

U.S. Congress



UNITED STATES

OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 11

MAY 5, 1970, TO MAY 13, 1970

(PAGES 14097 TO 15504)

scarcely difficult to imagine the need for a national recount, or an election where the final decision came down to the late-reporting precincts of Cook County. This is nothing but a recipe for strife, uncertainty and bitterness, for results at least as perverse as those conceivable under the present system.

In conclusion the editorial said:

Direct election has its own considerable potential for mischief, and if the nation is given an all-or-nothing choice between direct election and no change, it will be far wiser to stick to the devil it knows.

I hope the Senate follows this wise advice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, entitled "Lost in Theorizing" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial entitled "Lost in Theorizing," was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 29, 1970]

LOST IN THEORIZING

Direct election of the President is one of those cozy ideas, warm and soft and virtuous, beloved by civics teachers and all the best people. What with an amendment already passed by the House and approved last week by the Senate Judiciary Committee, it very well may be written into the Constitution of the United States. Unless, that is, the full Senate wakes up enough to recognize how it would operate in the real world.

The current fervor over electoral reform has produced a field-day for the armchair theorists. Direct election was obviously bound to win any armchair theorizing contest, but some of the other entries were instructive. Our favorite, from the standpoint of amusement, was the Dole-Eagleton plan. Its workings are too complicated to describe, but its backers argued it would guarantee that a candidate with a solid popular majority would always win but that in close elections widespread geographical backing would also count. Not a bad idea, indeed an excellent one, but also a precise description of the effect the Electoral College already has.

What got lost in all this theorizing was the reason the fervor over electoral reform came up in the first place. This, perhaps you may recall, was the possibility of a deadlocked election, which was prominent in the 1968 campaign because of the third-party effort. If no candidate receives a majority of the electoral vote, the Constitution presently calls for the House to elect the President, choosing among the top three candidates, voting one vote per state, and with a majority of states required for election. Thus an indefinite deadlock is conceivable, and unquestionably it would put a severe strain on both public trust in American institutions and the legitimacy of any eventual winner.

So it somehow seems to us, if to hardly anyone else, that the purpose of electoral reform ought to be to correct this defect. Or at least, that whatever else a reform plan may do, it certainly ought to eliminate the possibility of uncertainty and deadlock that damage institutions and destroy legitimacy. And it is on precisely this count that the country is begging for trouble if it opts for direct popular election.

What would have been the effect of direct election in 1968, when the difference between the two candidates was seven-tenths of a percent of the popular vote, or in 1960, when the difference was two-tenths of a percent, or less than 120,000 votes nationwide? It is scarcely difficult to imagine the need for a national recount, or an election where the final national decision came down to the late-reporting precincts of Cook County. This is nothing but a recipe for strife, uncertainty and bitterness, for results at least as perverse

as those conceivable under the present system.

Beyond that, we simply do not know the secondary and tertiary effects that might come from such a fundamental change in our institutions. Direct elections might promote third-party campaigns like George Wallace's, for under the proposed plan a third party could force a runoff election without carrying a single state. It would have unpredictable and perhaps controversial effects on the balance of political power among various voting groups and on the methods of political campaigning. All in all, there are a lot of unknowns to risk merely to satisfy the theorists.

We absolutely do know, by contrast, that the present Electoral College got us through the 1968 and 1960 elections without a Constitutional crisis. It has the obvious advantage of isolating any need for a recount to states both close and crucial to the outcome. We know that its decisions even in the closest elections have been accepted by the electorate without cavil. Even though the opportunity for a breakdown is obvious, for that matter, the system has in fact weathered that danger time and again.

It would be perfectly possible and eminently desirable, of course, to eliminate the risk of a deadlocked election without junking the present system. One proposal, for example, is to have a joint session of Congress, with one vote per Senator or Representative, decide any election where no candidate receives a majority of the electoral vote. A straightforward amendment to correct the obvious problems, though, runs into opposition from backers of direct election, who are intent that the defects in the present system must go uncorrected until their own cozy idea is enacted.

So be it, but direct election has its own considerable potential for mischief, and if the nation is given an all-or-nothing choice between direct election and no change, it will be far wiser to stick to the devil it knows.

MINNESOTA'S KETTLE RIVER

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I recently introduced a bill designating the Kettle River in Minnesota as a component of the wild and scenic rivers system. Representative BLATNIK has introduced a companion bill in the House.

I am pleased that this action has received the endorsement of two of the largest newspapers in Minnesota.

The St. Paul Dispatch says:

Congress should act favorably on a move by two Minnesotans to include the Kettle River in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

The Minneapolis Tribune says:

Sen. Mondale and Rep. Blatnik are sponsoring bills in Congress to keep the Kettle unspooled by including it in a national system of wild and scenic rivers . . . The Mondale-Blatnik proposal seems to us an attractive one.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be printed in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESERVING THE KETTLE

Congress should act favorably on a move by two Minnesotans to include the Kettle River in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Companion bills seeking to preserve the river have been introduced by Sen. Walter Mondale and Rep. John Blatnik.

The Kettle, located approximately midway between the Twin Cities and Duluth, is one of the most picturesque in the state and its waters have been virtually untarnished by human and industrial wastes. In addition, the Kettle flows into the upper St. Croix, which already has been designated as a wild river by Congress.

If the Kettle were designated likewise, it would mean that its waters and shoreline would be used almost exclusively by canoeists, fishermen and hikers. No new roadways could be constructed in the area and a strip of land—approximately 400 feet in from either shoreline—would be protected by easement or acquired by the federal government. Any large campsite, for instance, would have to be built behind the 400-foot zone. Moreover, under the Wild Rivers Act, construction of any kind within 1,300 feet of the river is severely restricted.

Upon completion of the interstate highway between the Twin Cities and Duluth, over two million Minnesotans would be within a 90-minute drive of the Kettle. The nature lovers among them deserve its protection.

ANOTHER WILD RIVER FOR MINNESOTA

For years, the Kettle River in northern Minnesota has been regarded by canoeists as challenging and by outdoor enthusiasts as enjoyable. It is underdeveloped and picturesque; it has exciting rapids, lazy sections, good fishing; there are interesting geological formations along the banks.

Sen. Mondale and Rep. Blatnik are sponsoring bills in Congress to keep the Kettle unspooled by including it in a national system of wild and scenic rivers.

This makes good sense from the Minnesota viewpoint. The state has designated the Kettle as a canoe route. The Kettle would complement the St. Croix, already part of the national wild and scenic system, which so far includes only eight rivers. The Kettle, which flows into the St. Croix near Pine City, could help relieve possible future crowding on that river. Also, the Kettle is largely undeveloped—only 17 homes are located on its banks—and half the shoreline already is publicly held.

From the national vantage point, though, the proposal might be viewed differently. Money has yet to be appropriated to buy land along six of the eight rivers already designated as part of the national system. And, at least technically, another 16 streams marked in 1969 for Interior Department study as wild and scenic rivers would take precedence over the Kettle.

The Mondale-Blatnik proposal seems to us an attractive one. If Congress doesn't act on it, why can't Minnesota take the initiative and—beyond designating canoe routes—begin forming its own system of wild and scenic rivers? There is no reason why the state must await federal action to protect Minnesota streams such as the Kettle from development.

BETTER SECRETARIES MEAN BETTER BUSINESS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, "Better Secretaries Mean Better Business" was the theme of the 19th consecutive annual Secretaries Week, April 19-25, 1970.

Governors and mayors throughout the United States officially proclaimed Secretaries Week, and their counterparts in Canada did the same. For the seventh straight year, the Outdoor Advertising Association undertook Secretaries Week as a public service project, and billboards were made available throughout the