REMARKS OF UNDER SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, JOHN A. CARVER, JR., BEFORE THE LUNCHEON MEETING OF THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE IN SYRACUSE, NEW YORK, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1965

By coincidence, one week ago today I participated in a day-long program on the same subject which you are considering here in Syracuse. The differences between both the opportunities and the problems of economic development in a sparsely populated public land State like Idaho and a well developed populated area like Onondaga County, New York, is striking. You have almost as many people in a county of 792 square miles as Idaho has in 80,000 square miles. Your industrialization is virtually complete while theirs is hardly begun.

Yet in each case the conference emphasizes the theme of local action to get a fair share of the benefits of the growth of our country.

On a nation-wide scale, the responsible and conservative projections of our growth economy show that compared with 77 million in 1964, the national workforce in 1970 could total 85 million and 92 million by 1975; and average annual increase of about a million and a half a year.

The Nation's stock of capital for production will increase at 3.5 percent per annum.

Research and development and gains in the techniques of management will increase productivity.

Our GNP in 1975 could be almost one trillion 1963 dollars.

This growth will not be smooth nor even; it will not be spread equally over the United States.

Sharing in this growth, I told the people of Idaho, depended upon four principles which I will for purposes of comparison list for you:

a. The development of the resource and other potential of States like Idaho depends upon a sound working relationship with the Federal Government.

b. If the first piece of advice I present is that attention must be paid to relationships with the Federal Government, the second is that Westerners might improve their methods of understanding each other.

c. The topic--Excellence in Education--leads naturally to my third point. Admiral Rickover a few days ago said well a fact of our age: "Change is now part of life in all industrially advanced countries--continuous, rapid, all pervading change. The ultimate cause of this
unsettling situation is the explosion of science; factual knowledge doubles every decade or so. Its direct cause is the technological revolution: new knowledge is put to practical use about as rapidly as knowledge itself expands."

Admiral Rickover's excellent speech does not make the point but I think it a valid one nonetheless: that excellence of its educational system is as important a factor in how a State grows and develops as is the quantity or the quality of its natural resources.

d. Public officials at any level, Federal, State or municipal, who administer programs which involve a close interaction of the public and the private sector of our system have the same duty to comprehend the basic nature of the private sector, as that which I have urged upon you to understand the workings of government.

Government people should comprehend the problems of the businessman, if it is expected that business people are to comprehend the government man. Such a comprehension is really necessary if the people's interests are to be properly served. Programs have been started to help with this understanding. Brookings Institution, for example, brings executives from the businesses of America into Washington for two-week or six-month programs on how the Federal Government works. A similar program takes government executives into the offices of presidents, comptrollers, general managers and boards of directors of America's businesses.

I think this area has already mastered each of these four points so that I may proceed to discuss with you two special programs in which Congressman Hanley told me you are interested. One of these is outdoor recreation and the other one is pollution. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation of the Department of the Interior has reported to me that New York State became eligible for acquisition and development grants from the Land and Water Conservation Fund on October 9, 1965, when Bureau of Outdoor Recreation Director Crafts signed a letter of eligibility to New York Commissioner of Conservation, Harold G. Wilm, setting forth terms and conditions.

New York's outdoor recreation plan contains impressive data about recreational opportunities in the second region which includes Onondaga County.

This County, since passage of the State Park Bond Act in 1960, has acquired nearly a thousand acres of park and recreation land; it has ten county parks and two State parks; two State game preserves; and four State boat-launching sites.

The State plan proposes development for three of the county parks and development of an additional boat-launching facility on the Seneca River west of Syracuse. Oneida County Park, Onondaga Lake Park and Beaver Lake County Park would get further development.
Within Syracuse, three major areas are planned on the "park-school" concept. Elmwood Park would get a ski slope with a rope tow, ice skating area, an archery range, with a special area for court games and a day camp.

Of particular interest to me is the proposed Erie Canal Park which this County has asked the State to establish and develop for a broad range of outdoor recreation uses. Our experts consider this to be the most valuable single potential outdoor recreational resource, and at least at this time, it appears to meet the criteria for fund assistance if requested. The economic values of recreation to an area need no further selling.

Comprehension of what the pollution problem means to our society really requires a re-examination of the history of the conservation movement. In his book, The Quiet Crisis, Stewart Udall traced the awakening of the American conscience and its challenge to the present generation. In a broad but direct sense I think his book is at the root of contemporary definition of the conservation issues to receive national emphasis.

This modern conservation emphasis was stated most forcefully and comprehensively earlier this year when President Johnson sent to Congress a special message on America's natural beauty. The President concluded his message with this call to national duty:

"The beauty of land is a natural resource. Its preservation is linked to the inner prosperity of the human spirit.

"The tradition of our past is equal to today's threat to that beauty. Our land will be attractive tomorrow only if we organize for action and rebuild and reclaim the beauty we inherited. Our stewardship will be judged by the foresight with which we carry out these programs. We must rescue our cities and countryside from blight with the same purpose and vigor with which, in other areas, we moved to save the forests and the soil."

In one tight paragraph, the President bridged the gap between historical conservation interest and our current resource concerns. Gifford Pinchot met the challenge of dwindling forest preserves. John Wesley Powell fought to preserve powersites and to manage properly our semi-arid West. Franklin Roosevelt and Henry Wallace saw the dangers of soil erosion, dust bowls, the human waste of submarginal land cultivation and the consequent need for comprehensive river basin planning. Today this conservation tradition is an integral part of the Great Society which is our national goal, but it has to be restated in the context of our complicated, interrelated generation.

Gradually, we have moved from specific threats of commodity shortages--food, fiber and minerals--to the more general concern with our total environment and the social consequences of its despoliation. This is the burden of the President's message from which I just quoted.
The term "natural beauty" may give too restrictive an impression of the total objective. The message itself is not restrictive. We are not merely concerned with the cosmetic aspect of America's present and future. The message sets forth clear goals for wilderness preservation, parks and recreation areas, water and air pollution abatement and pesticide controls, as well as the highway beautification, urban redevelopment and underground utility installations that have made news.

America's "natural beauty" is therefore more than skin deep. It runs to the very root of an integrated, unified concept of an abundant life for a free and creative people. Modern society, with all of its technological complexes and pressures, breeds problems that our forefathers never faced. It is as important to this society that we protect and improve our natural environment as it is to produce a rising gross national product.

One needs only to look about him almost any place in the Nation to see the needs that the President has expressed. Cities in decay, streams reeking of bacterial growth, sprawling junkyard and billboard jungles—but we need not belabor these symptoms. Let us, instead, seek out their root in the context of the practical resource decisions which confront us. Let me emphasize that it is we who face these issues—for most of them cannot wait the potentially greater wisdom of another generation.

To put it another way, and somewhat bluntly, the issue facing us today is whether the most affluent society in human history is willing to live in the dung-heap of its own creation. Can we have a healthy society in a polluted environment any more than we can have healthy individuals brought up on poisoned air and polluted water?

The President's Science Advisory Committee has just issued its report on "Restoring the Quality of Our Environment". This significant document contains, in its section on recommendations, a subsection on "Principles". I would like to quote you a few of these:

"A1. The public should come to recognize individual rights to quality of living, as expressed by the absence of pollution, as it has come to recognize rights to education, to economic advance, and to public recreation. Like education and other human rights, improved quality of life from reduced pollution will be costly to individuals and governments.

"A3. The roles of all governmental authorities, local, State, and Federal, in pollution problems should be complementary and mutually supporting. While enforcement of pollution control is primarily a regional, State or local responsibility, there is much that the Federal government can and should do to support and supplement regional, State and local action.

"A5. All agencies and organizations concerned with pollution should strengthen programs that lead to better public understanding of pollution and its problems. Today there is particular need for better understanding
of the nature and extent of soil contamination and of the nature
of the values currently damaged by pollution.

"As our pollution problems become steadily more serious,
it should be generally recognized that we must consider our balances
and choices within successively larger and more complex systems.
Garbage disposal by burning, land fill, or household grinding, for
example, sends the resulting pollution to our air, to our soil, or
to our waters. In the last analysis, we cannot treat even these
three broad classes of pollution separately."

Restoring the quality of our environment presents the single biggest
challenge of our generation. For the reasons set forth above, and particularly
the last one, the interrelationships are so complex and the technological
implications so great that a whole new dimension of thinking and a capacity
for the manipulation of data are required.

In my opinion the most important thing for all of us to remember is that
we must accommodate the complexities of technology and the complexities of our
governmental relationships and the permutations and combinations of these
complexities are astronomical. As a result, there is sure to be some inequities,
certain to be some inefficiencies and undeniably increased friction between
the States and local subdivisions on the one hand and the Federal Government
on the other.

Here in New York there is a State program which has many imaginative
features which present many difficulties to the Federal officials who must
see the problem nationally.

Here in New York, particularly in New York City, there has been a tre­
mendous increase in public awareness. It is really remarkable to me that in
three sewerage bond votes last week--New York State, Kansas City and St. Louis--
the voter support was 4-1. The size of these bond issues clearly indicates
the Federal aid must be increased if it is to be useful to large cities,
but the States know that not much can be accomplished if the communities do
not accept their share of the responsibility.

President Johnson put the challenge to all of us in his speech at An Arbor.

"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 capitol and the leaders of
local communities."