THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

MEMORANDUM FOR WHITE HOUSE STAFF

The attached should be of interest to you.

Herbert G. Klein

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

WHY THE PRESIDENT VETOED THE EDUCATION AND HUD APPROPRIATION BILLS

August 11, President Nixon vetoed two appropriations bills--one of them for education and the other for housing and urban development.

Had the President allowed these two bills to become law, they would have added $1 billion to his proposed Federal budget for fiscal year 1971, which began July 1, 1970.

President Nixon's 1971 budget was proposed to the Congress February 2 of this year. It is a fiscally responsible budget designed to shift priorities and to use the Nation's limited resources for the highest priority needs. Under this budget, the Federal Government can live _within_ its means, _without_ a tax increase.

The veto of these two bills was necessary to protect the interests of the consumer and the taxpayer from the consequences of spending decisions by those in the Congress who--while they are well-intentioned--are fiscally short-sighted. The Federal Government must act with firmness and consistency to bring inflation under control and _keep_ it under control.

The Education Appropriation Bill

The Education Appropriation Bill passed by the Congress ($453 million over President Nixon's budget) raises two important questions.

> _First_, by how much should the Federal Government increase its expenditures for education?
>
> _Second_, for what purpose should expenditures be increased?

There is no disagreement between the Congress and the President on the need to increase Federal expenditures for education. There is, however, disagreement on how much of an increase is fiscally responsible, and for what purposes an increase is desirable.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

The President's 1971 budget for the Office of Education is $4.4 billion, the highest amount ever recommended by any President.

This would produce 38% more spending than occurred in the last fiscal year of the previous Administration, a sizable increase by any measure.

But this is only <u>part</u> of what the Federal Government will spend for education programs across the whole Government.

The full amount to be spent in 1971 is nearly $12 billion, the highest figure in history and almost $3 billion more than was spent two years ago in fiscal year 1969. (This total includes expenditures for programs supported by other Federal agencies--such as Head Start, College Housing, the GI Bill to aid returning veterans, the education of American Indians, and scientific research and development conducted at academic institutions.)

In view of these large increases, it is hard to believe that the $453 million added by the Congress to the Education Appropriation Bill is sufficiently urgent to warrant approval at a time when stern measures must be taken to control Federal expenditures.

This is particularly true when you look at how the Congress would spend the additional money. Large portions of the congressional increase would go for outmoded programs, programs which in many cases are inequitable and which are not meeting the education needs of today.

At the same time, two of the greatest needs in education are to ease the process of desegregation of our schools and to find out what works in education in order to raise the quality of instruction for all of our children. The President's budget provided substantial funds to help meet both of these priority needs. Yet, it is funds for exactly these programs which the Congress chose to cut sharply to pay for increases in old approaches that experience has proved have limited results.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

The HUD Appropriations Bill

In the case of the HUD Appropriations Bill ($541 million over President Nixon's budget) the same situation was repeated. A generous budget was presented to Congress and then substantial and unwarranted increases were made.

The President's 1971 budget demonstrates his concern for the problems of the cities. It calls for spending $19 billion to help urban areas. This is 30% more than the amount spent by the Federal Government in the last full fiscal year under President Johnson.

Besides raising the amount of assistance going to urban areas, the President's budget was designed to accomplish another important goal, namely to increase the effectiveness of Federal money used to combat urban problems. Just as the Administration is reordering Federal budget priorities as between military and domestic purposes, it is also reordering national priorities within the domestic sector, concentrating resources in those areas where the Federal Government can best meet public needs.

The Congress in the HUD Appropriation, however, chose to increase two programs (each by $350 million) which do not provide the most efficient and effective solutions to the problems of the cities.

One of these provides Federal grants for water and sewer facilities. The provision of these facilities has long been viewed as essentially a local responsibility, rather than a Federal one. Of course, some cities may find it difficult to meet this responsibility due to a shortage of local revenue, but this obstacle can be overcome best by existing loan programs and ultimately by the Administration's broader revenue sharing proposal.

The other $350 million increase by the Congress in the HUD bill was for urban renewal. This additional $350 million was included, even though the President's budget already contains $1 big billion for urban renewal.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

In addition to the above increases, Congress reduced substantially the President's budget request for research funds designed to improve our ability to develop factory-built, low cost housing for the people most in need, and the Congress also made drastic cuts in a new program designed to lower the interest charges paid on home mortgages on low and middle income families. The fact that even with these cuts the bill was $541M over the President's budget demonstrates how much the Congress erred in increasing the least effective programs in dealing with urban problems.

In summarizing on these two bills, it must be recognized that, if our goals are to prevent inflation and not raise taxes are to be met, the resources which can be used for Government programs are limited. More money for one program has to mean less for another. The choices are extremely difficult. But they must be made. The President is willing to make these choices, yet the Congress gives disturbing evidence of an unwillingness to do so.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

MAJOR DOMESTIC PROPOSALS
OF THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION

Table of Contents

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

GENERAL REVENUE SHARING

The Nation's Fiscal Crisis

- State and local spending has risen 372% from 1950 through 1969, from $28 billion to $132 billion. State and local spending was a mere $11 billion in 1945.

- State and local debt has increased 454% in the same period, from $24 billion in 1950 to $134 billion in 1969. The increase has been over 600% since 1948.

- State and local taxes, on a per capita basis, have spiraled from $105 in 1950 to $380 in 1969, an increase of 262%.

- Federal aid to state and local governments amounted to $2.5 billion in 1950, $19.2 billion in 1969 and over $30 billion in 1971. The Federal Government provides 1 of every 7 dollars spent by states and cities.

- States have increased major taxes 300 times during the last decade.

- The $27 - $28 billion Federal categorical grants-in-aid system, with its 500 different spigots, defy effective Presidential or Congressional oversight:

  -- Authority must be delegated to thousands of program administrators

  -- Program administrators create a "jungle of regulations" -- an almost impenetrable obstacle to efficient state and local use of Federal aid dollars

A Major Solution -- Revenue Sharing

- $5 billion of new money is to be shared by states, counties, cities, towns -- in fact, every general purpose local government.

- The amount of money being shared represents an <u>automatic annual</u> distribution of 1.3% of the personal income tax base which historically has grown each year.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

- There are no program, project or functional strings attached to the funds, only standard civil rights provisions and accountability for funds spent.

- What does it mean for us?

  -- The (state, city, county, town) will receive $______** the first full year of operation

  -- Last year the (sales, income, property, etc.) tax in the (state, city, county, town) rose from ($ or %)** to ($ or %)**

  OR

  -- For the first time in our (state's, city's, county's, town's) history it was necessary to impose a (sales or income tax)

  -- Revenue sharing provides us with the opportunity to alleviate our fiscal crisis. This money should reduce the pressure for tax rate increases

  -- It is your pocketbook. You are already paying personal income taxes. Let us have some of that money sent from your homes to the Treasury returned directly to your (state, city, county, town)

  -- These shared funds are needed for:

    -- salaries for deserving public employees, such as police, firemen, teachers, etc.

    -- new or modernized public facilities, such as schools, libraries, parks, etc.

    -- maintenance and improvement of existing services, such as trash collection, street lighting, sewage treatment, pollution abatement, etc.

** This information can be excerpted from General Revenue Sharing, prepared by the Office of the Special Assistant for Public Affairs, Department of the Treasury, February 1971. The book contains: The President's Message, The Proposed Law, The State and Local Shares, The Formula.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

Alternatives to Revenue Sharing

- Federalized Welfare
  - -- No recognition of non-welfare needs
  - -- 41 states penalized compared to revenue sharing
  - -- 57% of the money goes to the 10 richest states
  - -- 6% of the money goes to the 10 poorest states
  - -- No help is provided for most local governments
  - -- Only 10% of the funds go to local governments; of this 10%, three-fourths goes to localities in only two states (N. Y., Calif.)
- Federal Tax Credits
  - -- No immediate help is provided for an immediate need
  - -- 11 states are forced to institute state income taxes
  - -- No sure help is provided to the cities
  - -- 36 needy states are penalized
  - -- Wealthier states are helped the most, since they have a greater existing tax base
- Federal Tax Reduction
  - -- Not responsive to the current fiscal crisis facing many of the nation's state and local governments
  - -- Does not move dollars from taxpayers' pockets to critical public problems in areas lacking resources

I Am Trying to Help You

- By supporting revenue sharing, I am trying to:
  - -- Take the pressure off higher property taxes
  - -- Take the pressure off higher sales taxes

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

-- Take the pressure off higher state income tax

-- Return your money which is already going to Washington to your state and local governments to meet your particular needs

. Revenue Sharing has been endorsed by many groups:

-- National Governors' Conference
-- National League of Cities
-- U. S. Conference of Mayors
-- National Association of Counties
-- National Legislative Conference
-- National Conference of State Legislative Leaders
-- Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations
-- The 1968 Democratic and Republican Party Platforms

. It may be helpful to point out that revenue sharing has been endorsed in this state by the Governor, Senator ______, Representative ______, Mayor ______

. And then point out that revenue sharing has not been endorsed in this state by: Representative _________, Senator ________

WHY NOT?

This is where you can help yourselves.

<u>Help Yourself -- Write in Support of Revenue Sharing</u>

. Write to (Congressman/Senator) -- indicate to them that you favor revenue sharing and are expecting their support for enactment of a revenue sharing bill this year.

. Join the National Citizens Committee for Revenue Sharing which was established in conjunction with the National Governors' Conference to support the concept of revenue sharing or your State Citizens Committee -- it is a bi-partisan coalition of concerned citizens anxious to see revenue sharing enacted. (The National Citizens Committee currently includes such prominent, civic minded leaders as former Governors William Scranton (Pa.), and Albert Brewer (Ala.) -- Sol Linowitz, Chairman of the Urban Coalition — Carl Stokes, Mayor of Cleveland -- Thomas Watson, Chairman, IBM -- Leonard Firestone,

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

Director, Firestone Tire & Rubber Company.

National Citizens Committee for Revenue Sharing
Suite 440
1707 L Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C.

Telephone: (202) 223-3043

-- Start your own local citizens committee to write letters to your Congressman and broaden support for revenue sharing

Summary

General Revenue Sharing:

- Moves resources and responsibility closer to the people
- Transfers the solution of local problems to local government
- Relieves the fiscal crisis of state and local government
- Relieves the pressure for continued growth in local taxes
- Builds capacity for better program performance
- Responds quickly to critical local needs
- Returns some of the taxes you are already sending to Washington to your own state and local government to meet local needs

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING

URBAN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

There is no question that a new approach is needed in order to make full use of national resources, local initiative, and community cooperation. Only through the united effort of these forces can we hope to achieve that long-sought goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family.

The Special Revenue Sharing approach, as proposed by the President, is a major step toward decentralization of government to get the authority, and the power and the money out where the people closest to the problems are -- and those people will be free to use it in the best possible way to get better results and to do it faster.

As we have seen, the present system of categorical grants in aid has grown by bits and pieces over the years. The proliferation of separate urban development programs has been accompanied by Federal directives for the city to create independent bureaucracies, which frequently operate outside the control of elected local officials. This has fragmented local effort. In addition, lengthy Federal reviews and categorical requirements have excessively delayed action and distorted local priorities.

The new Special Revenue Sharing program provides the flexibility, for the first time, for a total community effort to be launched. The city, with assurances of stable annual

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

funding from the Federal Government, can execute a community development program which reflects local conditions and priorities -- not Washington's. This means more local responsibility with local accountability by elected officials to their citizens who have the greatest stake in their own community's future. What is involved in Special Revenue Sharing is an affirmation of good faith in local representative government.

Urban Community Development Special Revenue Sharing funds will be distributed largely automatically to local governments, on the basis of a statutory formula reflecting objective measures of need. As long as the recipients use the funds within broadly defined statutory purposes they will not have to secure approvals from Federal bureaucracies.

In the first full year of operation, over $2 billion would be available for Special Revenue Sharing in Urban Community Development. This is about a 20% increase over the current year's program level.

At least 80% of the total funds will be allocated to the Nation's Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSAs). These SMSA's have been well recognized for over twenty years as geographical areas including a city or cities with a population nucleus of at least 50,000, plus those contiguous counties that have a metropolitan character and a socio-economic integration with the central city. The Office of Management and Budget recognizes 247 SMSAs at present, and these include nearly 70 percent of the country's population.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

Within these metropolitan areas, the metropolitan cites -- that is, the central cities and cities with at least 50,000 population -- will receive direct automatic grants based upon the statutory criteria of population, overcrowding, condition of housing, and poverty. If necessary, they will also receive additional funds to "hold harmless" -- that is, to meet the firm commitment of the Nixon Administration that no community will receive less under Special Revenue Sharing than it received, on the average, in past years under the programs being consolidated. Most metropolitan cities will actually receive larger formula shares.

Up to 20% of the overall total will be reserved for departmental discretionary use to "hold harmless", to provide funds expressly for smaller communities, to encourage superior performance, and to fund innovative programs.

The needs of smaller communities are explicitly recognized. They will be eligible for all Departmental discretionary funds, and the President has recommended that an additional $100 million be appropriated exclusively for smaller communities. Continuing programs of smaller communities will also be "held harmless" regardless of whether they are located inside an SMSA or outside of an SMSA.

Let there be no misunderstanding. The Special Revenue Sharing Program need not terminate any present program. All

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

commitments made under the predecessor programs, before Special Revenue Sharing is adopted, will be honored. Model Cities, Urban Renewal or any other program can be continued or reshaped depending upon local decisions based upon local priorities.

Under this approach the Federal Government does not continue or discontinue any existing organizations. It doesn't continue or discontinue city renewal agencies. It doesn't continue or discontinue housing programs. That's up to the City.

The "hold harmless" provision will remain in effect indefinitely to assure that communities may maintain the levels of effort and momentum underway. It will <u>not</u> end after one year, or two years, or three years -- it will remain in effect indefinitely. Also, the hold harmless provision applies to all metropolitan cities and to <u>all</u> smaller communities with continuing programs regardless of their geographic location. Thus, no communities will receive less and most of the communities will receive more Federal development funds under Special Revenue Sharing. As a bonus, communities will not need to use this money to pay excessive administrative costs justifying their proposals to the Federal Government. And they will not have to match Federal dollars with local dollars.

To those of us who have long complained about the ineffectiveness of government, we are now being given a

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

challenge -- and an opportunity. If we merely sit back and continue to complain, nothing will improve. On the other hand, if we recognize the President's far-reaching proposals and their full implication; if we use this opportunity as a means of getting involved in the affairs of our communities and our country; then and only then will we be able to build a better and a stronger America.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING

RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

The results of the 1970 Census show a trend which is cause for concern both to rural and urban America. The movement of Americans in the past decade tended to continue the drain of talent and people from rural America, and to continue the further increase in population in our metropolitan, or most heavily urban, areas. Nearly half of all counties lost population in the decade; most of these were rural. The pattern of outmigration affected most seriously the States of the Midwest, and a few parts of Appalachia. As the President has described it, the movement has been an emptying out of the middle of the country toward either coast.

At the same time this outmigration has compounded the difficulties of metropolitan areas. The pressures on those seeking to govern in metropolitan areas are intense already, and the further impacting of population makes their task harder, not easier. The President, in his Rural Community Development Special Revenue Sharing, notes the interest and stake that urban America has in the revitalization of rural America, and in more balanced national growth.

The Census results show an interesting trend which can help achieve more balanced growth. In every state, however rural, there were revealed by the census small cities or counties which showed a rate of growth as rapid as the rate

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

in metropolitan areas. These areas of growth often provide jobs for people who have left nearby rural counties and moved into them. They also often are development rapidly enough to provide jobs for many who continue to live in rural counties around them, and who commute to them.

Furthermore, these areas of growth or potential growth may have reached a "critical mass". They are large and vital enough that doctors and others who are reluctant to settle in very small towns, are willing to settle there.

Yet, by and large, our Federal programs have not typically even permitted assistance for job development in such areas. Furthermore, few of the upper Midwest States which lost population in the decade qualify for aid under current Federal criteria, since those criteria typically place emphasis on low income and high unemployment, rather than outmigration.

The President's proposal for Rural Community Development Special Revenue Sharing would make important changes in the eligibility of rural areas, and their smaller urban places, for aid.

The bill would provide $1.1 billion in flexible aid to the States, assuring that no State would receive less than it has been getting under some 11 programs which will be folded together, and assuring many States substantially more funds than they have been getting.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

The funds could be used in rural areas (areas with less than 100 persons per square mile) or for the benefit of rural persons. The funds could be used for anything which promoted rural development, whether it is Extension type activities, more vocational education, or direct incentives to industry to locate in rural areas. The decision as to what works best for each State, will be determined by each State, instead of being decided or dictated in Washington.

Furthermore, an extra $100 million will be available to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to use to support the community facility needs of smaller cities of between 20,000 and 50,000 persons. There will thus be "double eligibility" for such places, as well as for some slightly larger communities (over 50,000) which have less than 100 persons per square mile.

Moreover, parts of the $5 billion in general revenue sharing will be available in rural areas, as will parts of the funds under the other "Special Revenue Sharing" proposals for transportation, education, law enforcement, urban community development and manpower training.

A Statewide development plan, emphasizing more balanced urban-rural growth will be required, which can integrate all of these resources into comprehensive development efforts. Funding for this and for the management of the programs will be made available through a $100 million planning and management fund.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

Rural Development

An opportunity is thus presented to the States by these Presidential initiatives, to take positive steps toward development of rural areas, and to attract jobs and opportunities to them, steps which can ultimately benefit not only the rural, but the urban areas of the country.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING

LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

President Nixon's special revenue sharing proposal for law enforcement promises to make the alliance between the federal government and state and local governments even more effective in the fight against crime -- by providing more resources, and less red tape.

The Federal program of law enforcement aid to the states through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration has, in effect, already been operating as a sort of revenue sharing. Attorney General John N. Mitchell has called it the "cutting edge of the New Federalism."

And it is beginning to take effect. Police have developed new techniques of patrol and other innovative anticrime measures. Almost 10 percent of the nation's police officers have received some form of higher education, court improvement programs are getting underway from coast to coast to relieve congestion, prisons are gradually being supplanted by work-release and community corrections programs that really rehabilitate.

And most important, almost two dozen cities in the United States reported actual crime reductions last year. Washington, D. C. has experienced months where crime was as much as 25 percent below the previous year.

Now the time has come to make this vital program even more effective. The Federal Government will provide the

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

resources, and it's up to state and local government to put them to work.

That's exactly what revenue-sharing will do.

It will reduce Federal red tape by eliminating requirements that state and local governments must match every three dollars of federal funds with one of their own. That frees state and local money to be spent as those governments see fit.

Revenue Sharing will reduce red tape by eliminating the requirement that Federal funds cannot be used to take the place of local funds.

Revenue Sharing will eliminate red tape and free state and local resources by eliminating the requirement that state and local governments must take over the cost of federally-funded programs after a reasonable period of time.

Revenue Sharing will cut red tape by eliminating the requirement for prior approval of state law enforcement plans by the Federal Government before state and local governments can receive their money.

All of which greatly increases the freedom and flexibility of state and local governments to use these federal funds where they will do the most good.

Meanwhile, safeguards against misuse of Federal funds, such as audit provisions, remain in effect. Civil rights compliance regulations also will remain in effect, to assure that Federal funds are not used in a discriminatory fashion.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

Finally, important functions of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration such as the research and development program, the academic assistance program, and the information and statistics program, will continue unchanged.

These are programs which are properly administered by the Federal Government, and they will continue to be so administered.

Meanwhile, some half a billion dollars -- more than 100 million dollars more than was allocated for the same purpose last year -- will be allocated to states and local governments under law enforcement revenue sharing. Those funds will be administered by the states and governments concerned -- as they should be.

The result will be to provide more authority, more resources, more flexibility -- more responsibility -- to state and local governments to meet the state and local problem of crime.

That is the whole idea of revenue sharing, to move government out of Washington and back to the people.

Probably in no other area will that principle prove so significant, and so effective, as the fight against crime.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING

MANPOWER PROGRAM

In recent decades the powers of government at the local, state and federal level have become grossly unbalanced. Federal government, partly because it has a lock on much of the nation's tax wealth, has grown to inordinate proportions. President Nixon has now launched a bold and imaginative plan to redress this imbalance, to shift some of the power back to the state and local government. By so doing he is returning a significant share of governmental power to the people. For after all, it is local government that any citizen can reach with just a local phone call.

One of the President's proposals in this vast and significant program is called "Manpower Revenue Sharing." It is part of a comprehensive plan to share a portion of federal revenue with state and local governments. The fundamental idea is that manpower training programs can best achieve their purpose when under the full control of state and local governments.

Under the President's proposal the fundamental decision-making power would be transferred from Washington to the state and local communities. That is an historic step forward. To get a better gauge on what is happening, it may be useful to review briefly the history of the manpower training concept.

Manpower training programs have been carried out nationally for the last decade. Many of the specific programs have become familiar household names, such as the JOBS Program -- to help the hard core unemployed; the Neighborhood Youth Corps--

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

to help students stay in school or dropouts go back to school; and the On-the-Job Training Program--to give people with low skills an opportunity to learn while earning.

The decision as to which community gets which program and at what level of funding has been a federal decision. The programs themselves have been operated by local sponsors which includes a host of local organizations. Each program was set up in rigid categories. This meant that once a specific program was approved by federal authorities it was up to program sponsors to find the individuals who could meet the program criteria. There are several serious flaws in this approach. The President's new Manpower Revenue Sharing Act will correct them.

(1) Federal officials, no matter how dedicated, cannot determine the needs of people in a wide variety of localities from coast to coast as well as local officials on the scene. The Secretary of Labor would still be involved in Manpower programs, but only to the degree that he is assured federal money is used for the broad purpose for which it was intended.

(2) The new Act, by obliterating rigid categorical program lines, will enable us to fit the programs to the people rather than the people to the programs.

(3) The proposed Act means that local and state people can spend more of their time in making training programs work and less time in filling out a mountain of paper work for Washington.

(4) The Manpower Revenue Sharing Act would increase an element of government that has been most elusive in recent

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

decades--accountability. With both the decision-making power and the operating authority in the hands of state and local officials it will be possible for people to determine who to blame when things to wrong and who to praise when things go right.

(5) The President's proposal makes an exciting advance in caring for the needs of the nation's manpower. Whenever national unemployment reaches 4.5% or higher for three consecutive months, the Secretary of Labor would be authorized to distribute among state and local governments, based upon need, an additional sum of money equal to 10% of the funds appropriated by Congress in that particular year.

(6) The Manpower Revenue Sharing Act permits the federal funds to be used by state and local communities for public service jobs if that is the decision of the state and local officials in charge of the programs. Such jobs must fit the basic manpower concept: that they be developmental and transitional in nature, limited to a maximum of two years. Throughout all the manpower programs we want to increase people's skills. We want them to qualify for the best job available. Providing a man with a dead-end job that fails to increase his skill does him no good.

•Manpower Special Revenue Sharing will provide for 85% of the money appropriated by Congress to be passed on to cities and states. A formula for distribution of the funds would be set in advance based upon the population of poor people, the number of workers, and the number of unemployed

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

in a particular area. Communities with a population of 100,000 or more persons, or groups of communities that add up to more than 100,000 are eligible for the program. The state would control manpower training programs in the remaining areas of the state.

By requiring participating governors and mayors to publicly announce in advance the manner in which they intend to use federal funds for manpower training, it will enable the public to know how the money is being spent and would enable the public to influence these plans. Manpower Advisory Councils made up of a range of government and community officials would aid the mayors and governors in their work.

Thus, under the President's Manpower Revenue Sharing Act the success of manpower training programs rest at the state and local level of government and in the final sense in the hands of the people. That is as it should be.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING
TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

America's transportation system surpasses any other in the world. Sleek automobiles with vinyl interiors and colorful aircraft with charming stewardesses have conditioned us to expect the best. But we also know that our transportation system has an Achilles heel. Air pollution, traffic congestion, and various other community disruptions hinder even our most efficient transportation modes. Our task today is to determine the best method for dealing with these problems.

We know that in the last ten years air passengers increased 204 percent, passenger revenue miles went up 250 percent, and cargo ton miles increased 457 percent. The Federal government also knows that we have 108 million registered vehicles in America travelling one trillion miles annually.

But I believe that the local community best knows where the stop lights should be located, or where a highway should be built, or if a subway is needed. And President Nixon's Special Revenue Sharing Program for Transportation is designed to put the decision making power at the local levels of government. There are those who say that local citizens and locally elected officials shouldn't have this authority -- that they aren't responsible enough or smart enough to do the job. I don't believe it.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

Transportation Program

I would like briefly to outline the Transportation Special Revenue Sharing Program.

The President is proposing that $2.566 billion in Federal funds be returned to the states for transportation purposes. These funds would come from existing categorical grant programs and would provide each state with at least as much money under Special Revenue Sharing as it now receives. The only major grant program not included is the Interstate Highway System. Because the Interstate system is national in character, and because it is scheduled for completion by 1978, the existing funding arrangements would be retained. I might note that the Federal government pays 90 percent of the cost of this system anyway.

The only major qualification on this entire Special Revenue Sharing fund is that at least $525 million must be spent on mass transit capital investments. This money has been earmarked because of the magnitude and the urgency of the mass transit crisis in our cities. A few months ago the Congress passed special urban mass transit legislation to literally get our cities moving again. It is estimated that more than $33 billion will be needed in the next decade to upgrade mass transit in America. These Special Revenue Sharing funds will insure that an immediate and effective start is made toward this goal.

The remaining money in the fund, $2.041 billion, could be spent for the planning, construction, acquisition, improve-

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

ment, operation and maintenance of a broad spectrum of transportation systems and services -- including highways, aviation and mass transit.

States and local units of government for the first time would have maximum flexibility in the expenditure of Federal funds. No matching grants would be required and the usual roll of Federal red tape would be thrown out the window.

In addition, a portion of both the mass transit capital investment funds and the general revenue sharing funds would go directly to urban areas. Formulas have been worked out which would "pass through" 35 percent of the general fund and 40 percent of the mass transit money directly to urban areas. The remainder of the Revenue Sharing funds would be spent at the states' discretion.

I believe that these formulas give the States and local governments the ability to focus resources where they are needed most. Plus we would receive the benefits of better partnerships between all levels of government, increased citizen participation in governmental decision-making, and a new confidence in the ability of local leaders to solve local problems.

OBJECTIVES

-- Special Revenue Sharing for Transportation would give States and local governments maximum flexibility in the expenditure of Federal funds. It would return decision making to the local level.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

Transporation Program

-- Special Revenue Sharing would remove the administrative and political restraints inherent in existing categorical grant programs. Transportation decisions would be based on local needs, rather than the availability of matching funds or the relative difficulties involved in applying for grant-in-aid.

-- Special Revenue Sharing would improve local transportation planning. Those who know the problems best would have the authority to develop meaningful solutions. Environmental and other social considerations could be incorporated into transportation projects at their inception.

-- Special Revenue Sharing would strengthen local governments. Lower tax bases and other diminishing sources of revenue are leaving many cities helpless to meet their growing problems. Special Revenue Sharing would provide direct funding to help alleviate this situation.

-- Special Revenue Sharing would promote a balanced transportation system that would serve the needs of all members of the community. Local areas could determine whether they need highways, mass transit, airports or some other form of transportation.

FUNDING

-- The Special Revenue Sharing Fund for Transportation would be created by the transfer of most of the presently existing categorical transportation grant programs, except the Interstate Highway Program.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

Transportation Program

-- The requested FY-1972 funding level is $2.566 billion. Since the proposed effective date of the Transportation Special Revenue Sharing Program is January 1, 1972--midway through the fiscal year -- the effective funding level for the FY-1972 TSRS program would be $1.283 billion.

-- Of the proposed Transportation Special Revenue Sharing Fund, $525 million is restricted to urban mass transit capital investment. The remainder -- $2.041 billion -- may be spent for a broad spectrum of transportation needs including planning, research and development, construction, acquisition, improvement, operation and maintenance of transportation systems, facilities or equipment.

-- A "pass through" formula would allow 40 percent of the mass transit capital investment funds and 35 percent of the general transportation funds to go directly to urban areas. The remainder would be spent at the states' discretion.

-- Ten percent of the Transportation Special Revenue Sharing fund would go to the Secretary of Transportation for discretionary purposes. The Secretary could use this money as on incentive for the development of transportation programs.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING
EDUCATION PROGRAM

Education Special Revenue Sharing represents an evolutionary step in the development of Federal education programs.

Twenty-nine different programs and authorizations are being combined into Education Special Revenue Sharing. Funds will be available in five categories: Aid for the Disadvantaged, Aid for the Handicapped, Aid for Federally Impacted Areas, Aid for Vocational Education and Support Services.

Funds for the Disadvantaged and for children of Federal Employees both working and residing on Federal land will be passed directly to the agencies responsible for those children. Funds in the other categories will be distributed by the agencies according to plans that they develop. Thus each state will be able to use Federal funds to meet its' specific needs within the established Federal priorities. This should result in Federal priorities being more effectively met at the same time that local needs are also being fulfilled.

No programs presently in place would be terminated unless the State felt that the money could be better spent in another area.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

Each State would develop a plan for the distribution of funds it receives under Education Special Revenue Sharing. This plan would be the subject of public hearings within the State but would not be submitted to or approved by the Federal Government.

State Advisory Councils would be appointed by the respective governors and would represent the various special interest groups to the State administering agency.

Each State would be required to "assure" that private school children would receive equitable services from these funds. Where this assurance would not be made the Secretary would be required to provide such services and to pay for them from the States' allotment.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

Earlier this year President Nixon sent to the Congress what is perhaps the most far-reaching proposal for reorganization of the federal government in this century. The President asked that seven Cabinet departments be combined and reorganized to form four new departments; departments which would be formed to serve broad purposes and functions rather than specific constituency groups as has been the practice in the past.

Government reorganization on this scale can have a significant effect on the life of every citizen. Consequently, every American deserves to have a thorough understanding of the President's proposal and the reasons it is needed. First, let's take a look at the problem.

Today more than 1,500 government programs are scattered throughout seven departments and several independent agencies in a most confusing way. Twentynine organizations are responsible for 180 education programs; 38 federal groups in departments and agencies are concerned with water resources. Eight different groups are working on cancer research. The list of duplicating programs with overlapping responsibilities goes on and on. Neither Congress nor the Executive Branch, headed by the President, can pinpoint officials specifically responsible for all programs in a given area, such as education or health, in order to hold them accountable for program performance.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

When Congressional committees need information about how well programs are functioning, they must call on government officials in several different departments. The Committees listen at length to witnesses report on this program and that. But even then, like piecing together a picture puzzle, no one seems to know who is responsible for the missing pieces of information.

Likewise, the President has difficulty ascertaining if his own policies are being followed because he can find no one with all the program pieces.

By structuring government around broad purposes and by putting related programs under a single administrator, the entire government should operate more efficiently and more effectively for the taxpayers.

The proposed merger would put the seven departments administering domestic programs into four new departments geared to serving the nation's great needs: Human Resources, Community Development, Economic Affairs, and Natural Resources.

In the department transfers none of the present programs will be eliminated. No federal employees will lose their jobs. None of the programs will suffer budget cuts. The consolidation simply aims to draw together under one roof, and under a single administrator, similar programs so they can function jointly in planning and execution. For instance, most of the 180 education programs would be administered by the Department of Human Resources rather than by 29 separate agencies. Water resources, instead of being in the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior where they

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

compete with one another, and with the Army Corps of Engineers, would join the new Natural Resources Department.

Rural development programs would get more attention when merged with urban development in the proposed Department of Community Development.

And business, labor, agriculture, and transportation programs would all be better coordinated within the proposed Department of Economic Affairs.

As presently organized many federal departments are actually duplicating the work being done by another. And in some cases they work at cross purposes. Because each department wants a large staff, a big budget, and its own projects, the various federal offices are disinclined to cooperate by discussing future plans. As a result departments may be planning separate projects for the same city, and sometimes the same site. For example, one city proudly constructed two vocational education centers three blocks apart paid for by two different departments, but the same taxpayers -- The American Public.

Reorganization is not another political fantasy. It's a promise of real performance. As organized today, the government structure is almost an impregnable institution, uncontrollable by any administration in office. That means uncontrollable by you -- the people who pay the bills.

Reorganization will straighten out the confusion in Washington and put more of the power in the hands of people in regional and local areas who understand local and regional problems.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

WELFARE REFORM

A few days after President Nixon's Inauguration, he charged his newly formed Urban Affairs Council with the responsibility of developing a program of welfare reform. Several months were spent analysing, evaluating, and submitting various alternative proposals to the Urban Affairs Council and to the President.

On August 8, 1969, President Nixon announced to the Nation the first comprehensive welfare reform program since the original aid programs began in 1935. And since that time, the tempo of the "great national debate" over welfare reform has been intensified.

Everyone - be they Members of Congress, Governors, legislators, taxpayers, welfare recipients, or administrators- agrees that the present welfare system is archaic, inadequate, ineffective, and expensive - and it must be changed.

Unfortunately, the fact surrounding welfare have become so totally distorted and misinterpreted that even the most responsible critics find it impossible to address the real issues.

In order to put the issues into their proper perspective, let me first explain the present system, point out where it is taking us, describe what we want to achieve by welfare reform, and briefly explain the key elements of President Nixon's proposal.

There is one thing that can be said about our present welfare system - it was not designed - it evolved over a

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

period of 35 years. During the 1930's the Federal Government for the first time shared with the states the cost of caring for the blind, the aged, and the children of impoverished widows.

This simple beginning has grown into an administrative monstrosity involving complicated formulas for payments and a flood of paperwork which inundates the caseworkers.

What we have today is not one, but 54 welfare systems - operating in 54 jurisdictions - under 54 different sets of rules.

Within very loose Federalguidelines, the states may determine who is eligible, how much coverage will be extended, the amount the recipients will receive in benefits, and how the program will be administered. Let's see where this system has taken us.

As I mentioned earlier, welfare programs began very simply and modestly during the thirties--but they have expanded to the point where we now have 12,750,000 people in this Nation on Federally assisted programs at a cost to the taxpayers of nearly $9 billion dollars annually for benefits alone.

During the one year period between November 1969, and November 1970, the number of recipients on Aid to Families with Dependent Children rose 32% and the cost increased by 42% nationwide. In California during this same period, the caseload went up 38% and costs 47%.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

Welfare Reform

San Francisco, a comparatively affluent city by most standards, now has 11.7% of its population receiving public assistance--the highest ratio of any major city west of the Mississippi with the exception of St. Louis.

These statistics are an accurate reflection of just where we have come under the present system. I wish I could be more optimistic, but all indications are that the situation will continue to deteriorate unless basic structural changes are accomplished.

These changes must be designed to achieve certain specific goals which are essential to any viable and acceptable welfare reform plan.

Those goals should provide:

First, that the system be equitable and uniform -- treating each participant equally and without prejudice. It should provide strong work incentives combined with strong work requirements, so that those able to be gainfully employed do not assume a parasitic role.

Training opportunities should be provided so that beneficiaries can qualify for meaningful employment. The system should provide an adequate level of economic support to people who have nowhere else to turn for help.

And it should also help alleviate current welfare caseload growths, provide some measure of relief for the increasing financial burdens on the taxpayers, and reduce the incentive to break up family units.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

These are fair, and objective goals for any welfare system.

The Administration's welfare reform proposal contains each of these elements.

When the President submitted his proposal to Congress--more than a year ago--it contained five basic principles.

Federal minimum level of payment.

Uniform eligibility requirements.

Strong work incentives and work requirements.

Wage supplementation for the working poor, and

Fiscal protection for the states.

I think it is very significant that after 16 months of Congressional hearings and unlimited public debate, these basic concepts remain in the bill. Despite the debate and the criticism, there has been no significant challenge of these basic concepts nor has anyone offered any viable alternative proposal.

Let me briefly describe the President's welfare reform proposal.

It will establish a nationwide floor under assistance payments with national eligibility standards for both the family and adult categories with a provision for state supplementation. This change alone would eliminate many of the geographic and categorical inequities that exist under current law.

A basic element of the Administration's welfare reform proposal is its emphasis on work. With limited exceptions,

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

every ablebodied adult applicant, including those who are employed, would be required to register with the employment office. They must then accept training, upgrading, employment, or other manpower services to be eligible for benefits.

During the Ways and Means Committee Hearings recently, the Administration proposed an additional 200,000 new public service job opportunities be made available to welfare recipients.

Should a person refuse to accept work or training, then his benefits would be reduced.

The proposal required the Federal Government to provide day care services to those who have registered with the employment service.

For the first time, people in all states would be governed by the same set of rules. The 54 programs would be replaced by one program.

The measure also calls for Federal administration of money payments while the states would continue to provide social services to those in need.

The states would be assured fiscal protection through a "hold harmless" provision which guarantees that their future welfare costs will be less than expenditures under the current program.

As you can see, this welfare proposal brings the Federal Government into a stronger and more central role. While we begin to move in the opposite direction as far as other social programs are concerned, it is imperative that

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

we bring some national standards to bear in welfare.

Not because we believe the Federal Government has the answers in this regard, but because we believe that only through a strengthened Federal hand can we eliminate many of the inequities that now exist from state to state in welfare matters.

Our aim is not to control or to dictate -but to stimulate equity.

The welfare reform plan is not being put forth as a panacea to all the problems. It cannot make any guarantees, but...given the chance--we feel it can help remove some of the barriers to opportunity that the present system has institutionalized.

Governor Reagan summed it up very well in his remarks on welfare reform earlier this month when he said:

"Today we stand at a Crossroad. We can continue to talk about welfare, complain about it and watch it grow unchecked while we reaise taxes this year and every year thereafter to feed its cancerous growth. Or we can take the steps necessary to control it and reform it so that it will at least have the proud purpose of maximizing human dignity and salvaging the destitute."

I submit to you--Ladies and Gentlemen-- we are at that crossroad.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

HEALTH PROGRAM

Nineteen months ago President Nixon stated, "America's medical system is facing a massive crisis." The problems have not abated. Costs of medical care continue to rise faster than the cost of living. Economic and social barriers prevent large segments of our population from receiving adequate medical care. We focus our attention on curative care while we neglect basic prevention through maintenance of health, and early rehabilitation. Primary case physicians are generally scarce, and physicians of all types are in short supply in our inner city and rural areas.

The President's National Health Strategy is designed to remedy this health crisis by building on the best elements of our present health care system, and reforming those elements that are not effective. The President has proposed major changes in health service delivery to assure that care is available when it is needed, and a national health insurance plan to provide that no American family should be barred from needed care by the inability to pay.

The health care delivery system will be reorganized by encouraging the establishment of Health Maintenance Organizations (HMOs). These entities will provide low cost, efficient health care service, and will emphasize prevention of illness and maintenance of health. The

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

Administration will also improve care in medically underserved areas by establishing HMOs and Health Education Centers in such areas, as well as by encouraging medical personnel to serve in them.

Medical schools will be offered grants to encourage an increase in the number of graduates. A loan forgiveness provision for low-income and non-white students will be established to attract these individuals to medical and dental schools.

The President is also seeking significant increases in funds for research and prevention: for example, to increase cancer research expenditures by $100 million, a 30% increase over present funding levels.

The Administration's National Health Insurance Standards Act requires employers engaged in interstate commerce to provide all their employees with basic health insurance coverage. The Family Health Insurance Plan provides low-income families with a similar health insurance package. The Administration proposes to extend coverage under Part B of Medicare and eliminate payment of premiums to the aged. All insurance plans must allow participation in HMOs.

The Administration does not plan to nationalize our health care system, because it believes that diversity and freedom of choice are essential to improve health care,

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

and that efficiency and experimentation can be encouraged within the existing framework.

The National Health strategy provides an effective and practical answer to our present health problems.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

ENVIRONMENT PROGRAM

Everytime we open our paper we read of widespread mercury pollution, smog alerts, repeated episodes of ocean dumping and oil spills, and unresolved controversy about important land use questions. All these have dramatized with disturbing regularity the reality and extent of our pollution problems. And no part of the United States has been free from these problems, and all levels of government -- federal, state and local -- have joined in the search for solutions.

There can be no doubt about our growing national commitment to find solutions. Last November, voters approved several billion dollars in state and local bond issues for environmental purposes. Opinion polls show that Americans rate pollution as the single most serious problem facing their communities today. Now that we have severely abused our environment, we face the task of bringing our vast resources together -- into some orderly system.

Last year, to provide just such a system, two new organizations were established to provide federal leadership in our nation's campaign to improve the environment.

First, the Council on Environmental Quality was established in January, 1970, when President Nixon signed the National Environmental Policy Act as his first official act of the decade of the seventies. The President has called the Council "The Nation's Conscience on the Environment" and the Council hopes to be able to devote much of its time to fulfilling this role.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

Environment Program

In addition to the Council, Federal Pollution Control Programs have now been placed under the supervision of Mr. William D. Ruckelshaus, Administrator of the newly formed Environmental Protection Agency. Before EPA was established, air pollution control came chiefly under the Department of Health, Education and Welfare; water pollution under the Department of the Interior, and land pollution under the Department of Agriculture; Health, Education and Welfare, and Interior.

Now EPA brings together under one administrative structure the major environmental protection programs of the Federal government. These programs involve broad responsibility for research, standard setting, monitoring, and enforcement with regard to five environmental hazards: air and water pollution, solid waste management, radiation, and pesticides.

EPA is something new in the Federal government's approach to protection of the environment from pollution. It is an independent agency that has no obligation to promote agriculture, commerce or industry. It has only one mission -- to protect and enhance the environment.

For the first time, the Federal government now has an agency taking an across-the-board look at the causes of our deteriorating environment. We have at last recognized that there is little sense in removing impurities from the air only to put it back into our nation's streams.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

Environment Program

The reorganization of Federal agencies has certainly strengthened our attack on environmental problems. But new legislation is also necessary to provide our Federal government with the tools necessary to mount an effective attack on pollution and halt the deterioration of the environment.

The President chose the Clean Air Act of 1970 as his final bill to sign on the last day of last year, and said, "I think that 1970 will be known as the year of the beginning -- in which we really began to move on the problems of clean air, clean water and open spaces for the future generations of America."

"I think 1971 will be known as the year of action".

On February 8, President Nixon set forth his environmental legislative program to truly make 1971 the "year of action" in the field of environment. His comprehensive and wide-ranging action program builds upon the progress made in the past year and draws upon last year's experience. It truly gives us the means to assure that, as a nation, we can maintain the initiative, so vigorously begun in our shared campaign to save and enhance our surroundings.

Let me share with you, if I may, a look at the highlights of the President's new proposals.

Sulphur oxide, the most serious pollutant in the atmosphere today, causes damage to health, crops and equipment -- damage estimated now at over $8 billion a year. Another serious atmosphere pollutant is the lead we use in our gasoline.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

The President has, therefore, proposed to levy a charge on sulphur emitted to the atmosphere and a tax on lead in gasoline. These charges will provide a strong economic stimulus for drastic reductions in these two air pollutants. President Nixon has called these charges a major step in applying the principle that the costs of pollution should be included in the price of the product.

Last year the Administration proposed spending $1 billion a year for four years for municipal waste treatment plants. A recent study, however, found that this has just not been enough. Therefore, this year, the President has asked for $2 billion per year for the next three years as part of a $12 billion program. To clean our river and streams, in addition, he has proposed that the federal water quality program be extended to cover all navigable waters, their tributaries and their ground waters and that limitations be set on what can be discharged into waters not only by industry but by municipalities as well.

Further, a National Land Use Policy has been proposed -- calling for $100 million -- $20 million in each of the next five years -- to encourage states, in cooperation with local government, to plan and regulate major developments affecting growth and the use of ecologically critical areas. In line with the President's challenge, open space programs are also proposed to be expanded. The emphasis will be on providing "Parks for People" especially in urban areas.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

Environment Program

Changes are also being proposed in the Internal Revenue Code to encourage charitable land transfers for conservation purposes and to encourage the rehabilitation of our historic buildings. Surplus federal properties will be turned over to public park use and we hope to expand the wilderness area system to include many new areas nation-wide.

Other major program proposals in land protection and reclamation include a power plant siting plan which would require electric utilities to submit plans for new power plants ten years in advance, and a proposal to establish federal guidelines for state programs to regulate the en-vironmental consequences of surface and underground mining.

New problems continue to emerge in our constant battle to protect our environment. It is essential to identify and correct these new problems before they become critical. Ocean dumping is one of these emerging problems. To prevent the indiscriminate dumping of materials into our oceans, estuaries and lakes, the President has asked for a strict limitation on ocean dumping especially in areas of critical significance, and a complete ban on dumping of waste materials dangerous to marine life.

In an attempt to control excessive noise, the President has proposed to authorize EPA to set noise standards for con-struction equipment and transportation vehicles, such as trucks, and buses, and would require labeling of the noise charac-

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

teristics of other products traveling in interstate commerce.

The decline in numbers of several of our bird species highlights the potential dangers of the uncontrolled use of pesticides. To improve our pesticides control, the Administration has asked that pesticides be sold through a registration procedure under which they would be designated as "unrestricted," "restricted use" or "for use by permit only". Cumbersome procedures for canceling pesticide registration and stopping sales of any pesticide that violates federal law, would be streamlined.

Finally, the President has asked that the Chief of the Environmental Protection Agency be directed to prescribe minimum standard tests for new chemicals <u>before</u> they reach the market place and to stop, or restrict, the use or distribution of any substance he finds hazardous to human health or to the environment.

Over twenty separate proposals have been made this year by the President to truly make this the "year of action". The subjects covered reach areas of national life that have never been touches before at this high a level. One thing definitely emerges: the days of polluting our streams and air, the days of littering our countryside, and the days of poisoning our wildlife are truly numbered. Our American earth is no longer defenseless.

The creation of the Council on Environmental Quality and

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

the Environmental Protection Agency, and the President's 1971 environmental legislation reflect this Administration's concern about the growing problems of pollution in our country -- problems that threaten our health and diminish the quality of our lives.

Our deteriorating environment has now reached a critical point, not by a deliberate intent to pollute, or desecrate, or destroy, but because we have too often taken a short term view of what are desirable and beneficial objectives.

The Congress and the Executive Branch are now working to correct our nearsightedness. We have come to realize that there is an interdependence in the web of life -- that the fate of animals, plants, earth, air, water, sunlight and man affects each of us.

But we need your help -- help from all citizens -- businessmen, environmentalists, educators -- help, marshalled in support of needed air, water and solid waste management legislation proposed by your President.

Today, I have talked of the seriousness of many of our environmental problems. Today I have discussed legislation proposed by the President to solve many of these environmental problems. Now let us work together to stop pollution to protect our environment. Why? Because we see a vision of a balanced, healthy, and inspiring world, a world we can be proud to leave for our children -- a world where we can re-

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

joice and wonder at the sunbursts of morning seen through clean air, the noon day radiance enjoyed in a pleasant park, and the peace of the evening sunset, reflected in clear water. The Earth's beauty is eternal and all around us--the sun always rises somewhere, the dew is never dried all at once--- the beauty of our nation is our god given right -- a beauty to be enjoyed without the smudge or taint of technocracy.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum