

PRESIDENT NIXON - 1970 WINTER MTG.
4

the appropriation measures delayed far, far, into the fiscal year and the uncertainty that brings to us. This is only one example.

We will have this afternoon, after the President speaks, some discussion and briefing on some of the current legislative matters on the Hill of importance to us. We will have, as I said, meetings tomorrow with the congressional people. We will have another Plenary Session tomorrow afternoon, and report back and discuss some of the problems that have arisen; some of the solutions that hopefully we have found, and then an Executive Committee Meeting again Friday morning.

May I welcome Governor Cahill, our newest member of the Conference.

(Applause)

We hope that you will participate fully in the Conference. I think, at this moment, I will simply ask you to stand at ease for a moment until we are notified that the President has arrived.

(Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

GOVERNOR LOVE: Ladies and gentlemen, the President of the United States.

(Applause)

PRESIDENT NIXON: Governor Love, Mr. Vice President, all the distinguished members of the Governors' Conference and your guests.

Governor Love told me when I arrived that he had already introduced me. So now that I am on, let me come directly to the matters that I would like to discuss briefly on the occasion of this Mid-winter Meeting of the Governors' Conference in Washington, D. C.

You will recall that in Colorado Springs I spoke of our programs in the field of the new Federalism. I would like to give you my political evaluation--not a partisan evaluation but my political evaluation--of how two of those programs which will very much affect the Governors of the States, how those programs now stand.

First, with regard to the Family Assistance Program, when I spoke to you at Colorado Springs I, very candidly, did not have high hopes that we could get substantial action on that program in this session of the Congress. That situation has changed.

I would say, now, that there is at least a 50% chance that the Family Assistance Program--somewhat in the direction recommended by the Administration although, of course, the Congress will work its will on the Administration measure--that that Family Assistance Program will be enacted in this session of the Congress.

With the support of the Governors, the chance that that program will be enacted will be more than 50%. Now, naturally, I would like to urge your support after each of you

has considered the effect of that program in his State, and also after each of you has evaluated it again.

I know the arguments for it and, naturally, I know the ones against it. Without going into it in any detail as to the arguments against, perhaps the two major ones are these.

First, that it isn't enough. My answer to that is that considering budgetary limitations, I believe it is the right amount at this time and it is a beginning--a beginning that American should make in this very great breakthrough in this field.

The second objection is much more fundamental, and much more profound, and one that all of us must consider. The question is will it work? I could tell you here that I am sure that it will work. I do not say that because it has never been tried, not tried on a national basis, although there has been a pilot program in the State of New Jersey in which the results have been quite encouraging.

But while I cannot guarantee that the new Family Assistance Program will work, I know that the present welfare program won't work. It is a disaster. It should be abolished, and I say it is time to move in a new direction.

And with those thoughts in mind, then, we would suggest that if you feel that we do need a change; if you feel that this program offers some new directions that the nation should move in, certainly your support might put it

over the top. It is now 50%. I think it could go over the top with more support.

The other program that I will refer to briefly, which I also covered in my remarks at Colorado Springs, is in the field of revenue sharing. Then, and now, I would have to say that the chances for the Congress enacting revenue sharing in this session are not good. I do not say that critically of the leadership of the Congress. I say it only as an evaluation of how the votes are in both the House and the Senate, and in the Committees that have the responsibility.

Here, again, arguments can be made for and against these programs. In the case of revenue sharing, one of the basic arguments that is made again is that it is not enough. It is certainly a very modest start on what will, in my view, eventually be a very significant program of sharing revenues, Federal revenues, with the States. But it is the kind of a start that we can afford now. It is a beginning, and I believe it is essential that we do begin.

The fact that the Governors of the States might conclude that they would put their full weight behind revenue sharing--behind revenue sharing not next year, but a beginning this year as we have recommended in our budget, and we have budgeted an amount as you know--if the Governors would do that what is now virtually a moot question as far as revenue sharing is concerned could become a very live question and there might

be a chance that we could get action.

And so, for that reason, I would urge you to consider revenue sharing. If you feel as strongly about it as I feel, and as I know some of the members of this Conference indicate that they feel, I would hope that you move in a direction so that we could get moving now in the Congress on this as well as in family assistance.

And now a third area, an area that I did not discuss at Colorado Springs, but one which many of you have brought to my attention and to the attention of the various people in the Administration who represent the agencies, and who are here to meet with you.

I want to say, parenthetically, in that respect that we have our first team as far as legislation is concerned here. Bryce Harlow, who has moved from the position of Congressional Liaison to that of a Member of the President's Cabinet as Counselor to the President is, in my opinion, perhaps the greatest expert on legislative representation and also in terms of expediting legislative action that it has been my privilege to know.

I would not loan him to any of you, incidentally, for some of your problems. But certainly I can tell you that for any advice in this field he is one I can very highly recommend.

We also have John Ehrlichman, who is the head of our

new Domestic Planning Staff, and the top people from the various departments, the Undersecretaries, who really get the job done. We want you to know them because these are the men that you can call upon when you have problems in their various departments in which you need action.

But having referred to this group, let me now go to the problem of the environment which, as you may recall, I covered in a major statement to the Congress a few weeks ago a program, incidentally, in which several of the States represented around this table are considerably ahead of the Federal Government; a program in which presently there is more popular support than there is for any other domestic program that I currently see on the domestic scene.

When we look at the problem of the environment, and where we go, there are these thoughts that I would like to leave with you. First, the necessity that the approach be national. I believe in State responsibilities. I believe in State's rights as well as responsibilities. That is why revenue sharing, to me, is a concept that should be adopted.

On the other hand, when we consider the problems of the environment it is very clear that clean air and clean water doesn't stop at a State line. And it is also very clear that if one State adopts very stringent regulations, it has the effect of penalizing itself as against another State which has regulations which are not as stringent insofar as attracting the private

enterprise that might operate in one State or another, or that might make that choice.

That is why we have suggested national standards. That is why we believe there must be the closest consultation with the States in implementing those standards, and why we want to work with you on it.

A second point with regard to our environmental program is one that I think all of us must consider as we move into this area, and that is that here is one area where we cannot wait. I had this brought forcibly to my attention when I was in Chicago meeting with the Governors in that area who happened to border on Lake Michigan. And we had the example of what had happened to Lake Erie. Once a lake, a body of water, goes beyond the point of no return, it is almost impossible to restore that lake, to restore it in terms of its being one that is attractive, and habitable as far as man is concerned, let alone those that live on the lake.

As far as Lake Michigan is concerned, it has not reached that point. But unless we act now it could go over that edge, and become like Lake Erie.

These examples could be multiplied all over the country. That is why, with all of the various priorities, all of the programs that are demanding attention for a limited Federal budget this year, we put as our first priority the environment. Because as important as all the other areas are

here is an area where, if we do not act now, it will be too late possibly ever to act again.

And this is true of air pollution; it is true of water pollution; it is true of all of the other areas with which you are very familiar. And, now, to a third point and here it is necessary for us to consider one of the dangers that will arise, and could arise, as we consider these environmental programs.

I have met recently, as I am sure many of you have over these past few months, with representatives of environmental groups; people who are justifiably and also very deeply concerned about the environment, and whose reaction is therefore very strong. And the reactions, as in the case of any program, sometimes go to extremes. One reaction is that there is an irreconcilable conflict between economic growth and happiness, or economic growth and a decent life in this country.

And the argument goes that what we must do is to turn the situation completely around, that the ideal that we should try to achieve is to return our country and return man basically to his natural state as nearly as we possibly could, and that if that were the case that we would all be much better off.

I know that is a popular situation. It just doesn't happen to be true. And it also doesn't happen to be new, because Rousseau advocated that 200 years ago. As we all know,

man in his natural state is not a particularly admirable object. As we also know, when we consider growth and as we look at this great nation of ours, growth has done very much for the United States.

It is very interesting for me to note that as I travel around the world the traffic is never from the United States to other nations, it is usually from other nations to the United States with all of its problems.

And as we reform those things which need to be reformed, we must not destroy those particular characteristics of our society that has made this nation the wonder of the world. We should not be apologetic about it; we shouldn't be defensive about it. What we need to do is to turn the scientific genius, and the managerial genius, that has made America the rich country that it is, the enormously wealthy country it is, to turn that genius to the service of man to solving the very problems that that productivity has created in terms of debasing our environment.

That is the approach. It is the responsible approach. It isn't as easy, it isn't as simple. It, therefore, isn't just as appealing, but it is the right way. I am sure that you as leaders in the States will take that approach.

And then I would finally close with one other thought in terms of the rhetoric that we should use in discussing this problem of the environment. Seventy years ago Theodore Roosevelt

caught the imagination of this country and, incidentally, the admiration of the world when he spoke of the strenuous life and also spoke of conservation; conservation was the right term for that time.

Conservation today, I submit to you, is an inadequate term to describe what we need to do. What we need to do now is not to conserve simply what we have in the way of natural beauty and natural resources. We need a lot of conservation, that is true. But what we need is something considerably more than that.

We need restoration, restoration of the beauty of waterways, and of air, and of land, which has been destroyed or virtually ruined by reason of this economic progress which, on the one hand, has its advantages but on the other hand brings with it some side effects that all of us, of course, want to deal with effectively.

And so rather than conservation we should speak of restoration, restoration of the beauty of this land and we should combine that, it seems to me, also with another very positive word the word reform, because if we are going to deal with these massive problems we can't deal with them with some of our present instrumentalities of government.

We need to reform the instruments of government at the Federal, State and local government levels if we are effectively to deal not only with problems of the environment,

but also in terms of family assistance and the others; those that you have been discussing, and that I have touched upon briefly on this occasion today.

And then the final word that I would suggest we might constantly emphasize is that of renewal. And, here, when I speak of renewal I mean renewal of the spirit of this nation and particularly renewal of the spirit and of the challenge for the young people of this nation. This is not the time, nor certainly the place, to get into any details to discuss the problem of the alienation of the youth which I know commands much of your attention as it does ours. But I would only suggest that here, again, the automatic simple answers are usually not the right ones.

A few months ago when I was traveling in Europe I was discussing with a major European leader the mutual problems that we had, the problems that we had with our youth in the United States and the problems that he had with his youth in his country in Europe, and I pointed out to him that there were many in this country who thought that once the war in Vietnam was over that the problems of our youth would disappear, and his comment on that was very interesting.

He said, "I don't agree that that would happen." He said, "The problem with your youth is war." He said, "The problem with our youth is peace."

What he was, of course, suggesting was not that

what they needed was war and we we, therefore, should be concerned as we moved toward peace. But, what he was suggesting was that the problem of youth today is much more profound simply than to find a society in which we have an absence of war because there needs to be a positive thrust, a renewal of the spirit.

And we can talk, now, and we can suggest that if we could only clean up our air, and clean up the water, and have more parks, and have peace in the world, and have a guaranteed income for every individual, and everything there on a silver platter, that then everybody in this country and particularly the youth in this country would be happy, and they wouldn't be at all. Because unless we can give to our youth and to all Americans, for that matter, a sense of challenge; a sense of excitement; a sense of participation in building the "New America" in this program of restoration and renewal and reform, unless we can do that we are not going to give them the satisfaction, the satisfaction that you have; you, the leaders of your States, in the positions that you so responsibly fill.

That is why I would urge strongly that you go forward, as we are trying to go forward at the Federal level, with programs of volunteer action; volunteer action in which we will cooperate with you; volunteer action where our young people have the opportunity particularly in this field of the environment to participate, and to contribute in solving the problem.

I do not suggest that the solution of the problem will mean, as I have already indicated, that from then on youth will be forever happy. But, I am suggesting that what we must remember is that it is basically the search; it is the challenge; it is the participation that gives meaning to life rather than simply the end result.

I have appreciated the opportunity to address this Conference, and to share with you some of my concerns on the practical programs that we have. I simply want to add one final note, which will be touched upon in greater detail by the experts when they come before you if you want to ask questions on this particular point.

I know that many of you have been frustrated by the fact that Presidents come before Governors and set forth great programs, and then States rely on those promises by Presidents and go forward in their own programs, and then Congresses failed to appropriate the money which is necessary for the Federal Government to maintain and contribute its share to the solution of those problems.

Several of you have brought this to my attention when I announced our program in the field of water pollution. I want you to know that we have taken your views into consideration, and we have an answer. We believe that any State that went forward after the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 relying on what the Federal Government had indicated, went forward in its

own program, should not be penalized because it took that initiative. As a matter of fact, it should be rewarded.

That is why 20% of all the funds that we have asked the Congress to appropriate in the field of water pollution will go through the Office of the Secretary of the Interior and the first priority on that 20% will now be to take care of approximately \$320 million in the case of those States which between 1966 to the present time did go forward in their own programs and who have not been compensated for the Federal share from the Federal Government.

I simply want to say, as I conclude, that it is very easy to stand before any group--as all of you know--in a political context and to make promises that sound very good. I simply want to say to you that we have presented our program in terms of what we think can be accomplished. We are not going to make promises in this field that we are unable to fund. And we think the place to begin is with this environmental program.

It is a program that we believe is adequate to handle the problem. If it is not adequate, we will go back for more funds. But in no event will any State represented around this table be penalized when it relies on what the President of the United States indicates will be a Federal commitment. We have made a commitment. If the States go along, we will see to it that you are reimbursed. That will be our program.

Thank you.

(Applause)