
This is my second trip to Canada in less than two weeks. In Ottawa the week before last, delegations from our two great countries explored their mutual problems, some competitive and some cooperative, in the lumber industry in the Pacific Northwest.

As we used the geographical term, it covered the same area as it does in your lexicon--Alberta, British Columbia, the Yukon, and the States of Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, Washington and Western Montana. We agreed in Ottawa, as you do, that the interests of all are characterized by a high degree of mutuality which invites coordinated effort.

At Under Secretary Robertson's dinner in Ottawa I was flanked by the distinguished Secretary of the Cabinet and Clerk of the Privy Council, Mr. Bryce, and Dr. Rousseau, the renowned educator from Laval University now with the Canadian Department of Forestry. We talked of Indians, and it developed that there are lively differences of opinion in Canada, as in the United States, over the role of government in this field.

And we talked, too briefly, of recreation as a governmental activity. It was further evidence that the burgeoning activity of the Federal Government our side of the boundary is being watched keenly by our Canadian colleagues, particularly those engaged in the conservation and development of resources, such as timber.

When similar problems develop, on your side of the border or ours, in the field of Indian affairs, timber resources, recreation, or whatever, Canada and the United States are quite likely, as free governments with Anglo Saxon juridical backgrounds, to react in similar fashion, and the apparent differences will disappear if they are measured against a time-scale of the relative occupation of available land.

I am told that Canadians did not have an Indian problem for a long time after our own had become a major concern of government. The explanation, of course, is that our open land was filled up earlier. Canadians in the Pacific Northwest probably have fewer problems of economic dislocation in the lumber business than we have, but perhaps yours are still to come.

I haven't seen the figures on your tourism, but even with devalued dollar resulting in a Canadian travel bargain, you have not yet felt an impact on your parks equivalent to the one which we have had in 1962.
This movement to the parks defies description, so I won't attempt it, but those of you in the business don't wear that haggard and harried look from worrying over where your next customer will come from. You may be wondering, however, whether you'll ever see the old ones again, considering the headaches and hardships many of them endured in traffic, in parking, in service, or the lack of it, and in the general confusion of an unprecedented tourist season.

Mr. Knapp, your executive vice president, suggested that I should discuss the importance of outdoor recreation in general, and what is being done about it in the United States. The first part is easy. President Kennedy's Executive Order of last April 27 put it this way:

"... it is necessary, through the conservation and wise use of resources, to preserve, develop and make accessible to all our people outdoor recreation of such quantity and quality as will make possible the individual enjoyment of, and will assure the physical, cultural and spiritual benefits of such recreation ..."

The same order declared that the Federal Government has major nationwide responsibilities for outdoor recreation resources, and that the effectiveness of Federal participation in the field has to be improved.

This hits very close to my office. The Interior Department is a major force in the recreation business. I won't claim that it is always a force for good--but at least it is a force.

Our National Park Service purveys recreation directly. Our Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife assists in providing fishing and hunting, both directly and indirectly; directly, for example, through construction of fish hatcheries and indirectly in the administration of the Pittman-Robertson Act and the Dingell-Johnson Act.

When our Bureau of Reclamation builds a great dam, the impounded water becomes a recreational resource, and we are pledged to see that it is managed to serve this purpose so far as is practicable.

Wildlife habitat is a recognized objective for which we manage the public range and forested land under the Bureau of Land Management. Other objectives are the development of sites for camping and picnicking, and the preservation of natural and historical sites.

The Forest Service of the Agriculture Department plays a vital role in outdoor recreation; the Corps of Engineers, which builds flood control dams, the Treasury Department's Coast Guard, with its water safety functions, and many other Federal agencies are involved in the United States bureaucracy which administers our outdoor recreation resources.

There are so many that the new Bureau of Outdoor Recreation was created in the Interior Department, and a Cabinet-level Recreation Advisory Council was established to try to bring some kind of order to their activities. Thus the Presidential order.
I take every opportunity I can to harp on the theme that outdoor recreation is not a panacea for every economic ill. But it is a specific for some chronic ills. Our Department regards recreation as a prime undeveloped resource for a number of Indian communities. The Navajos plan tribal parks which will rival some national parks in spectacular beauty; the White Mountain Apaches and the Eastern Cherokee, to pick two groups as geographically diverse as Arizona and North Carolina, have done outstanding jobs of capitalizing on the economic potential of recreation. The Nez Percées in my own State of Idaho have a plan well under way, as have the Flatheads in Montana.

The Department of Agriculture's rural development program emphasizes recreation as an alternative economic resource to replace retired cropland in certain circumstances.

Wilderness is categorized as a recreation asset, although not usually as an economic resource in the usual context of the term, and a Wilderness Bill is one of the program targets for this Congress.

States are climbing aboard the recreation band wagon, but you will hear more about that this afternoon. My special purpose today is to formulate a few propositions on the subject from the point of view of a Federal administrator—or bureaucrat, if you will—who is concerned with recreation.

Here in the Pacific Northwest the Federal Government, at least south of the border, has a more important place in the recreation picture than, say, in the Northeast. The reason is simple. Out here our proprietorship is so much greater, in National Parks like Glacier, Mt. Rainier, Olympic, Yellowstone and Crater Lake; in Reclamation water impoundments, like Hungry Horse and Roosevelt, Arrowrock and Owyhee, and many others; and great national forests already designated as having great, if not paramount, recreation values, such as the Northern Cascades, Sawtooth, Oregon Dunes, and the primitive and wilderness areas.

For Canadian thinkers who are observing our governmental patchwork quilt, and our efforts to keep pace with the explosive demand for governmental action in the recreation field, I offer these suggestions:

1. Government (speaking loosely or generally) has been in the recreation business in the United States for a long time. But until very recently its concern for recreation was almost always tied to its concern for a physical resource over which it had dominion, a particular piece of land or body of water. It has not generally been tied to an acknowledged Federal responsibility for satisfying an individual or a personal human need. Now the outlook is changing. "Open Space" is one of the things for which help is provided in the Housing Act of 1961. Our great National Parks traditionally have been carved out of public land, or from areas which were purchased privately and donated to the public, but now Congress has authorized the acquisition, with Federal money, of privately owned land at Point Reyes and at Cape Cod, and is considering similar projects at Padre Island and Oregon Dunes. However, Congress has not yet fixed the guidelines for this type of commitment of Federal effort.
We can anticipate the passage of some time before we have a clean cut
definition of what the Federal role should be in furnishing recreational
opportunity outdoors to all the people. When and if that day comes, of
course, there will be a major change in the Northwest's recreational role.
The Federal money and the Federal effort will be concentrated where the
people are (Cape Cod, for example) rather than where they aren't; and
happily for our own craving for elbow room, the Pacific Northwest is still
in the latter category.

2. Recreation is going to have to achieve a better accommodation with
other uses of the lands in public ownership. When it comes to National
Parks there are powerful and impassioned preservationist traditions which
are barriers to mining, lumbering, grazing and other commercial uses of the
parklands. This very fact militates against the creation of new areas as
national parks, no matter how deserving. The consumptive users of the
traditionally free public lands sense the accelerating pressures of the
population increases and the westward migration, and they react viscerally.

To be fair, it should be pointed out that there is a compensating
reaction among those in the resource business who own their own lands.
Men who have integrated wood products operations with large private timber
holdings have also sensed the public pressures for recreational use, and
they have largely abandoned the "no-trespassing" policies of the past.
In Washington and Oregon they develop campsites in their private forests,
and they develop picnic areas on the roadside--dozens in the coastal areas
of Washington--which are so attractive they put some of the Government's
activities to shame. They do it out of a high sense of civic service,
which also happens to be good business.

It is not wicked to chop down a tree, per se, nor to graze a steer.
But trees need not be cut to the very edge of the road or the stream, if
a strip of trees can be left to screen the harvest in back of them.

It is a shame that the excesses of yesteryear are still creating hang-
overs today, and that battles continue to be fought on charges of wasteful
practices that were abandoned long since. The combatants point the finger
and complain that the other covets that which is his. We have to stop it,
on both sides, for there is land enough to have parks and wilderness and
yet have sustained yield management and wise use of land and water. Some
areas must be set aside, either for or from a certain use, just as good
forestry sometimes dictates clear-cutting. Lumbermen, miners and cows all
deserve living space, but it does not have to be in a park.

3. We know too little about this thing called "leisure time." A new
book, the Twentieth Century Fund's Of Time, Work and Leisure, questions the
prevailing idea that we have the greatly increased amount of "free time" for
outdoor recreation and other activities which our governmental planning
relies upon so heavily. I think that all "recreation planners" ought to
read the book. And, speaking of book reading, it seems to me we need to
get our colleges and universities tuned in to us better to train the people,
the wise and sensible people, we are going to need to operate this govern-
mmental creature we are spawning.
4. Government ought to ease up on its tendency to be self-centered. The tendency in Government, at any level or of any kind, is to confuse "need" with "desirability for government action." I don't mean to imply that we should say "Let George do it." But neither should we say "We'll do everything we can to stop George from doing it."

The Congress and our Department are struggling to adjust policies to present day conditions in the matter of using private concession operators to provide for the needs of the public in our parks. The Recreation Advisory Council is considering, along with many others, the broad question of how to pay for recreation facilities, with a land conservation fund to buy new areas, or a car sticker or some other standard price device for use of the public recreation areas. I hope that none of us loses sight of the important role which private enterprise can play in filling the needs of the people for an outdoor recreation experience.

One example that comes to mind is the question of charging for camping in public areas. When I started camping with my family, 15 years ago, I was regarded, as my teenagers would put it today, as some kind of nut or something. Camping is universal today, but private camping grounds are as scarce as motels were east of the Mississippi 25 years ago. Perhaps we are discouraging privately owned campgrounds by our tradition of free camping, by the hit-or-miss nature of our decisions on developing new facilities, and by denying our best areas to the private entrepreneur on terms he regards as reasonable. The last applies in particular to the West where so many of the best camping areas are Federally owned.

Federal areas turn away enough business to keep many a private businessman going well. You should read the letters I receive from disappointed campers who have spent their vacations staring at signs reading "Campgrounds Filled to Capacity."

Some of our public agencies, such as the Bureau of Land Management, don't have enough money for a big recreation program, but with a more flexible policy or more authority might be able to use what money they do have as "seed money" to persuade private business to help out, to our mutual advantage.

5. Last, but not least, all of us, in government or business alike, must see this recreation picture in perspective. On the Government side, we are proud of the fact that a hundred years ago the National Park idea was conceived, that the national forests were set aside, that conservation is the touchstone of this Administration. These are ideas we can export, just as, on the commercial side, our managerial techniques in hotel or food management, in travel, and the related service industries, are widely emulated.

"Outdoor recreation" conjures up, in some minds, the image of a mountain climber or a horseman. The term is a bigger umbrella than that. It covers a lot of activities. Here, in descending order, is how a poll by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission found what Americans do most in outdoor recreation:

Outdoor recreation has so many facets it is big business, estimated variously at from $20 billion to $30 billion a year. Whatever its gross value, and I don't know that anyone has a really clear idea of its true value in terms of dollars, it is going to get bigger.

Whatever the value is in currency, it is insignificant compared to the worth in intangibles, in spiritual refreshment. What price can we apply to the prevention of a nervous breakdown? What is the going rate for a sunrise over a lake?

This is one consideration we have to keep in mind in keeping the subject in perspective. We share a pride in our region, and on both sides of the border we are proudest of the areas which are natural and beautiful. We want millions of people to see it, but we don't want it spoiled in the process. While we hope the visitors bring money, we must take care that we don't let the greenbacks blot out the greenery. Perhaps our watchword should be restraint—restraint in advertising, restraint in design and construction, restraint in operations, restraint in Government.

Another factor to remember is that "recreation" means different things to different people. Birdwatchers and pheasant hunters do not always agree on it, nor do wilderness advocates of roadless areas agree with the automobile and gasoline interests. A measure of restraint is certainly needed in this regard. I refer again to your "high degree of mutuality which invites coordinated effort."

This opportunity to visit with you has been refreshing to a Northwesterner who feels close ties with the Canadians as neighbors. Under the inspirational leadership of another Westerner and internationalist, Stewart Udall, I work in a Department which has a big stake in this region, and in its economic potential. Outdoor recreation is looming larger in that potential. We must work together to manage it successfully, for if we don't manage to work together, we will manage to make a mess of it.
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