
Although the President promoted me to the position of Under Secretary three months ago, and although I have a different and wider scope of office, I still carry the portfolio of public lands, for my successor as Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management has not been appointed. So my personal interest in public land management has not diminished and I hope that my association with groups such as yours will be as open and friendly as ever.

Great changes are occurring in the conservation movement in this country. We are entering an era that President Johnson has called the "new conservation".

I think I am as aware as anyone of the sensitivity of Western people to high-level pronouncements on the
conservation theme. I am sure that many of my Western friends are asking the question: "What does the new conservation mean to those of us who are accustomed to equating conservation with sustained yields of material things -- range management, forest management, hydroelectric power, mineral development, and the like?"

Some may ask, "Have aesthetic considerations preempted the field over the practical considerations of wise husbandry of material resources?"

Clearly not.

The President's emphasis on natural beauty re-focuses the spotlight on conservation. While the old work goes on, there is a new challenge, a realization of the broadened view that must be given in the face of decaying city centers, exploding suburbs, multiplying super highways, and an alarming crime rate.

We have not forgotten the great unfinished agenda
of conservation in the more conventional theme. Our efforts in these directions have not diminished and must not diminish.

During the past week in Washington, D. C., there was held the Silver Anniversary meeting of the National Advisory Board Council for Public Lands. In addressing the Council last week, I reviewed with them some of the things that I had brought to their attention in my four years as Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management.

Early in the new Administration we built the foundation for good relationships with all the users of the public lands, commercial and non-commercial. We reaffirmed our confidence in the National Advisory Board Council, and we broadened its membership and that of the State and National Boards. I emphasized that the basic, keystone structure in the advisory organization is the district advisory board, a creature of the Congress -- that the State and National Boards
had gained regulatory status only as representative extensions of the statutory district boards.

I touched on the concept of "multiple use" and summed it up by saying that it is really "prudent management." There is good precedent for this, going back to Theodore Roosevelt, who said:

"All these various uses of our natural resources are so closely connected that they should be coordinated, and should be treated as part of one coherent plan and not in haphazard and piecemeal fashion."

The State Boards and the National Council, following their multiple-use reorganizations, stand today as organizations capable of treating problems in a coordinated way and capable of presenting coherent recommendations.

In 1962 here at Albuquerque the grazing fee problem was faced squarely. I personally sincerely appreciate the public service provided by the Advisory Board system in the year that followed as the "democratic process"
unfolded on that difficult problem.

In 1963, I saw no reason why the Department and the Boards could not come a great deal closer to understanding how to estimate grazing capacity, how to schedule increases or decreases in permitted grazing use, how to provide for administrative review of actions, and how to preserve the exercise of sound common sense at the grass-roots level.

I said that a decent conservation job on the public's land is possible only with the cooperation of those who share in its use and that this cooperative task demands the best efforts of all of us.

Then in 1964 the issue of land tenure was very much on our minds -- one of the tough kinds of questions the Council had undertaken beginning in November of 1962.

Just a week before the Department was asked where
It stood on this matter. As it was presented with a divided report from the National Advisory Board Council, the House of Representatives overwhelmingly approved authorization of the bill to establish the Public Land Law Review Commission and had sent the bill to the Senate. In this framework, I suggested that the land tenure question would be a critical issue of the Review Commission's work. Furthermore, the Council's relationship to the new Commission, when it should come into being, was a matter of great importance.

I said that the Council's recommendations before the Commission would carry weight about in proportion to the extent that its recommendations were based on hard facts and sound logic and were widely supported within all elements of the Council and its constituencies.

The Public Land Law Review Commission was
authorized by the Congress, and the bill was signed into law last September. It has the task of matching theory with reality and reaching common ground from the public interest standpoint.

It is probable that in the new conservation an even wider choice of alternative decisions will be available than ever before. The available alternatives for action must be carefully weighed and considered. The public is entitled to know what the alternatives are, to debate and discuss them, and to participate in the process of making a choice.

We have all heard the cry that further extensions of outdoor recreation on the public lands would be "an economic step backward."

Much of the opposition to added outdoor recreation is based on a belief that established business operations would be upset and that wages, profits, and taxes would be reduced in the locality or the region.
Commercial production would, of course, be eliminated or reduced on the site of lands reallocated to non-commercial use. But allowance must be made for offsetting effects and for other elements in the overall conservation program.

One of the elements in the overall program that must not be overlooked is the development and rehabilitation of wealth-producing natural resources. Of special interest to range management is the fact that forage resources on many public lands can be and are being developed to offset forage lost on lands no longer suited to or used for grazing.

Project areas demonstrate that striking gains in capacity can be economically achieved, and the overall addition is expected to return in the order of millions of dollars more per year to the local stockmen, in the form of added sales of products.
The Bureau of Land Management a few years ago estimated that two million acres of BLM lands could be economically re-seeded in a six-year program. Brush control on 2 million acres, 14,500 miles of fencing, and 7,000 water control and conservation sites were projected, to be followed by further work in later years.

Some have indicated a belief that as much as 25 million acres of Western brushlands in various classes of ownership can be economically seeded to grass in the long-range program.

The challenge created for the stockman-use of public lands was well stated in a recent article (in the June 1964 issue) of American Cattle Producer:

Federal land administrators do not create these demands; they merely try to resolve the problems of increased need for our restricted resources. The stockman's problem is no longer one of how he can keep the other uses out, but rather a
question of how he can keep grazing as an important part of the multiple-use of public lands.

This Administration believes in the future of domestic livestock grazing on public lands. It has demonstrated an intention to protect and stabilize domestic livestock grazing use at the same time as other worthy uses are protected and stabilized in a manner that will serve the public interest.

Another event occurring in Washington last week was a public hearing on rule making proposed by the Bureau of Land Management under two 1964 Acts of Congress. The Public Sales Act, and the Classification and Multiple Use Act. Witnesses reflecting many shades of Western opinion were heard, in Washington, but we have decided to hold further hearings in the West to allow others to be heard on these very important regulations.
One of the hearings has been set for Albuquerque on Wednesday, April 14.

I know that you are all interested in rumors about changes in the organization of the Bureau of Land Management districts and offices. The rumors reflect the activity based upon our search for ways and means of effecting economies, an effort I know you all support. But unrealistic changes will not be made in the name of economy. And economy to the public is just as important as economy to the government.

Director Stoddard has promised that any proposed change will be brought formally before the appropriate district board if it has not already been presented. The advice of the board will be carefully considered.

There may, up to now, have been a presumption that the geography of the boards had to coincide in all cases with the geography of the BLM management
areas. This need not be the case. The greatest merit of the district-level board -- its familiarity with local facts and opinion -- might be lost if it covered too large an area.

Another one of our responsibilities that affects many of you is our new responsibility under the Wilderness Act of 1964.

So far as the National Forest wilderness is concerned -- 9.1 million acres now in the System -- we are charged with continued administration of the U. S. mining laws and the Mineral Leasing Act. We are drafting regulations to carry in effect special provisions of the Act affecting minerals. When the regulations are publicly announced, they will be open to public comment and under our customary procedure all comments received are carefully considered before the regulations are finally written and adopted.
With regard to national forest primitive areas -- 5.5 million acres -- our geologists are starting mineral surveys, consisting mainly of mapping and reconnaissance. Reports of this work will be scheduled to coincide with reviews of these areas to be submitted by the Secretary of Agriculture on the question whether they should be added to the Wilderness System by Act of Congress.

With regard to Department of the Interior lands, both the National Park Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service are beginning reviews of "roadless areas" under their management. When these reviews are completed, public hearings will be held, and public views will be carefully taken into account before recommendations are submitted to the President.

I will take a minute also to comment on problems of the grazing use of public lands at the McGregor
Missile Range. Lands in this 660,000 acre range were reserved for the military in 1957 with a proviso that any grazing would be administered by BLM under the Taylor Act. Actually, all base ranch properties were bought up and all grazing was eliminated by the military -- at least on paper. In fact, however, unauthorized use has continued at a level of 6 to 8 thousand head of cattle and horses.

The question now is how to bring grazing back under control. BLM officials have proposed that grazing privileges be offered on the basis of bids without preference bidders.

Conservation in this decade, and in the longer future, is going to involve weighty judgments affecting wider segments of the community and the Nation. These judgments are too important to be left to the experts alone. Social judgments in a democracy
require involvement of the public.

Secretary Udall was entirely correct in telling the National Woolgrowers in January of this year that there is heartening evidence that the lines traditionally separating the "users" on the one hand and the "protectionists" on the other are being softened by reason and understanding. He was correct in judging that the relationship between Government and users of public lands had been improved. We intend to increase and widen these lines of communication, and we know that the cattlemen's organizations will continue to cooperate with us.

This kind of progress in reason and understanding is vital to the President's concept of the new conservation.

I would like to conclude this presentation this morning by going back to the subject of the Public Land
Law Review Commission. I have said many times that the passage of this legislation was one of the truly significant accomplishments of the 88th Congress or of any Congress. I am proud that I had the opportunity of assisting in the development of the concept for this Commission by working closely with Chairman Wayne Aspinall. Mr. Aspinall said last week that he was "optimistic that the Commission will be able to organize and start its work before the end of this fiscal year," in other words, before June 30, 1965. This is heartening news.

Mr. Aspinall made another observation which I would like to repeat:

"The establishment of the Public Land Law Review Commission, however, does not mean that all problems involved in the public lands must await the completion of the Commission study. Granted that the Congressional committees involved will be reluctant to consider general legislation during the period of study,
we have made it clear, from the time that the study was originally proposed, that matters of urgency should be and will be considered as they arise."

And he said in concluding his speech before the Meeting of the National Petroleum Council in Washington on March 25, "I am confident that both the Public Land Law Review Commission and the Congress will act, not only in what it considers to be the public interest, but within the framework of our free enterprise-private capital-business system. . . ."

The Public Land Law Review Commission will be an instrumentality for the "creativity" which the President seeks as the hallmark of the Federal system under his leadership.

For creativity, and the highest order of statesmanship is going to be necessary to meet the demands upon our inelastic land base -- not just the Federal Government's land base, but the land base generally.
In about three years, we will reach the 200 million we have said would come in the seventies. And, say the population experts, it is possible by the year 2010 that the population may conceivably exceed the 400 million mark. Most of our planning has been for 300 million by that time.

The need for creativity is correspondingly acute. President Johnson, in his Ann Arbor address, summarized the challenge:

"The solution to these problems does not rest on a massive program in Washington, nor can it rely solely on the strained resources of local authority. They require us to create new concepts of cooperation, a creative federalism, between the national capital and the leaders of local communities."