

REMARKS TO ASSOCIATION OF STATE PLANNING
AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES

May 11, 1966

It is a particular pleasure to speak to you in my two-fold capacity as Director of the Office of Emergency Planning and liaison for the President with the Governors of the fifty states. Both these roles should be of interest to you. Both can have a significant impact on state development in the years ahead.

First, let me tell you what Emergency Planning is all about. It has been going on, in one form or another, since World War I. The participation of the states in a direct and crucial way is a consequence of the nuclear age. No longer can we rely solely on the war production plans and programs of the Federal Government simply because a situation could develop in which the Federal Government is, at least temporarily, cut off from the states. Such a prospect is, of course, improbable; but it is not impossible. So for several years now, the Federal Government has encouraged the States to develop what is called a Comprehensive Program -- that is, a definitive plan to assure continuity of government and economic mobilization capability at the state level. Forty-nine of the fifty states, including Florida, are now engaged in this important enterprise. Its Federal sponsors are every Federal Department and agency under the coordination of the Office of Emergency Planning. As its Director, I serve as a statutory member of the National Security Council. In this capacity, I help to bridge the gap between broad national security requirements and the Governors of the fifty states.

Fortunately, the Comprehensive Program, while it has a national security orientation and objective, produces other dividends which can be used in the business of promoting industrial development and for other peacetime aims. In my years as Governor of Florida, I learned how much there was to learn about the economic potential of my State. In my meetings with other Governors, particularly as regional concepts were developed and regional compacts came into being, it became evident that in too many instances the potential and promise of the individual state was held back not so much by lack of initiative as by lack of knowledge. It is not enough merely to know what your state produces, its major resources, its tributaries and highways. This is elemental information available to all of us. But economic potential extends beyond the adding machine inventory to which I allude. It takes a wide assortment of experts, working together, to gauge the true potential of a state's development, and I suspect that each of you believes deeply that your State, however prosperous and successful, has barely tapped the hidden wellsprings of progress.

The Comprehensive Program, which involves the establishment of Task Forces in virtually every resource area -- manpower, fuel, water, production, construction, food, etc. -- really represents the most definitive effort to gauge a state's potential yet to be devised.

It was founded to meet a clear need in total national planning against the ultimate peril of our age. It has proved to be a boon for peacetime planning as well. This makes the circle complete. For let us remember our principal purpose is to maintain, under the most severe trial, a viable and productive economy. It stands to reason that the stronger the economy is, the better able it would be to withstand an event we devoutly pray will never occur.

There is another aspect of my work as Director of the Office of Emergency Planning of direct interest to you. I refer to OEP's responsibility for the administration of the Federal Disaster Act of 1950. To date more than \$300 million has been allocated to 41 states and two territories which became victims of hurricanes, storms, earthquakes and other natural catastrophes over the past sixteen years. This program was designed, and is administered, as a supplement to a state's own effort. It is invoked at the appeal of the State Governor when it can be shown a disaster has gone beyond the resources of the State. As Governor of Florida during Hurricane Betsy and Hurricane Dora, I asked for and we received -- such assistance. Its importance to the health, safety and well-being of the people of our State is, of course, obvious. But it can be extremely helpful to state economic development as well. These funds are used for repair and rehabilitation of essential public facilities such as roads, bridges, dams, health and sanitation systems and the like. I needn't remind you that such facilities, so often taken for granted by the average citizen, are among the things which make a state or a community a good place in which to live and an attractive location for new industry. So, as you can appreciate, emergency planning in many areas is bound up with your day-to-day efforts to strengthen the economy of your states and improve the prospects for your people.

The second assignment from the President covers the entire range of Federal-State relations and, as such, is bounded only by the Governors themselves. In 1963, Federal funds going to state and local governments in the form of grants-in-aid, shared revenues and loans, amounted to about 5.5 billion, ~~exclusive of the benefits of trust funds, particularly highway construction,~~

In 1966 we can anticipate in excess of \$9 billion, exclusive of the benefits of trust funds, particularly highway construction, which should run to about \$3.8 billion in 1966.

These statistics, and the sharp increases in Federal-State programs, point up the immense problems facing most Governors today as well as the increasing complexity of the Federal-State relationship. But I do believe we are moving toward a better balance in the Federal-State partnership. President

Johnson has called this Creative Federalism and in a larger sense -- the Great Society.

If I might shift into a philosophical vein for a moment, I think the Great Society ought to be distinguished from predecessor efforts of another generation. We are not faced today with widespread, sweeping national poverty. But we do see pockets of remaining poverty, a school system which, however superior to its counterparts elsewhere on this globe, is still short of our requirements; we can see evidence of urban blight and suburban sprawl. It is, in short, poverty in the midst of plenty not to be denied or downgraded simply because we are, for the most part, a prosperous nation.

The second distinction, as I see it, is that President Johnson has conceived a program which stresses not doles but deeds, not gifts but opportunities. It seems to me that we seek not the "holding actions" of yesteryear when hunger stalked our land, but permanent solutions in the form of opportunities for those yet to share in the national abundance; permanent solutions in the form of inducements to learn new skills and, in fact, change a way of life.

Most significantly, I think creative federalism is distinguished by the reliance we are placing on participation of the states in planning what is yet to be. We will be successful only to the extent that the states have a significant report to make -- and to the extent that we can achieve an integration of state and national purpose. That the states have a significant impact there is no doubt -- that we can achieve the integration -- well, that's our job and we plan to do it.

I earnestly hope these objectives might be realized in an orderly, constructive way. As a lawyer, I have a particular reverence for law and for the orderly process by which law evolves. This point is important to those engaged in industrial development for two reasons. First, because our heritage is lawful. As a people we have evolved from the ancient English Common law. And in a sense, our respect for law and the judicial process is very much like the Englishman's reverence for the King or Queen. The English oath of allegiance is to the crown; ours is to the Constitution -- the oldest written constitution in the world.

But from a pragmatic standpoint, your interest in a stable society is even more compelling. It is stable societies that attract new industry and enable you to break new paths for your state's progress. I would hope, therefore, that the social strides this nation will take in the future, whatever they may be, will be peaceful and orderly and always under the moderating restraint which is so often lacking in other countries; but which has been so manifest in America.

Finally, let me say a word about my approach to this matter of Federal-State relations. I do not believe, and I shall never believe, that there is a natural antagonism between State governments and the Federal Government, or between State governments and municipal governments. It has been my experience that such differences as may arise among the respective political subdivisions need not lead to destructive clashes, and should engender constructive compromise. Always the solution lies in a reasonable and flexible approach on the part of all parties. Always the solution can be found with patience and understanding. That is the posture I will assume in my relationships with the Governors.

It was not long ago that I met with this group from the other side of the fence, as a Governor who shared the problems of industrial development with my fellow Governors. If I no longer exercise this responsibility in an official sense, I am still deeply committed to finding better ways to help the states in this area and others.

Time and again, President Johnson has referred to "Creative Federalism" as the domestic challenge of our time. I accept that challenge in my official capacity today with a conviction that Federalism, to survive, must be creative, and that the States, to survive, must be participants in the creative process.

###

At Washington, D. C.