

REMARKS OF HONORABLE BOB DOLE

KANSAS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
WASHINGTON, D. C.
MONDAY, APRIL 26, 1971

James P. ...
...

Bob Dole
...
...
...
...

WITH THE COUNTDOWN TO THE 1972 ELECTION CAMPAIGN ALREADY UNDERWAY, THE NATIONAL CHAIRMAN OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY IS OFTEN EXPECTED TO MAKE PARTISAN POLITICAL SPEECHES. HOWEVER, THIS EVENING I WOULD LIKE TO TALK WITH YOU AS A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM KANSAS AND ABOUT SOME OF THE PROBLEMS, CHALLENGES AND SOLUTIONS INVOLVED IN THE RELATIONSHIP OF OUR STATE, AND THE OTHER 49 STATES, TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. THIS SUBJECT IS BIGGER THAN POLITICS, BECAUSE IT CONCERNS REASONABLE MEN OF ALL POLITICAL PERSUASIONS.

IN HIS STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS, DELIVERED LAST JANUARY 22nd, PRESIDENT NIXON EXPRESSED THIS POINT WHEN HE SAID: "AS WE APPROACH OUR 200th ANNIVERSARY IN 1976, WE REMEMBER THAT THIS NATION LAUNCHED ITSELF AS A LOOSE CONFEDERATION OF SEPARATE STATES, WITHOUT A WORKABLE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT."

...
...
...
...
...

-2-

STATE-FEDERAL BALANCE ERODES

THE PRESIDENT DESCRIBED HOW LEADERS OF VISION SOON REALIZED THAT, IF AMERICA WAS TO SURVIVE AS A VIABLE NATION, THEY WOULD HAVE TO BALANCE THE POWERS OF THE SEPARATE STATES WITH A CENTRAL GOVERNMENT. THE CONSTITUTION WHICH THEY DREW UP SOUGHT TO ESTABLISH THIS BALANCE.

SINCE THEN, HOWEVER, MUCH OF THAT BALANCE HAS ERODED. GRADUALLY, IN OFTEN UNNOTICED SMALL STEPS, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS SWALLOWED UP MORE AND MORE OF THE NATION'S FISCAL RESOURCES. THERE IS AN OLD POLITICAL ADAGE THAT WHERE THE MONEY GOES, POWER SOON FOLLOWS, AND THIS IS EXACTLY WHAT HAS HAPPENED IN AMERICAN GOVERNMENT. STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, LACKING THE FINANCIAL STRENGTH TO MEET THE NEEDS OF THEIR CITIZENS, HAVE BECOME INCREASINGLY DEPENDENT UPON AND SUBORDINATE TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

TIME TO REVERSE POWER FLOW

AS PRESIDENT NIXON SAID IN THAT SAME ADDRESS LAST JANUARY, "THE TIME HAS NOW COME IN AMERICA TO REVERSE THE FLOW OF POWER AND RESOURCES FROM THE STATES AND COMMUNITIES TO WASHINGTON, AND TO START POWER AND RESOURCES FLOWING BACK FROM WASHINGTON TO THE STATES AND COMMUNITIES AND, MORE IMPORTANT, TO THE PEOPLE ALL ACROSS AMERICA."

-3-

I AGREE WITH THIS GOAL. I BELIEVE THAT MOST AMERICANS AGREE WITH IT. AND I BELIEVE THAT THE PRESIDENT'S REVENUE SHARING PROPOSALS HOLD THE ~~KEY~~ TO REVERSING THIS FLOW OF POWER -- TO RESTORING A JUST MEASURE OF INDEPENDENCE AND SELF-DETERMINATION TO THE CITIZENS OF AMERICA, AND THE COMMUNITIES IN WHICH THEY LIVE.

BECAUSE REVENUE-SHARING GOES A LONG WAY TOWARD ACCOMPLISHING THIS GOAL, I WOULD LIKE TO SPEND A FEW MINUTES DISCUSSING THE PHILOSOPHY BEHIND IT.

BETTER WAY TO DO THE JOB

SPECIFICALLY, THE PRESIDENT PLANS TWO METHODS OF SHARING FEDERAL REVENUES -- GENERAL REVENUE SHARING, AND SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING. BOTH METHODS SHARE SOME BASIC ASSUMPTIONS. THE FOREMOST OF WHICH IS THAT THE PRESENT SYSTEM OF DELIVERING MONEY ~~BACK~~ TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, FROM WASHINGTON, IS NOT THE MOST INTELLIGENT, EFFICIENT OR EFFECTIVE WAY OF DOING THE JOB.

ANYONE WHO HAS EVER BEEN ON THE RECEIVING END OF A FEDERAL GRANT CAN ATTEST TO THIS FACT -- REGARDLESS OF THE PARTY OR PHILOSOPHY HE HAPPENS TO PREFER.

-4-

GRANTED, THEN, AN AWARENESS THAT THE PRESENT SYSTEM DOES NOT WORK WELL, THE NEXT STEP IN THE PRESIDENT'S PLANNING WAS TO ANALYZE SOME OF THESE FEDERAL GRANT-IN-AID PROGRAMS AND DEVISE REPLACEMENTS WHICH NOT ONLY WORK BETTER -- BUT ALSO INVOLVE LOCAL DECISION-MAKING.

GENERAL REVENUE SHARING

DO THE ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSALS ACHIEVE THESE GOALS? I BELIEVE THEY DO. FIRST, LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT "GENERAL" REVENUE-SHARING.

GENERAL REVENUE SHARING INVOLVES THE APPROPRIATION OF \$5 BILLION TO BE APPORTIONED IN FISCAL 1972 AMONG THE STATES AND THEIR MUNICIPALITIES ACCORDING TO TWO FORMULAS:

FORMULAS FOR DISTRIBUTION

FIRST, THERE IS A DISTRIBUTION FORMULA WHICH IS BASED ON A MIXTURE OF TWO FACTORS ~~X~~ POPULATION AND LOCAL TAXES. THIS MEANS THAT IF THERE WERE TWO STATES WITH THE SAME POPULATION AND ONE OF THEM WAS GENERATING MORE TAX REVENUES ON ITS OWN THAN THE NATIONAL AVERAGE, AND THE OTHER WAS GENERATING LESS, THEN THE ONE CONTRIBUTING MORE OF ITS TAX MONEY TO ITS OWN PROGRAMS WOULD RECEIVE A LARGER SHARE OF GENERAL REVENUE SHARING FUNDS ~~X~~ IN OTHER WORDS, GENERAL REVENUE SHARING RECOGNIZES BOTH NEED AND EFFORT. STATES THAT TRY HARDER TO SOLVE THEIR PROBLEMS WITH THEIR OWN DIRECT RESOURCES ARE REWARDED FOR THEIR EFFORTS.

BOB DOLE
U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510



*Thought this might be
of interest to you...*

KANSAS REVENUE SHARING STATISTICS

Total General Revenue Sharing funds
for Kansas \$54.23 million

Pass Through Percentage to Cities
and Counties 53.21%

Representative Figures:

Douglas County-----\$404,120

Gearv County----- \$112,646

Johnson County-----\$877,253

Wyandotte County---\$919,312

)OVER(



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250

Finney County-----\$124,183

Russell County-----\$147,048

Montgomery County --\$198,127

KANSAS REVENUE SHARING STATISTICS
Total General Revenue Sharing Funds
for Kansas \$54.23 million
Pass Through Percentage to Cities
and Counties 83.31%
Representative Figures:
Douglas County-----\$404,150
Geary County-----\$312,648
Johnson County-----\$287,253
Wyandotte County-----\$219,312