

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 113—PART 2

JANUARY 25, 1967, TO FEBRUARY 7, 1967

(PAGES 1423 TO 2878)

Senate. It would also win one electoral vote for each congressional district which it carried. Under my proposal, as under the present system, the total number of electoral votes would equal the number of members in the Congress of the United States. The presidential ticket receiving a majority of the total number of electoral votes cast would be elected. If no presidential ticket obtained a majority of the electoral votes, Congress in joint session would select a President and Vice President from the top three tickets.

Mr. President, I offer my resolution as an improvement of the present winner-take-all system whereby a State's entire electoral vote usually goes to the ticket which wins a plurality of the popular vote cast in the State. Under my plan, the entire Nation, not populous centers alone, would be the arena for selecting its President and Vice President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 25) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of the President and Vice President, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DESIGNATION OF FEBRUARY OF EACH YEAR AS AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] I introduce a joint resolution and ask that it be appropriately referred. On January 12, President Johnson invited the American people to observe February of this year as American History Month, saying:

It is only through knowing and understanding the sources of our common heritage that we become aware of ourselves as being, in truth, one people.

This Presidential proclamation parallels the yearly proclamations by the Governors of nearly every State calling for activities and ceremonies during February which evoke an awareness of American history.

But, indeed, as trying times force us to reflect more deeply on our past, it seems that our homage to history might better be given a permanent status. The resolution which I introduced last year and which was passed by the Senate, designated February of every year as American History Month. However, the House of Representatives struck the continuing authority, making the resolution applicable only to 1967, and struck the preamble. And the Senate, anxious to see the resolution enacted before the Congress adjourned adopted the House amendments.

Today, with the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], I introduce another joint resolution to designate February of each year as American History Month. I ask that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and lie at the desk through Lincoln's birthday,

February 12, for the convenience of Senators who may wish to cosponsor the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Kentucky.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 26) designating February of each year as American History Month, introduced by Mr. COOPER, for himself and Mr. HRUSKA, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. J. RES. 26

Whereas the study of history not only enlivens appreciation of the past but also illuminates the present and gives perspective to our hopes;

Whereas a knowledge of the growth and development of our free institutions and their human values strengthens our ability to utilize these institutions and apply these values to present needs and new problems;

Whereas Americans honor their debt to the creativity, wisdom, work, faith, and sacrifice of those who first secured our freedoms, and recognize their obligation to build upon this heritage so as to meet the challenge of the future;

Whereas, February, 1967, has been designated by the President as American History Month; and

Whereas it is appropriate to encourage a deeper awareness of the great events which shaped America, and a renewed dedication to the ideals and principles we hold in trust: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That February of each year is hereby designated as American History Month, and the President of the United States is requested and authorized to issue annually a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe such month in schools and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in the study of history a man can find just about anything he needs or wants to live by. He can find obscenities to justify his own, he can find excuses to justify his failures, and he can find examples of heroism, patriotism, nationalism or any other ism conceived. But more than this, man can find hope: Hope in his destiny and hope in the future. With this hope, his purpose is strengthened and his resolution restored.

Mr. President, it is with this basic concept in mind that I again join my friend from Kentucky in cosponsorship of the Senate joint resolution designating February of every year as American History Month.

Although the prior version of this resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 133, was introduced in the last session and passed by both Houses, it was amended on the House side to make the designation apply only to February of 1967. Whether this resolution will meet with the same fate is not known; however, it is my sincere hope that the annual designation of this month will not be an annual legislative event. It could be argued that the resolution is not of the most pressing importance in the priority of legislative measures. But it will definitely stimulate a great interest in our history in all parts of the country. Local and State

historical associations and private individuals could effectively advance programs to stimulate and to further this interest generated by an annual Presidential proclamation.

It might be that the annual introduction of this measure will do more in the way of activating this interest than by the passage of one resolution making the designation an annual event. However, with the press of immediate business, it would seem far more appropriate that the designation be now declared to be an annual event.

As a lawyer and a legislator, I am constantly reminded of the importance of history and precedent. Without the knowledge of the experience of others, we will too often take one step forward but two backward. With the increased suffering and struggle in Vietnam today, the increased role the Federal Government is playing in every man's life and the ever-increasing importance of today's chapter in American history, it is vital that we know what has gone before if we are to be wise in the present.

This resolution will also give emphasis to those individuals who daily pass on to our young people, the lessons of history. With the growing emphasis on the educational and technical excellence of our schools, we should acknowledge the important role of teachers of history.

REVENUE SHARING STUDY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I submit, for myself and the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], a resolution authorizing the Senate Committee on Government Operations to study the revenue sources of State and local units of government and of the Federal Government to determine whether those sources are properly allocated for meeting national and local goals. It expressly authorizes the study of various revenue sharing proposals including the Heller plan.

In every discussion of revenue sharing and other proposals to furnish State and local governments with sufficient funds to meet their needs, the necessity of preserving and promoting an effective Federal structure must always be the key point at issue.

Senator MUSKIE and I are cosponsors of Senator GAYLORD NELSON's proposal to establish a blue ribbon National Tax Sharing Commission which would study various proposals to achieve revenue sharing between State and local governments and the Federal Government. But I believe it would be most helpful to have a specialized study from one viewpoint in particular—studying in depth the effect any such plan will have on State and local governments.

One of the most basic issues underlying any such proposal is whether the Federal Government, in providing huge blocks of funds to localities with few strings attached, can be sure that such funds will be used wisely to meet national goals in fields of education, transportation, air and water pollution, health and welfare, and so on. Talk of inefficient and even corrupt State and local governments is an ever-present negative factor in every rebuttal to the Heller plan.

Therefore, I believe there is a real necessity to focus—as well as on the financial and social issues involved—on the question of the capability of State and local governments to join in a more powerful way the war on poverty, illiteracy, disease, and social ills. The Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, chaired by Senator MUSKIE, has been a leader in exploring the complex and difficult ties between the Federal Government and local, State, and city governments. That committee would be an appropriate mechanism for an in-depth, skilled inquiry into these problems.

For some 3½ years this subcommittee has been studying and examining the critical subject of Federal-State-local relations. Senator MUSKIE has found that the increasing number of categorical Federal aids to State and local governments has precipitated a crisis in governmental manpower on the local level which is available to use and work effectively with those aids.

Congressional enactments in recent years have brought a wealth of programs to attack the social ills of our time. But all of these programs rely heavily on the ability of the Federal-State-local machinery to administer them efficiently and wisely. Senator MUSKIE, in his speech to the Senate early last year, said:

During the past two Congresses we have concentrated primarily on the substance of government; now the spotlight must be turned on the procedure. Here is where the new challenge lies.

And it is squarely on the State and local governments that the full weight of operational responsibility lies. Therefore, it is all the more important that we investigate and study carefully the impact, for good or for ill, that revenue sharing plans might have on State and local governments, and their ability to join with the Federal Government in meeting the problems of our day.

There is no doubt that it is highly unlikely that any of these proposals will be enacted during the first session of the 90th Congress. The costs of the war in Vietnam, adequate funding of existing social legislation, and the possibility of huge expenditures for anti-missile-missile systems make any rebate or tax sharing fiscally impossible at the present time.

For the present, we have a rare opportunity to study in depth an idea that is widely acclaimed and accepted, outside the normal pressures of proceeding to immediate legislative enactment.

The basic problem is the so-called fiscal mismatch where States and municipalities have the problems, and the Federal Government has the financial resources. Among the questions that must be raised and discussed, in determining how best to correct this fiscal mismatch, are:

What strings or controls, if any, are needed on the funds returned to the States;

What formula of distribution between the States will be most beneficial;

What share, if any, of the funds should be passed through to the cities in each State;

Do we want State and local govern-

ments to be more than mere conduits or shells for these Federal funds;

And how best can all levels of government work together to meet national goals?

The basic need for additional assistance to State and local governments rests upon a very persuasive case. State and local governments simply cannot meet their problems, relying only on revenue resources available to them at the present time. State and local governments are subject to rising expenditures, rising State and local debt, and generally regressive, inefficient tax structures. They are plagued by threats of runaway industry and political agitation for decreases in State and local income and property taxes. In many States, the price of increases in existing taxes or passage of new taxes is heavy political turnover.

My own State of Minnesota is a good example of the way State budgets are being squeezed to the breaking point, even some now have temporary surpluses of revenues resulting from the recent national economic growth.

In the last decade, State and local indebtedness in Minnesota has increased 126 percent—from about \$712 million in 1957 to roughly \$1.6 billion at the end of fiscal year 1964-65. During the same period, general State and local expenditures increased 92 percent to \$1,553,700,000 in fiscal 1965. These figures show that Minnesota has been making a determined effort to meet the need of its citizens—and has in that time spent 91 percent more for education, 70 percent more for highways, 77 percent more for public welfare, and 45 percent more for health and hospitals.

By way of measuring what State and local governments have been doing in Minnesota, it should be noted that while total indebtedness in Minnesota was increasing by 126 percent from 1957 to fiscal year 1965, the total indebtedness of the Federal Government increased only 17 percent. Federal expenditures in that period increased 60 percent, while State and local expenditures in Minnesota increased by 78 percent.

In fact, increased spending by State and local governments over the United States as a whole may even raise an argument against revenue sharing proposals. If the general revenues of all State and local governments in the United States have increased, as well as expenditures and indebtedness, why should not they be able to continue to meet their needs for the immediate or foreseeable future? Those of us who support some type of revenue sharing measure generally agree that we are reaching the end point of State and local ability to increase expenditures and indebtedness.

In general, proponents of some sort of revenue sharing agree with Dr. Walter Heller, who said:

If the state and local governments are forced to solve their fiscal problems at the lowest common denominator arising out of interstate competition, limited jurisdiction, and inequality, their tax structures will deteriorate, and their vigor will be sapped. Without greater federal help, they will face a disheartening battle for higher, and highly unpopular, taxes. That battle, combined

with their inability to provide the services expected of enlightened governments in an affluent society, could seriously weaken their role in our federalism.

The case for greater Federal financial support for State and local governments must be made on the basis that by so doing we are restoring an imbalance in resources and capabilities, and promoting a smooth joint relationship between Federal-State-local governmental units in the solution of national problems. I believe a study by the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee would be most helpful in finding answers to these and related questions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 79) was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

S. Res. 79

Whereas the United States of America is today confronted with problems of unparalleled scope and magnitude in air and water pollution, urban decay, poverty, conservation of resources, education, transportation, and numerous other areas of great public concern;

Whereas cooperative and interrelated action on every level of government within the United States of America is required to meet these needs and to assure to our citizens a decent life in a nation capable of achieving its highest goals;

Whereas there now exists a great disparity of resources among different units of state and local governments and between all such units on the one hand and the Federal Government on the other;

Whereas this disparity and other problems of interrelation of local, State and Federal Government impede the solution of our national problems: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations is hereby authorized to undertake a study of the existing relationship between local, State and Federal governments and their comparative revenue resources and capacities to meet the public need at each level; to study and evaluate methods of reallocation of financial and other resources by revenue-sharing and other appropriate means; and to make such recommendations and propose such legislation as it may determine to be appropriate.

AUTHORIZATION FOR S. 696 TO LIE AT THE DESK UNTIL FEBRUARY 10

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], I ask unanimous consent that S. 696, the REA financing legislation, lie at the desk for an additional week, until the close of business on Friday, February 10, to permit additional Senators to become cosponsors if they so desire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTION, AND RESOLUTIONS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name may be added as a cosponsor to the milk