above particular issues what central elements of disagreement there may be about those purposes; that we include on the agenda the special concerns of the governmental process and that we use democracy's process, democracy's process to implement people's purposes. We don't need a new politics or a new system or a new America. We need a regeneration, a revitalization of democracy, a refocusing of America's goals and skills and resources, a revitalizing of America's greatness. And I call this simply and directly our new democracy, a new democracy where the people's business is the business of every person.

America is restless--yes, it's even discontented. But it is the restlessness of new reason for higher hopes. It is the discontent of new realization, new possibilities of seeing new horizons, the sensing of new dimensions of quality and equality in human life. America's dreams are changing but she has dreams. And so are her ideas about making those dreams possible and if we who lead a people meet these challenges, not as obligations, but as opportunities--not with the corners of our mouths down, but with the smile of confidence on our lips--with a heartiness and a joy of leading--then I believe a people will gain in that leadership.

And that's what this election, and this year are all about. And that is what John Adams called the spirit of public happiness to which I have referred, but which seems so little understood. Listen to his words. Our second President. He defined the spirit of public happiness, a spirit which is reflected in the life of the people in participation or public discussion and public action and then he said this spirit of public happiness is a joy in American citizenship in self-control, in self-discipline, in dedication. My fellow Americans, that is the

the America that we are a part of. That's what makes democracy meaningful. That's why this business of politics ought to be a joyful experience even in difficult times. As a great minister once said, in the worst of times we must do the best of things. And when you're doing the best of things you can only do it with the fullness of spirit. And I think John Adams was right that there is a spirit of public happiness which is a joy in our citizenship. I'm so happy that I was privileged by birth to be an American citizen. I think most Americans feel that way and I know millions of people around the world wish they had that same joy of citizenship. But this great statesman reminded us that spirit of happiness is more than just a joy in citizenship, it is in self-control, restraint, in self-discipline, character and above all in dedication, commitment. John Adams, second President of the United States, spoke for you and for me. I think he spoke for the last third of the 20th Century which third of this Century will decide possibly more than any other time in human history the fate of mankind, whether we shall be human beings created in the image of our maker with spirit and soul, or whether we shall just be flesh, machines, tools to be used, rather than spirits to be enriched.

Thank you.

DRAFT

Michigan Legislature
May 10, 1968
Mike Moynihan

An agenda for Americans is being assembled today in every corner of our nation ... in this chamber, in the Congress of the United States, in school boards and planning commissions, in union halls and chambers of commerce, in board rooms and in mule-drawn wagons converging on Washington.

It is an agenda of opportunity.

We are not faced with new problems. Our problems preceded our capacity and will to meet them. The poor did not suddenly become impoverished, nor did discrimination emerge overnight. It took centuries to pollute our waters and decades to foul the air. The median ~~age~~ age of Americans has been moving steadily youthwards and farmlands were losing people before the first automobile was made in Michigan.

What has changed are not the issues, but the agenda. The agenda is not only longer but it applies at all levels of government. The poor may march to Washington to seek help for their troubles but they will look to state legislatures for schools for their children. They will ask the counties for hospital care for their sick and their aged. They will turn to their mayors for decent protection of life and property.

The town of Hope is not a place but a state of mind.

We can deal successfully with a new agenda if this state of mind prevails. And it will prevail. I believe we are building a city of Hope in the City of Lansing and in other state capitals and municipalities across America.

#

I have been privileged to hold elective office at more than one level of government and I know that what happens at each and every level can help or hurt us in facing our new agenda. It will not do in America today to wait for a new idea from Washington ... or a new grant ... or a new federal coordinator.

There are many important studies being made on improving the relationship of federal, state, and local authorities and there are promising proposals for action. This is fine but not good enough. We must move now on all fronts. Many of us in Washington, for example, believe that there is a clear need for a national service program, but let us first ask "Why a national service program rather than a state or city or community service program?" I don't have an answer to that question but you should be able to find an answer for Michigan and other states and cities and communities should be able to find their own answer.

To move on all fronts, we must begin looking at the federal-state relationship as a cross-country race rather than a tug-of-war. It is a race to do more for America, to do it well and to do it wisely .

The states in the past have been great laboratories of innovative reform. The Federal government did not enfranchise the first woman to vote in America, or pass the first usury law or first indict a bigoted employer or landlord. If the states have lost their lead in the race, they now have the opportunity to again move ahead.

I see every sign in America today of the beginnings of a renaissance in state and local government. It is now 50 years since Jay Gould could tell a Congressional committee that he used his own money to form the legislature of four states because he "found it was cheaper that way." It is 35 years since Luther Gulick could write "It is a matter of brutal record. The American State is finished. I do not predict that the States will go, but affirm that they have gone."

For the first time in our history State Government in the United States is based on the principle of one man, one vote. The time will come when men and women in every state in America will thank Michigan for the dignity and pride that this change is bringing with it. The growing capacity to conduct their affairs well, to provide staff and research facilities to their legislators, to recruit more qualified employees and to bring ferment and innovation to the public scene in America are signs of this new and welcome pride that befits an American state.

The renewal of the states is the first step toward reconciling real and imagined conflicts of interest among the states themselves and between the state and the federal government. As Governor Terry Sanford writes in his sensitive book, "Storm over the States" the opponents of measures to reform state and local governments are usually the chief complainants about federal intrusion."

This turnabout is also spurring regional cooperation in transport, in clean air and water programs, in the creation of new industries and archaic units of government are going the way of the rotten boroughs. Federal support for such programs is essential and will be forthcoming. Other forms of federal assistance are increasing and the states and the cities themselves are earning more. They are also spending more but even these amounts are far from enough to deal with the new agenda.

Money is a powerful engine and we shall need more money but money alone cannot make a mesh of present programs that are broader and more effective than many realize. Money alone cannot recreate communities within cities. And money doled out grudgingly by the state or accompanied by a grid of federal control will hardly satisfy the expectations of those to whom political power is coming in the cities.

More than money is needed. Our race must also run in the direction of human renewal, of an interchange between private and public pursuits, between the university and a cooperative housing program, between the shop and a youth program, the office and a public safety corps. In running this part of the race, I say "God Speed the States."

I believe our common goal is neither to centralize nor to decentralize government services. Rather, our goal is to individualize these services until every American may find help when he needs it and until every American may gain in spirit by offering help to his community and to others in their need.

James Madison wrote in the beginning of our nation:

"It is too early for politicians to presume on our forgetting that the public good, the real welfare of the great body of the people, is the supreme object to be pursued; and that no form of government whatever has any other ~~value~~ value than as it may be fitted for the attainment of this object."

It was not too early then and it is not too late now.

~~DRAFT~~

Michigan Legislature
Lansing
May 14, 1968

FL

American is today assembling its agenda for the
last years of its second century of independence.

That agenda is being put together in every corner of
our nation -- in this chamber ... in Congress ... in school
boards and planning commissions ... in union halls and
chambers of commerce ... in board rooms and in mule-drawn
wagons converging on Washington.

And the fundamental issue, I think, is how much
effort and imagination America can muster to overcome the
problems that ~~stand~~ stand between fulfillment of the pledges we
made in 1776.

Our problems are not new.

The poor did not suddenly become impoverished, nor
did discrimination emerge overnight.

It took centuries to pollute our waters and decades to foul the air.

And farmlands were losing people before the first automobile was made in Michigan.

What has changed -- and what makes the need for progress so urgent -- is the enormous amount of resources we now have to deal with them.

Where do the answers lie?

"Washington" is usually the ready reply. But "Washington" will not and cannot provide adequate answers in our federal system.

The poor may march to Washington to see help. But they will look to state legislatures for schools for their children.

They will ask the counties for hospital care for their sick and their aged.

They will turn to their mayors for decent protection
of life and property.

No, the answers to the challenges on our national agenda

lie -- and must be found -- in every nook and cranny of our federal
system, and in the efficient, coordinated action of the whole.

In this part, American federalism has proven its
durability and its utility, despite a continuing tug-of-war between
states rights and central authority laced with local jurisdictional
jealousies.

Today I think that tug of war may is turning -- very much for
the better -- into a cross-country relay race, with common
objectives and mutual dependence, obliterating the ~~fold~~ tensions.

I believe that Washington has done its part over the last
seven years to help encourage this process.

The Model Cities program, for example depends entirely

upon local planning and local initiative.

So does the elementary and Secondary Education Act.

So do our new Youth Opportunity programs and many others in which the federal government functions as an opportunity bank but not as a ruling directorate.

In addition, we have created new federal agencies specifically designed to service pressing local and state needs. The most important of these are a new Department of Housing and Urban Development and Department of Transportation.

At the other end of our federal spectrum, the cities are also responding.

of myself
Having once been mayor of Minneapolis, I have served during the last three years as President Johnson's liaison with the cities. I have met the mayor of every American city with a population over 15 thousand, and many from ~~smaller~~ smaller cities.

And I have tried to serve as an ombudsman for our cities -- as
a red-tape cutter and champion in the federal bureaucracies.

And I can tell you that the desire to develop local
solutions to local problems -- with or without federal support --
is there.

Burns
etc.
As the the states, we have come a long way since

Jay Gould could tell a Congressional committee, 50 years ago,
that he used his own money to form the legislature of four states
because he "found it was cheaper that way."

We have come a long way in the 35 years since Luther
Gulick wrote "It is a matter of brutal record. The American State
is finished. I do not predict that the States will go, but affirm that
they have gone."

Today, for the first time in our history state government
~~is~~ in the United States is based on the principle of one man, one vote.

The time will come when men and women in every state in America will thank Michigan for the dignity and pride ~~that~~ that this change is bring with it.

The growing capacity to conduct their affairs well, to provide staff and research facilities to their legislatures, to recruit more qualified employees and to bring ferment and innovation to the public scene in America are signs of this new and welcome pride that befits an American state.

Certainly the renewal of the states is the first step toward reconciling real and imagined conflicts of interest among the states themselves and between the state and the federal government. As Governor Terry Sanford writes in his sensitive book, Storm Over the States, the "opponents of measures to reform state and local governments are usually the chief complainants about federal intrusion." (I like to quote)

What is it going to take to win this cross-country relay race?

The answer that comes easiest is "money," and that usually means "federal money."

[Note to WW: The following 7 paragraphs are adapted from a speech of the VP's given in January, 1967]

We hear plenty of proposals for federal revenue-sharing with states and localities. Let me say first that we already share substantial amounts of federal revenue with our state and local governments.

You might be surprised to know that state and local governments ~~will~~ have derived about 17 per cent of their total revenue from the federal government last year.

This is not to reject proposals for further revenue-sharing.

But I think we must take a long and careful look at them.

I do not think, for example, that the federal government would be keeping proper faith with American taxpayers if tax revenues were to be handed over, no string attached -- as some have proposed -- to state and local governments which might not be ready or able to use them effectively. Federal aid is worse than useless if the political and social environment in which it is to be used are more _____ to procrastination than to action.

Methods of ~~distribution~~ distribution would have to be devised, and above all, problems of allocation among the states and among the various levels of government would have to be solved.

Tax sharing is not a panacea. It should not be oversimplified. It is worth serious consideration and thorough debate -- and I expect that to be forthcoming in the months ahead.

But money alone is not the answer to the needs of our states and cities. Better management and organization are urgently required as well.

For all the progress our states have made, there are still many with horse and buggy constitutions that make effective use of resources already available all but impossible.

There are still plenty of city charters that deny city governments the authority to tap local sources of revenue which are available to them.

There are far too many city and state governments wasting resources today in independent efforts to attack water pollution, air pollution, migration and many other problems which can only be handled on a regional basis.

And, finally, there is still a little of that all-important ingredient, citizen participation.

Government of the people, by the people, and for the people is a venerable part of American political theory. But it can also be a vitally important practical asset as we confront the last obstacles to full ~~adequat~~ and equal opportunity in America.

Today public involvement has been rediscovered as "participatory democracy," and I don't mind pointing with pride to the fact that the Johnson-Humphrey Administration put community action at the very root of the entire War on Poverty.

Participation makes people want to protect rather than to destroy.

It lets people hope rather than hate.

And in and of itself it is a giant step toward freedom and opportunitith which no amount of money of governmental stremlining can buy.

* * *

The issue before our federal system today is not really whether to centralize or decentralize government services.

Rather, it is whether we can individualize these services until every American may find help when he needs it . . . until every American may gain in spirit by offering help to his community and to others in their need.

James Madison wrote in the beginning of our nation:

"It is too early for politicians to presume on our forgetting that the public good, the real welfare of the great body of the people, is the supreme object to be pursued: and that no form of government whatever has any other value than as it may be fitted for the attainment of ~~the~~ this object. "

It was not too early then and it is not too late now.

#

P3 elements pt 2

P4 Today speak of specific

P6 - ord cities & ports

but part P7

New democracy
- new participation
Father, it is whether we can individualize these
services

... can still every American may find help when he needs it...

With every American may gain in spirit by offering help to his

community and to others in their need

feel your
in a financial
for child & elderly
order & stability
star
Liked much the
living down
put about
Municipal
to be pursued; and the interest of government whatever
of the great body of the people, is the supreme object
our forgetting that the public good, the real welfare
It is the duty of politicians to organize
James Madison wrote in the beginning of our nation
federal policy

let's know it
what
where you
in

these are local in you, cities
people are local
let's learn me about him
to make first system with both
whole picture of first system
don't want planning for top
so we need action for bottom
city, state & state and
want me down, but being
an interest, which anticipates future



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