There were some fits and starts in planning this conference, about what we wanted to accomplish and what the goals should be, and where it should be held, but here we are and this is the kind of representation we need to begin a task which hasn't been done in this state, or probably not very well in any state, and it hasn't been done very well at the national level, either.

Let's try something new for our state and perhaps take some leadership and show the way to others across the nation. Maybe we can provide inputs, not just receive outputs from the federal level.

I do congratulate the Management Improvement Council and its leadership. There will be a continuation of our work here. We are merely beginning this job. I hope this will be a time of gaining a "second wind". Most of those who serve in state government represented here today have served for five years and some longer. We all tend to become stereotyped. I hope today we will shake up our own views of things. I hope we will respond a little better to precisely the kind of question Fred Bassetti proposed. Why can't government do a better job? And more important, why can't government select a new set of standards more
vital and approach them in a different way? Traditional methods are not always adequate, and they are certainly not adequate today. We face dramatic new changes.

We are beginning a new task to set some direction for the 70's. I have talked about this conference to a good many people during the last few months. I have talked to some in the private sector who view with alarm government setting directions for a state. This smacks of socialism, they say, and has a dangerous connotation. They say we can't do it and that we ought to leave it up to them. Traditionally in this country and in our state we have measured where we are going. Now we have got to measure where we want to go. Where do we want to be ten years in the future?

Here is a simple example: In the field of transportation we have traditionally measured what is needed in terms of highway building on the past, extended. It doesn't matter what period we pick. It could be the last five years or ten years or back to World War II. The general rate of use of motor vehicles is 5 percent. The general rate of population growth is 2 percent. In 1980, continuing this growth rate, we will have one motor vehicle for every man, woman and child. In the year 2,000 (only 30 years away) we would have 6,000,000 people and 12,000,000 vehicles. This would take 25,000 miles of two lane highway just to park! Obviously, that isn't a rational thing on which to base the future. The Highway Department doesn't plan that way today. But traditionally we have done that in many areas.
During the first part of the 1960's we had a slow growth period, and a couple periods of recession. From 1965 to 1968 we had excessive economic growth. It came too fast. Since then we have been suffering the pressures of overcrowded schools, transportation needs that can't be met, etc. Now we are suffering the hangover for the binge we were on those three or four years.

Look at the rate of population and job growth. Compare jobs in 1965 and today, and you would find a steady rate of growth, much more rapid than the first five years of the 1960's. If it had been a gradual, steady growth, we wouldn't be facing today the rate of unemployment, economic setback and other difficulties. Who knows if the wisest men could have planned for that kind of growth? Maybe it isn't possible, but I don't think we even tried. We enjoyed the party and now face the hangover. Just because the number of jobs goes down doesn't mean the population goes down. We have urban blight, inadequate transportation systems, the social consequences of the overcrowding, over-urbanization and pollution. These are the consequences of the last few years. We must plan the kind of direction and kind of state we would like to have in the future. This can be a generation of choice.

Here is another example. Traditionally, we have viewed flooding and flood control as having only one solution: eliminate flooding by building dams and dikes and levies and stop the floods, then open the land for new uses. The Army Corps of Engineers has been under attack lately, but I don't think they are to blame, because they have done what the people have demanded. Those who live in the flood
areas wanted protection from flooding, and others wanted the land for industry, etc. Now we know we have a choice. In Snoqualmie Valley we have a choice. The Corps of Engineers has proposed a dam across the middle Fork of the Snoqualmie and another to be built later one. This wouldn't do a complete job of eliminating flooding, but would preserve much of that farm land which is subject to flooding. Where do we spend our money and what do we want to achieve for that land? The Engineers have come full circle now, and they are suggesting that a dam is required, for flood control, but they do agree that the land should be retained in open space. When you look at that and balance off cost and benefits, there is perhaps a choice. And that is to measure the possibility of buying some of the land for open space or letting it remain in farm land, and perhaps provide some type of insurance for flooding. There are a variety of ways, and perhaps some can be done more cheaply. There are scores of examples in this state.

We must develop the mechanism for measuring alternate choices. We have tried to solve our problems with traditional tools and traditional wisdom. Guiding growth is a legitimate personal goal. Each of us likes to think we are planning for our future. We have education, life insurance, retirement and other things in the way of planning personal goals. It is a legitimate personal decision. It is also legitimate in private enterprise. No business lasts very long unless its leaders have some goals. And why private individuals should wince when government plans for the future I simply don't know. Some say a "planned society" is bad. I don't think it is that. It should be a plan for goals we select.
Goals that are desirable for our state. Then we have a "skeleton" on which government can operate.

We need a response to the new challenges. "New Federalism" is a term used on the national level a lot. I don't know how fast it will come. But if we are out in front and can say we are ready, then the chances of a new federalism will emerge. I think there is a renaissance in state government. There is a new attitude and a new type of leader. Instead of a desire to be shorn of tough problems, there is an eagerness to do a good job. There is a changing relationship between states and local government, too. For years we haven't been involved in local affairs. During the past several years we have developed a rising tax revolt of people against spending. The revolt isn't so much against the total amount as it is the way in which money is being used or mis-used. The future offers an immense new opportunity for the state and its citizens to begin to restructure so that it can do a better job of handling problems.

We are spending billions of dollars in supporting a duplication of services at the local level. There is a new interest in environment and in population distribution and in how we create and change our neighborhoods and cities. This demands new responses to the challenge.

Youth's new ability to be concerned comes from the security of today. They may not like what they see their parents doing. Their ability to help solve those problems comes primarily from the relative economic security which has been given to them. Perhaps the economic security enables them to assign themselves to social issues that we weren't able to do. This is a good thing. To pay more attention to social problems, environmental problems.
One of the new challenges is the question of our fiscal capacity to do a good job. What people don't realize is that in this state the ratio of personal income to state and local taxes has not changed over the last four or five years. A true measure of the tax difficulty in this state is that the tax burden is within a few cents of where it was a few years ago. Taxes have gone up and so have our incomes. The relative tax burden today is the same as it was four years ago, and look what we have been able to accomplish. We have advanced rapidly in helping the mentally ill and retarded. We haven't been perfect, but we have come a long way. We have expanded rapidly our ability to handle the environmental problems. Throughout the whole of state government we have come a long way in four years.

That is an indication to me that our fiscal capacity is adequate. We just have to do the most important job of selecting the goals and then that next most important job of creating the structure within which we will work. If the job is done we need to get from people a productive response.

What should the goals of this conference be? We can't do our job in one-and-one-half days. But we can begin to sort out the problems and priorities and can create a framework within which we can operate and this should be just the beginning.

We should initiate a plan for broad citizen participation. The ultimate goal ought to be a method of restructuring as necessary to include local government and even private enterprise approaches to reaching these goals.

We all love this state, and we have had experiences where we've hiked in some secluded place, only to go back later and find many people there. We naturally want to return to what has been.
But we cannot return to what was. We can preserve what we have, protect what we have, recognize that change will come, but in the guiding of change lies our greatest responsibility.

This is not the end. It is the beginning. It is your challenge and I hope you will all be involved in the greater share of the '70's to guide this state to be the kind of state we would like to see in 1980.

Thank you.
I have learned, as all of you have, many things through this conference and I don't know really whether I am adequate in a short period of time to assimilate all of the reports of the moderators and to respond adequately to you. One of the things I learned vividly, however, is that Walt Howe can get more laughs out of a busted joke than Red Skelton in a half hour. You may think it was all a mistake - he planned it right from the beginning.

I do want to thank all of you for participating. You know, I suspect that this is really the first opportunity of this kind that we have had collectively, those of us who serve in state government, to gather together for this period of time, to engage in some freewheel thinking, to step aside for the moment from our day-to-day responsibilities and to look further ahead than our own nose. My thanks join those of Walt's to the moderators, those who have come in from the outside to give us a fresh perspective and a little different approach, a little different guidance than we might have had if we had remained solely within our state government family. In modern terms, I hope for some, and perhaps all of you, it has been literally a "mind-blowing experience".

As for the goals for the 70's, if that is really what we are assigning ourselves to, or any look at the future for that matter, demands a review of history, and at the considerable risk of getting myself into the same trouble Walt did, I believe it was George Santayana who said essentially these words: "Those who ignore the lessons of history are doomed to repeat them". If we don't look back a little and see where we have come, some of the successes and even some of the failures of the past, we have really little hope of doing anything much better in the future.
Without going into all of those elements of our past history, let me point out just a few of them that have struck me during the course of the past couple of days because they do relate to what we might be doing or should be doing in the future. First, as I think I pointed to at least one or perhaps several of the groups I sat in with yesterday, the population distribution of this state - the little chart that you had with the material that came to all of you before the conference began - is a pretty important and fundamental chart whose lessons we cannot escape. I think sometimes we look ahead at the future, and perhaps even during this conference we are caught up in some over emphasis in certain areas and under emphasis in others because we were looking ahead at the 70's in the same light as our view of the 1960's, particularly in relationship to the distribution of our population. If you will sometime go back and look at that chart, you will find that the age of our population, the numbers who are over 65 and those who are under 20, has shifted rather markedly between 1960 and 1970, and they shift in a different way between 1970 and 1980.

The growth in the past ten years in the population over 65 was 44,000 people. That is the growth in the total. The growth in the next ten years is anticipated to be 55,000 people, and the total growth in population, incidentally, is predicted to be almost exactly the same - a little over half a million people in each of these ten year periods. The percentage then, of the elderly will increase. Those under 20 - between 1960 and 1970, we had an increase of 263,000 in that category. Between 1970 and 1980, that increase will be only 82,000 so you see a significant drop in the number who are under 20. Perhaps while we are still getting used to the age of Aquarius, it is temporarily going to be over. Those who are today's young will be tomorrow's wage earners and family providers, family builders. More and more they will be assuming the responsibilities and the reins of power.

There is a basic shift in the kind of population and the distribution of population if we wholly ignore the total numbers of people we are likely to have. As far as we in state government are concerned, how do we approach the needs of people? We have talked a lot about these needs during the past two days, and I suspect everyone of us has fallen into the trap of
viewing the future through the eyes of the departments or the responsibilities we now have. Yet, I sat here this morning and looked around the room and tried to figure out how many of the responsibilities you now hold existed in their present form or even existed in state government just 20 years ago. Twenty years isn't a long time, but 20 years ago we didn't have a Department of Natural Resources as we have today, we didn't have an Office of Economic Opportunity, we didn't have an Urban Affairs Council, we didn't have a Department of Motor Vehicles of the kind we have today, and we didn't have a Youth Commission. We didn't have a Department of Commerce and Economic Development, nor a Department of Revenue of the comprehensive nature of today. We didn't have a Department of Social and Health Services, and in fact in terms of its constituent parts, we didn't even have a Department of Institutions 20 years ago. We didn't have a Department of General Administration of the same kind we have today, nor a Department of Ecology and its constituent agencies of Solid Waste Management and Air Pollution just simply didn't exist as agencies 20 years ago.

We didn't have an Interagency Committee on Outdoor Recreation, we didn't have a Traffic Safety Commission, a comprehensive health planning section, a committee on law and justice. We didn't have the Thermal Siting Council, and Office of Program Planning and Fiscal Management, or Department of Planning and Community Affairs.

Most of you who sit here today fill responsibilities that didn't even exist in the same form in state government 20 years ago. I suspect that as things change even more rapidly than they have during that last 20 years that the chances are that few of the responsibilities you fill today will exist in the same form just 10 years from now. I think as a result, we ought to quit looking at what we do in the future based simply on our own experiences and our own responsibilities as they exist today.

A comment was made earlier by a representative of the Yakima Indian Nation which has been referred to a couple of times since, but it brings up another area where we tend to look in terms of stereotypes and look in terms
of today's existing ways of doing things rather than the ways, perhaps they
should be done. The complaints of many in this state are that certain areas
or certain groups of people are forgotten, are left out, are not dealt with
on an even basis by state government, or any governmental unit for that matter.
Part of our problem is that we have spent so much time over the past years
protecting certain groups and certain individuals through the institutionalization
of our tax system that we prevent doing a real job of assigning ourselves to
the top-priority needs collectively within the state and using all available
resources to meet those needs.

I am indebted to Don Horowitz for a term which I think is a pretty
good term. He said I didn't have to give him a footnote, but I will. He
referred to them as "tax ghettos" and that is precisely what we have. We have
the motor vehicle fuel tax which is assigned only to the building of highways
on the somewhat questionable premise that because the user paid the tax, he
should get all of the benefits. We have many other taxes, most other taxes
in this state, where that simply isn't true, but we do have sports' fees,
license fees of certain kinds whose benefits go solely to those who buy those
fees. We have licensing of a variety of occupations who demand that all of the
money that goes into those licensing requirements come back in direct services
to those precise groups. We ask students for tuition to various colleges and
universities and demand that all of those revenues go back into support of
various elements of higher education.

These all represent tax ghettos. Every time we create a separate
source and then associate with it delineated responsibility, we narrow the choices.
We don't expand the choices for dealing with the highest priority needs of
government. Too often we are hung up on conventional wisdom. Conventional
wisdom I have already mentioned in terms of taxes, how they should be collected
and where they should be distributed. We are hung up on the conventional
wisdom of governmental organization as it now exists, and as it now provides
delivery systems. We are hung up on stereotyped ideas of urban development,
of the distribution of the population. We even attempt to determine for others
what their own feelings are, and as a result, what the policies, programs, and services for those people should be. Too often as citizens, and this goes far beyond the responsibilities of those of us in state government, but too often all of us as citizens continue the conventional wisdom of building institutions that too often remain idle or stand idle. Too many of them, rather than being useful institutions, are more often than not, monuments. We build schools - our common school system - and then in virtually every case we let them stand idle for at least three months of a year plus having them stand idle for too much of a day and an evening and a weekend during the school year.

We build auditoriums for specialized purposes and let them stand idle most of the time only intermittently filled with some spectacle or some cultural event. Our churches at least pretend they have comprehensive activity, and yet I would challenge almost every church to really suggest that their monument, their particular church, is being fully utilized on a seven-day a week, day and night basis. They too stand idle too much of the time. Our sports stadia, consistently with huge capital investments, stand idle, except for the weekly spectacles happening only during a limited season.

Someone mentioned earlier the problems even of graveyards and I was struck enough by that, that I did some quick figuring. Do you know that even to bury, if we give everyone a good seven foot by three foot standardized plot, to bury all of the people who today are living on the face of the globe would require more than 3,000 square miles which is a questionable use for 3,000 square miles of irreplaceable land.

So, the use of our land and the idleness of our institutions, have to represent one of the major elements of new thinking and change that must come during the 1970's.

Highways are another element of misuse and even idleness of land. We too often focus our attention on the overcongested and overused freeways and major arterials and wonder how we can provide either alternative sources of transportation or build more freeways to handle more cars on more congested
routes. We forget that a very high percentage of all of the miles of streets and roads and highways in this state or any state are underutilized.

City streets again we build on conventional wisdom. Where we ever started selecting a block size of approximately 400 or 440 feet, I don't even know, and I suspect most of you don't either; but, we build the streets that far apart in one direction and that far apart in another direction. We can put a certain number of houses or apartment buildings on that square block. Some have mentioned earlier that maybe we are overcrowded in some of our urban centers. If we had the simple notion of creating super blocks by taking some of those underutilized streets we could suddenly gain for ourselves unused space that is now under concrete and could instead be utilized for a much higher and better purpose.

Why not put four square blocks together, build homes or townhouses around the edge and create a micro-community, if you will, surrounding this major green area inside. A protected and secure play area for children, a park area, if you will, a green space within our urban community, and we would gain for ourselves, again from some very quick and simple figuring on those average sized blocks just by eliminating that unnecessary interior street system some 16 or 17% extra land area.

Our priorities aren't very straight because we haven't started thinking in new and different ways. The common threads that I perceived during the reports of the moderators related to about 8 or 9 items. First, and I think perhaps the most important: citizen participation in the decisions of government. Now any of us who have been involved in government over the past few years know very well that that's coming and we usually do not like it. It is sometimes painful, and the confrontations, the arguments, and perhaps even the sit-ins aren't what we would like to see. Too many of us would find it easier to sit isolated, decide on plans and directions that were useful in our view, and then supply the resulting services to people without their real participation. But that isn't going to happen and rather than react to the confrontation tactics that come with a desire for citizen participation that isn't met, one of our great responsibilities in this state and through you must be a reaching out and a seeking of citizen participation to make what we do more meaningful in the views of those who are receiving the services, not just
those who are providing the services.

Second, another common thread is the continued concern that we have a lack of adequate information or perhaps a lack of adequate expertise to deal with the problems. This was brought up by some of the moderators - that they were dealing with problems where they didn't feel anyone there had a particular expertise. But, I'm really not so sure that's true. All of us are people who are subjects of the results of governmental action and so we should have a view or a concern on the worth of present action, and we don't necessarily have to have a broad expertise or a technical background to at least measure the worth of present services. It may take experts to help restructure and to make sure that we are responding better to the decisions, but all of us have the expertise to make comments. This goes for all citizens of the state - on what is happening and what has happened to them.

Third, a continued thread of needed regionalization of government, the interchange between departments, which is so desperately necessary and a personalizing of governmental services (even more necessary as our state grows and as the complexity of governmental services grow). The natural tendency is to make that service more impersonal because we simply don't have the time or we don't have the staff to make it a personalized service. But we ought to realize, and I think most of us do, that the growing cry, not just from the young and not just from the minorities, but from all citizens, is to treat me as a person, not a thing. And that's one of the major elements we must respond to.

Fourth, a need for consistency expressed in so many ways during the course of all of these discussions. I ran across something in American Samoa which may be worth imprinting on each of our minds. It is a slogan they happen to put up on every wall and along the streets, as a constant reminder to all citizens who live in that territory. It is a very simple slogan. It merely says: "One Law for Everyone". Now, they have worked for centuries under a high chief system, a system of special privileges, special emoluments for certain citizens, and they are rapidly coming to the realization that this simple slogan is a vital necessity to them and it certainly is for us, in a drive for consistency. "One Law for Everyone".
Fifth, a quality of life. A quality of life expressed again as a continuing thread whether it was in the sections on environmental or economic or other problems. I was particularly struck by Roberta Barr's statement of a quality of life all the way to the end which is something we too often forget. I would add to that, right from the beginning, all the way to the end. We apply our services unevenly. We respond to the needs of those who are old enough to complain about inadequacies but not so old they cannot complain about inadequacies. The unrepresented are the very old and the very young and they deserve to have the same quality of life and opportunity as those who are perfectly able to get it for themselves or who are able to get it through confrontation or from other tactics.

Harry Goldie mentioned environmental insults, which I knew very well would bring a response from Fred Bassetti, but I have a personal view too of environmental insults. Engineers, during the past 6 or 7 years, have been kicked around. You know, that sounds like Nixon in 1962, doesn't it. One of these days, you won't have this engineer to kick around anymore! But, while I'm here, I can kick back. And, we do have environmental insults. And too often, they come from lousy engineers. But, there are good engineers. But, they also come from lousy architects. And there are those as well as fine and sensitive architects. And, we've got to demand higher quality from those who do have the expertise to provide it. Too often, we simply don't demand it.

Another thread is the consolidation of services. The recognition we all have that we have too many units of government, too many of which cannot effectively respond to their responsibilities, and yet we haven't done much of a job in this state in the past of effectively consolidating those units. We've tried in fits and starts, but today we have more units of government than we did 10 years ago. And unless we have better and more effective ways of achieving consolidation that in turn can bring more efficient and even cheaper government to people, we're going to end up with more units of government and bigger problems and more fractionalization 10 years from now than we have today.

Finally, the thread that again is perhaps of basic importance, is the thread of restoring the family as a cornerstone of our society, realizing
that perhaps only in this way can we begin to turn the corner in terms of the rising demands on government which often come from the failures of the family. That in itself represents one of the major tasks of youth today. Here is a real chance to turn around some of the evils and the ills of our society. Instead of figuring out new ways to handle the problems of the unwed, of the problems of the divided family, the foster children, the fall-outs of our society, what we really ought to be aimed at is preventing the fall-out in the first place. And that's a real challenge that frankly, we are unlikely to resolve, which very well may be resolved by a young and determined generation.

Finally, then, what are the mechanisms for reaching the goals of the 1970's? Quite obviously today and yesterday weren't enough to do anything more than search out some of the problems, to perhaps get our thinking into some new directions, to open up some of our viewpoints, but the real question is -- Where Now?

First, let me say just as emphatically as I can, because I believe it very strongly and I see from my contact with other states and from talking with other governors that I am very proud of those of you who serve in state government. Here in this state, I think, generally our governmental administrators stand head and shoulders above those of other states of the nation. I believe this from personal comments I've had from those who have worked as moderators and those who have sat in these sessions from outside state government - their comments frankly of surprise and pleasure - over the high quality and high caliber of those with whom they have worked during the past couple of days. And yet, another thread through all of these responses, has been that we still stand condemned of insufficient response to the needs of our people. Some things we can and should be doing. Right now, without any change in government, but through our own individual responsibilities as they exist today, we must open up continuing lines of communication with others, your colleagues and counterparts in other departments and demand the same of the people who work with you in your departments. Our people too often get tied up with the immediate problems of today and have little, if any idea, of what is going on in other departments, even at the same levels in government that they are now working. I suspect that a good many of you during the course of the past couple of days who work in state government, learned something, found out something, you hadn't been aware of before as it came through a comment from a fellow director sitting in on your same group.
Second, we can and must continue as well as we can within some pretty obvious limitations of a civil service system, to reward excellence in government and to prune out those who are the slackers and those who represent mediocrity and those who are merely looking ahead to retirement, not to the problem and the responsibilities they now have. It is obvious that this is not an easy task. It's going to take some tough-minded administrators, some hard decisions and in some cases can't even be done very well. But, in every way we can and with every choice that comes before us, the reward of excellence in government and the pruning out of those who fail to make it, has to be one of our prime responsibilities.

Third, this is something I've told virtually every one of you at the time you became a director and I hope that each one of you continues to tell it to all who work for you and with you in your departments. Be innovative enough to make mistakes! I'm disappointed and we all ought to be disappointed within our departments if we continue along day after day with nobody thinking innovatively enough -- no one taking a step long enough to fall on their face. Every once in a while when our family goes skiing we end the skiing day and my 9 year old comes down the last hill, and he is kind of a hot shot skier, and he proudly says "Dad, I skied all day today and I didn't fall once". And everytime he says that, I say "You didn't ski hard enough, because if you didn't fail, you weren't learning anything new". And the same thing is true in state government or in any other of our responsibilities. I am a lot more attracted by innovative ideas, even though some of them may be screwy, than those who have no ideas and make no mistakes. It's not enough to be satisfied with just filling our present statutory responsibilities. We can carry out all of the present statutory responsibilities in an excellent fashion. We can be doing all of our job as it exists today very well and still be falling far short of the kind of job we should be doing. You know, I suppose if Henry Ford and all who came after him had been satisfied with what had gone on, we would still be driving Model T's. If the Wright Brothers had been satisfied and all who followed had been satisfied with their product, most of us would still be walking. And if Mark Twain were satisfied with Huckleberry Finn, Walt Howe wouldn't have had all of the laughs he had this morning.
One other comment that was made - and I think this ought to again be pretty much of a cornerstone for all of us in state government - it was said, let people know if you have anything to say, otherwise keep quiet. That is true and, if as a result we keep quiet in state government, then we are big failures. Let's make sure we have something to say because we have created something new and something innovative and something better than the generation gone before. We've had scores of positive and specific ideas on which I won't comment now. I hope that they will be put together in a form that can be distributed and will represent the beginnings of what comes next. We will be working with the moderators, the leaders and perhaps with all of you, in reaching a final decision on what comes next. But here, several things come to mind. We must expand this effort of the past two days in terms of task forces, in terms of more specific conferences, bringing in, as several moderators have suggested, thousands of our citizens who have something to say but who have never been given the chance to say it. The goals of the 70's will be meaningless if they are goals that are put together by this group or by only those working alone who represent state government. We have got to reach out farther and better than we ever have before in gaining citizen involvement and citizen determination of what those goals ought to be.

Along this line, we're talking about a rather massive process. It may very well require necessary funding of a specific unit of continuing management, of some structure to insure that this process is fully carried out. That is a very real possibility. We have to be working for some positive timetables for the reaching of certain goals which we know very well today we can reach and haven't had the courage to set some positive and absolute timetables. It was mentioned sometime this morning that raw sewage is still being discharged into certain waterways of this state. This is only one simple example, but there are many others like it. There is no reason why we can't right now, today, set an absolute, unvarying timetable for the ending of that kind of basic pollution and we ought to be tough enough on those who fail to respond to make the tough decisions that if you cannot and will not respond to this absolute timetable, you've simply got to close down.
Finally, I want to say something that I suppose could be easily misconstrued, but let anyone construe it any way they want. Don't assume any one of you, that your responsibility in state government is merely to look ahead to doing even the best job you can for the next two years. Your responsibility may or may not end then. Look forward instead to the next generation, and if you look onward to the next generation - if you are really involved in setting the goals of the 70's and effectively beginning to carry out those goals of the 70's - a lot of you may be and ought to be around all during the 70's to see those goals carried out.

Thank you!