

ministration—as we are doing. Others will need to revise their constitutions and their laws to bring them up to date—as we are doing. Above all, we must find ways in which the multitudes of small jurisdictions can be brought together more efficiently.”

The President, indeed, courteously understated the magnitude and urgency of these problems of governmental fragmentation and inefficiency. State governors themselves, in recent inaugural addresses, have stressed the degree of obsolescence and disorganization in state after state. (*Time*, January 20, 1967). Governor Harold Hughes of Iowa declared:

“I think we need to pay less attention to states’ rights and more attention to states’ responsibilities.”

Governor Love of Colorado attacked his state’s:

“crazy-quilt development of overlapping, duplicating, and sometimes competing groups of governmental jurisdictions”

and warned that future challenges could not be met with the “organizational patterns of the 19th century.”

Governor Winthrop Rockefeller called for basic revisions in Arkansas’ 1874 constitution and called for a new look at state operations, hindered, according to *Time*, “by an incredible total of 187 boards and commissions.”

Governor Daniel Evans of Washington summed up the states’ predicament in these words:

“State governments are unquestionably on trial today. If we are not willing to pay the price, if we cannot change where change is required, then we have only one recourse. And that is to prepare for an orderly transfer of our remaining responsibilities to the Federal government.”

Senator Muskie, who was himself governor of Maine and who as chairman of a Senate subcommittee on intergovernmental relations has been holding hearings on the administration of federal grants, confirms this general view of state governmental inadequacies. He agreed (*New York Times*, February 7, 1967) that some governors were trying to generate new life into state government, but added:

“* * * they still need legislative and constitutional reform, and they have a long way to go to establish their own leadership over the planning and administration of state programs.”

Under such circumstances, it would appear, at the very least, to be untimely for the federal government to relinquish to the states and local governments present federal controls over the use of federal revenues.

It is important to note in this connection that the mayors of our big cities—where so many of our major social ills and needs are concentrated—apparently have little confidence in the capacity of the states to administer federal revenues fairly under a no-strings tax-sharing approach. Mayor Harold Tollefson of Tacoma, Washington, speaking as President of the National League of Cities, (*New York Times*, February 7, 1967) told the Muskie subcommittee that state governments could not be trusted to respond to urban needs. He said that cities would welcome help from the states but that “the past leaves too many doubts.”

In view of these doubts and the widely shared reservations regarding the effectiveness of state and local governments, reason would seem to counsel against an abdication of federal responsibility in efforts to lighten local and state fiscal burdens. What is truly pernicious about some of the current campaigns to render the federal role in revenue sharing more passive, is that they do more than merely distort the realities of the situation: they reverse the priorities and they call for abdication of federal leadership precisely at a time when the nation cannot meet its mounting human needs and expectations without greater federal expenditures and greater federal leadership in the federal system.

What happens when the federal government fails to assert its proper authority and carry out its proper responsibility in deference to a loose definition of states’ rights is nicely illustrated in the matter of air pollution. President Johnson states the problem in the following passage:

“Under the Clean Air Act of 1963, we have attempted to encourage states to develop effective regional control programs. The act offered three federal dollars for every local dollar spent to develop and support regional interstate air pollution control programs. Despite this incentive, no effective regional programs have been developed under the act.”

The passage is from the President’s message, “Protecting Our National Heritage”, in which he asks for passage of an “Air Quality Act of 1967”, which would provide for more vigorous federal enforcement powers.