# UNITED STATES
# DEPARTMENT of the INTERIOR

★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★news release

For Release to AM's of October 7, 1965

REMARKS BY STANLEY A. CAIN, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE AND PARKS, AT THE EVENING LECTURES ON "NATURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES IN AN EXPANDING POPULATION," AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, OCTOBER 6, 1965

## What Price Natural Beauty?

On February 8 of this year, in a landmark message to Congress, President Johnson said:

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

And yet, in our populous, industrialized, urbanized, affluent land, the defenders of environmental beauty -- when you come down to individual cases -- too often have been an embattled minority of crusaders, triumphantly winning one skirmish only to be defeated roundly in the next battle.

Though ignorance and apathy may have been involved in many of the battles lost, the pivotal question in the acquisition and continued protection of areas of natural beauty is becoming more and more a matter of cost -- dollar cost and social cost.

A few years ago the planners of such a conference as this might not have had the sophistication to raise the question of price in a lecture series devoted to conservation. That you have done so on this occasion is a sign of both necessity and of maturity. And necessity, the mother of invention, may well be the mother of maturity also.

Had you invited a real estate developer, a banker, a power company executive, or a government budget officer to address you on this subject, you would be hearing an analysis based on a different background of experience and knowledge. To the knowledge, values, and affinities that I bear as a result of being a biologist, I have added the experience of being a State Conservation Commissioner and, more recently, that of a Federal officer with responsibility for decisions often involving multifold conflicting demands.

The experience that I have had so far as Assistant Secretary of the Interior with responsibilities for fish and wildlife and parks makes me warier than ever of voicing easy solutions and wary, too, of viewing the conflicts as struggles between Saint George and the Dragon.

This is not a counsel of despair. Although there are problems in tonight's subject with no visible solutions, we are on the move -- moving to acquire new wilderness and recreational lands, moving to preserve what we have for the pleasure of future generations, moving to repair what is already despoiled, and moving to new channels of cooperation among Federal agencies, with the States, and with groups of citizens.

The job of salvaging the American heritage of a beautiful country is a prime concern of President and Mrs. Johnson, of Secretary Udall, of the Congress, of a large and dedicated Federal bureaucracy. It is a prime concern of cities and States, of many well known conservation organizations, of some labor organizations, chambers of commerce, and industries -- and of innumerable individuals.

I have learned much about the latter because of the letters that cross my desk every day. I find it heartening that there are so many men, women, and children who will take time to write personal letters to the President and to the rest of us who have some degree of responsibility for public property and the public interest in it. These letters which, in their petition to government, are themselves actions, call for action by government. Many plead for the protection of natural beauty, and they often are written in frustration and anger. This is good. This is the essence of democracy, for, as the President has said:

". . . A beautiful America will require the effort of government at every level, of business, and of private groups. Above all, it will require the concern and action of individual citizens, alert to danger, determined to improve the quality of their surroundings, resisting blight, demanding and building beauty for themselves and their children."

I will make some remarks about the acquisition by the Federal Government of areas of natural beauty. The history of the National Park System illustrates changes in the manner of acquisition and the spiraling of cost.

During the early history of the National Park System the public domain was important. Parks were carved out of it by Acts of Congress and National Monuments were created by Presidential decrees. Such areas, at the time they were set aside, had not yet been used or had been only slightly used. Sometimes the boundaries were drawn more or less at the frontier of use for livestock, lumbering, or mining. Also, one or more of the boundaries of a particular unit was the straight line of a given latitude or longitude, sometimes unexplored, often unmapped, and long to await exact determination on the ground. Although such units of the growing system included the known central features for which they were reserved, it was too early in history to have known whether a unit was complete and natural.

This point has been learned subsequently at Yellowstone, where the Park -- large as it is -- is not large enough to include adequate winter range for elk. By the time that Mount McKinley National Park was formed, nearly a half century later, there was an awareness of the requirements of the wide-ranging caribou and their accompanying wolves; but toward the north, in their winter range, there already was some mining. This caused Congress to hold back from including within the Park a sufficient total area. McKinley also illustrates the other point. Its opposite boundary is a straight line that cuts through the heart of the great Alaska Range, and scarcely anyone knows by thousands of feet east or west where the boundary is except as a line on the map.

Still later in the history of the System, National Parks were formed by gift to the Government. It was not that Park-quality lands were no longer to be found in the public domain, but that the need for Parks had become recognized and urgent where no public domain remained. Great Smoky Mountains National Park is a good example. The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Foundation gave $5 million which was matched by the States of North Carolina and Tennessee to buy private land.

Finally, we have entered on a new period in the history of the development of the National Park System -- that of appropriation by the Congress from general funds for the purchase of privately-owned land. The new National Recreation Areas, such as Delaware Water Gap, illustrate this phase.

The Bureau of Land Management in the Department of the Interior administers the remaining public domain. There still is some opportunity for dedicating such lands to park purposes. There are possibilities for the transfer of public lands from the jurisdiction of the United States Forest Service, as in the difficult case of the Northern Cascades, or from the Department of Defense, as in the potential Sonora National Park. In some cases land may be transferred from State ownership, as was the case at Isle Royale National Park. Generally speaking, however, new areas for parks and related units of the National System, as in the case of the State systems also, will have to be purchased from private owners.

What can we say, then, of the cost of preserving natural beauty?

Alexander Hamilton's plan to pay off the new nation's war debts by using the public domain in the West as a source of revenue was done in by the pioneers who were hungry for land. They prevailed, as Thomas Jefferson predicted they would, but the Hamiltonian policies did result in sales of immense areas to speculators. In the early days the Government also wooed Western development by divesting itself of public land by grants to canal and railroad companies. Also there were the school grants of Section 16 in many townships, lands that went to homesteaders, and in some cases to land barons. The Nation was short of dollars and short of settlers. But the public domain seemed to be and was described as boundless, endless, limitless; and so it became the medium of exchange to push the frontier toward the Pacific.

Few persons were disturbed by the visionary creation of National Parks and Monuments. We can say, then, that the cost seemed negligible. In those years the market price for such lands, when there was any market at all, was no more than a few dollars an acre.

Although there was no cost in the sense of money changing hands, we must remember that there has been the continuing cost of economic uses foregone. I refer, of course, to the natural resources that could have been extracted, had the areas not been dedicated to park purposes, and used to aid the economic development of the Nation: the timber that could have been cut and regrown; the water that could have been harnessed and put to work; the minerals that could have been mined; and the wildlife crops that could have been harvested. I do not mean to imply that the Nation has not received offsetting benefits for those foregone, but it is instructive to keep alternative uses in mind.

The Rockefeller family has been outstanding among philanthropic friends of the Nation by its purchase and donation of critical areas for National Parks. The roll call is impressive, including among others Acadia, the Jackson Hole extension of Grand Teton, Great Smoky Mountains, and Virgin Islands National Parks.

Also significant for the "public health" of the National Park concept has been the smaller contributions by tens of thousands of citizens, the dimes of school children and the dollars that families might otherwise have spent for more prosaic goods and services.

Today the citizen is being called on to carry much of the burden of land acquisition through governmental expenditure of a portion of his taxes for the re-creation of public lands, regardless of whether he is a park visitor. Also, the concept of user fees for recreation is just now being put to work for the first time on public lands in a systematic way. The Land and Water Conservation Fund will be supported in part by ear-marked taxes and by the annual auto sticker required of users of public lands and their facilities. There are other sources of contribution to this Fund, but it makes the point crystal clear, that the user of National Parks will contribute more to land acquisition than the non-user. The Park user, because he is a user, pays both general taxes and special ones.

And this is certainly fair. It is a safe bet, in my opinion, that the public will find that the auto sticker is a genuine bargain, perhaps a phenomenal one.

The probable cost of some of the Nation's ambitions for the preservation of nature is impressive. The proposed Redwoods National Park is an outstanding example. There is already a long history of redwoods preservation because these forest giants are so clearly of national, even international, interest. Over a hundred thousand acres are now included in California State Parks, due largely to the success of the Save-the-Redwoods League in stimulating interest and soliciting donations, but a sufficiently large area to assure adequate protection, including one or more entire watersheds, has yet to be acquired.

Toward this end the National Park Service, with private assistance, has made a study and put its findings before the public for comment. This study puts forward three plans involving different acreages. Commentators pro and con have come forward with their ideas, including the Sierra Club, the American Forestry Association, and the trade association of the redwood lumber industry.

Because of the interest of the President, the Department of the Interior, and a very large public, one can expect that a bill will be introduced in the next session of Congress, and that it will go for a certain but as yet unspecified acreage on which there will, of course, be a price tag. The three plans drawn up by the National Park Service range in area from 31,750 to 53,600 acres and the cost, although not estimated by the Service, could range well above $100 million.

The proposed Redwoods National Park is only one of several proposals to protect natural beauty that the people and the Congress expect to be financed from the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This expectation needs to be examined in the light of hard reality. Let us suppose, for instance, that the fund will yield $125 million for 1966 and that this may be the order of magnitude for some subsequent years. In such a case the Federal share would be about $40 million and, within that, the National Park Service's share would be about $20 million. The share of the 50 States would be about $85 million and California's share about $4 million. Assuming these levels, what do we face?

I think that one point is clear. The Fund seems like a horn of plenty, in contrast to our previous capability, and its establishment was one of the signal accomplishments of the 88th Congress. But can it meet all our needs? I believe that it is already psychologically over committed. It will not provide for all that the public expects of it.

Take the case of a sizable Redwoods National Park and assume that it would cost $100 million. That price would use up all of the expected funds of the National Park Service for five years, if all were devoted to the single project. If half of the Service's total share were devoted exclusively to redwoods, it would be a ten-year commitment.

Other National Park units already approved by Congress and still others likely to be approved in the near future will have legitimate claims on the Fund. It is hardly to be expected that all, or even a majority, of the available money will be spent on one project.

A second point should be equally clear. The responsibility should not, and cannot, be solely a Federal one. Several States are doing increasingly well, raising funds to match the Federal ones, and developing funds for independent programs; New York, New Jersey, Michigan, Wisconsin, California are among the leaders. Some States have passed enabling legislation that frees the hands of local government to take direct action, as in the case of Massachusetts and Connecticut. In some instances groups of citizens have banded together to strengthen their private philanthropic capacities by collective action. The Nature Conservancy and the National Audubon Society have functioned on a national scale in the acquisition of land for the protection of natural beauty, and the Philadelphia Conservationists, Incorporated, is an example of a group working locally.

Such volunteer citizens groups have effectively combated the inflation of real estate costs by their ability to use their funds for immediate purchase of threatened areas. Their acquisitions may be sold later to the Government at uninflated values and the money used again to acquire more land.

I would like to change our attention from the grand scale of national areas to needs and opportunities that exist everywhere, on a scale that is intermediate between our daily living and annual

vacationing. Every State, certainly, and every county, probably, has opportunities for preservation of natural beauty that challenge ingenuity. Sometimes the only price tag is the labor of love. I will give you an example from my own State of Michigan.

About twenty years ago I joined the research staff of the Cranbrook Institute of Science and became associated with a small group of knowledgeable amateur flower lovers, bird watchers, and rock hounds. Many of them spent weekends, holidays, and vacations roaming Michigan's wildlands searching for and enjoying natural beauty as they perceived it.

Among the men were two research chemists, a quality-control engineer, a labor organizer, a school superintendent and a teacher or two. The small group included wives, a few professional women and some students. Their days afield were balanced by weekly night meetings at the Institute when they worked on their collections, assisted the Institute in its endless tasks, looked at each other's colored slides and ended with a midnight, pitch-in snack. I do not remember that the word "recreation" was ever used to describe the fun these persons were having.

They lived in the Detroit metropolitan area. They saw the urban sprawl of the post-war Forties swallow up the cherished areas where they had found rare plants, the woods and swamps where interesting birds nested or were sought during migration. But some of what they enjoyed in nature was still around because it was part of the State's four and a half million acres of public land and the metropolitan area's ring of open space about Detroit. But even on public wildlands the threat existed. Roads, public utility easements and recreation facilities were enveloping natural areas.

Out of this frustration was formed the Michigan Natural Areas Council. From this small core group there developed an organization that grew to include on the Council representation of a dozen or two other groups such as the local Audubon Society and Botanical Club. Many individuals joined the band for the purpose of conserving natural beauty, including several professional scientists from the colleges and universities. The public's own acres under the jurisdiction of the Michigan Department of Conservation were the first target.

After endless hours of talk and exploration of idea after idea, there gradually emerged a few concepts of land classification with criteria for their management to preserve the integrity of each by the strict exclusion of all inappropriate developments and usage.

What these people conceived, expressing their concern through well-considered action, was a system that worked. State personnel got involved -- professionals from Lands, Parks, Forests, Fish, and Game Divisions of the State Department of Conservation -- and when the scheme was matured it was presented to the Department and its policy-making Commission and was accepted by both. But the Council did not stop with the idea.

It made its ideas concrete and explicit. Unit by unit proposals for land classification were put before the State officials. The ground had been well prepared. Suggestions of high-value areas needing maximum protection were explored on the ground by small committees of amateur and professional natural scientists. Their well-documented reports made an impressive case for maximum protection. The next steps were other committees that suggested the actual appropriate boundaries to delineate each natural area. These committees contained one or more employees of the State Department of Conservation so that when a specific proposal finally reached the Commission, the situation was already well known to the Department. Call it lobbying, if you will; it was a lofty public service, and it got the mission accomplished.

In no case during the years has a proposed natural area reached the point of presentation to the Commission without its being accepted, placed on the master plan for the State Park or Forest, and made an integral part of management. Management became an expression of policy that could be reversed only by the Commission. I was associated with the Council for more than a decade and then saw the arrangement from the other side as a Commissioner. To my knowledge, there has been no violation of the understanding.

I have taken the time to discuss the Michigan Natural Areas Council in some detail for two reasons. It shows clearly that preservation of natural beauty does not always involve high dollar costs. What the Council members invested was their time and energy and

brains. They worried the problem long and hard enough to find a workable system. They were, in this instance, not working on national problems, but ones near to home, to assist the preservation of natural beauty of places they could and did visit time and again.

The second point is both more complicated and obscure. It involves the necessity for constant vigilance by private individuals and organizations. At first, the attention of the Council was directed at lands already in public ownership, largely in State Parks, lands that one might assume were permanently well protected. In spirit and intent that is so, but in actual practical fact it is not necessarily so.

A State Park System, like the National Park System, is subject to both internal and external pressures for developments of various kinds and degrees. Each development may have relatively minor influence on a natural area but collectively and over time they menace its integrity. Public land-managing agencies cannot do without the constant scrutiny of their plans and actions by the Sierra Club, the National Parks Association, the Wilderness Society, State groups like the Michigan Natural Areas Council, and thousands of watch-dog citizens.

The problems for the public agencies are manifold. Without the help of interested persons, such as those of you in this audience, public administrators may have increasing difficulty resisting the power of the road builders. Paraphrasing Parkinson's law, bulldozers tend to increase to fill up the available parks.

And it will take all the understanding and skill that can be marshaled to protect the natural beauty of parks and other wildland areas in the face of the exponential growth of human population and its growing propensity -- and I would add, need -- for outdoor recreational opportunity.

This is not the time for me to speculate in any detail on measures that could be taken by Government, at its several levels, to protect nature while permitting its mass usage for appropriate recreation and outdoor experience.

Many suggestions have been made. Exclusion of mechanized travel from trails and wilderness waters, limitation of roads and expediting of traffic flow by one-way routes, limitation or exclusion of private vehicles and use of public transportation within National Parks, and careful zoning of areas of intensive use, are among the possibilities; yet much imaginative planning remains to be done. The Wilderness Act, one of the great accomplishments of the 88th Congress, is an important step in the zoning process because, once defined, these public wilderness areas would be inviolate. Only Congress could change their status.

I will now turn to a different aspect of: What price natural beauty? The post-war years have seen a tremendous, in cases fantastic, rise in the cost of real estate and this bears directly on the acquisition of lands of natural beauty and the preservation of open space that is already in public ownership. I will start with the situation faced by the cities.

An Associated Press story dated September 10, this year, recounts the battle in Chicago between "tree huggers" and the City. I did not misspeak, the tree lovers were tree huggers in their battle against the City which proposed to cut down 800 trees to widen and straighten South Shore Drive through three city parks.

The news story said:

> Conservationist Stuart Chase described the holding action on the lakefront yesterday: "They started up their chain saws and, with blades whirring, charged at us and cut the tree off right on top of us. They tried to drop trees on people and waved whirling chain saws at everybody." . . . Bernard Baum, 39, a sociologist, had sawdust in his hair as he talked to newsmen, his back pressed against a large tree: "I wrapped my legs around one tree trunk a little while ago, but they cut it down anyway." . . . The 75 or so stalwarts of the Burnham Association -- named for Daniel Burnham, who was responsible for the design of Jackson Park -- say the $6 million, high-speed, eight-lane divided road is no substitute for 800 trees and lost park space.

This is Chicago, famed for direct action and reaction. But the problem is almost universal and one question is whether traffic flow takes precedence over every other value.

City open space has been yielded to almost every use other than those of parks and beauty. Because parks are already public property, and because urban real estate is costly, City Fathers have permitted park property to be used not only for roads, but for parking lots, fire stations, libraries, and museums.

In Washington, Secretary Udall is leading a drive against the engulfment of the Nation's capital by autos and the roads to serve them. A news story, also on the 10th of September, mentioned almost in passing, that park land near the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials, where a proposed road would be placed in a tunnel to keep it from marring the beauty of the area, was valued at $1.7 million per acre.

One reason that public park land is so easily transgressed is that it has been free to road departments. It is my personal belief, when such lands must be sacrificed, that they should be paid for at full development value, just as private property owners are compensated for their land. As an alternative, developers could be required to replace the park land in kind. Parks would cease to be magnets for highway builders if a highway appropriation had to cover such costs. In a city it might be buying a block of apartments, razing them and landscaping the rubble into a park, as the price for paving a block of open park into the highway system. In this way a better appraisal of the cost of highway development would be available, and park agencies would have some money to mitigate losses and enable them to acquire land elsewhere. Parks in a good many cases would be left alone.

The rapid and enormous inflation of real estate is especially apparent when Government negotiators attempt to acquire private land within authorized public projects, whether local, State or Federal. This is experienced widely, but one case will be sufficient to make the point.

The Act authorizing Point Reyes National Seashore, approved in September 1962, carried a statutory limitation of $14 million for land acquisition. Since passage of the Act, land values have increased at such a rate that the statutory limitation has been reached with only about one-third the authorized area acquired. An

amendment has been proposed to raise the limitation to $44.5 million, in view of the more than 32,000 acres yet unacquired. The total cost of the project will be more than three times as great as the initial appraisal.

This distressing three-year history is not irresponsible appraisal by the National Park Service. It is a case of landowners having the advantage of there being one, and one only, committed buyer -- the Government. In such instances there is no longer a free market, and common market forces do not operate when the Government has declared its intention to establish a public project. Outside of the boundary of a new park area, land prices go up on a seller's market because many people like to live or do business near a park while others buy in anticipation of speculative profits. This inflation, due to a park proposal, raises prices to the government within the authorized area.

Much thought is being given to a solution of this problem. Somehow, the Government should be able to contract for purchases at a firm price. This is credit buying, certainly familiar to Americans, that requires a negotiable interest on unpaid balance. However, the credit of the Government should be good and the price it pays should not be grossly inflated in a few short years. Congressional Appropriations Committees, as you can appreciate, are as seriously concerned over the situation as the Executive agencies.

I do not feel that I can keep silent about the natural beauty of water and its price even though you have already heard my distinguished colleague, Luna Leopold, talk authoritatively about that natural resource.

A few years ago in northern Ohio an attempt to forecast water demand in an industrial area was partially frustrated because many industries did not know how much water they were using. When the cost of city water seemed high, a company would draw water from the river or sink its own well. In any case, it was too cheap to meter. Throughout much of our history water has been an economic "free good." It was there for the taking. It went with the land and its associated riparian or prior appropriation rights, or it cost no more than sinking a well to ground water.

Conditions have changed rapidly in many parts of the country. All water is no longer cheap, much less a free good. This is no better known than here in California, where you have a several-billion dollar water plan. At the same time, New York City is experiencing an agonizing reappraisal of its traditional and enormously wasteful, unmetered water service.

What price water? Let me enlarge the question. What is the place of water in natural beauty? What is the price of natural beauty of water? What is the Nation's need for free-flowing streams? What is the cost of impoundments of rivers in the loss of fish and wildlife values? What benefits to white-water canoeists are foregone? What scenic beauty has been replaced by muddy shores that follow the drawdown of reservoirs?

Although it is as difficult as putting a price tag on a sunset, these are very real questions that are posed on nearly every stream in the Nation. The answer has already been given on hundreds of miles of our finest rivers, including the Columbia, the Tennessee, and the Colorado. The Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the public utilities have further plans for the completion of stream development. The development goal has been reached by the Tennessee Valley Authority which has created a chain of pools from dam to dam, from the mouth to the headwaters.

Granting the Nation's important needs for water, we are nonetheless rushing ahead with a program that will completely remove all power of decision for future generations. Tomorrow there will not be the choice to dam or not to dam, for all rivers will have been dammed.

Today we are paying very dearly for the lack of foresight on the part of past decision makers. For example, land for recreation and open space and natural beauty that could have been bought for a few dollars is now costing thousands today. And we are willing to pay the price. What will citizens be willing to pay per mile for free-flowing rivers ten or twenty years from now? I do not know the answer to that, but when our decisions today preclude their choices tomorrow, we are, I believe, preempting beyond our moral right.

Forests will grow again, given a fair chance, although in the case of redwoods a millenium is scarcely time enough. But an extinct species -- one we have needlessly allowed to become extinct -- is gone forever. So it is, I think, with conversion of a wild river into a developed river. I may be wrong, but I do not see the possibility of desilting large reservoirs, much less removing all traces of outmoded major dams.

At the least, we can slow down the rate at which we are destroying all semblances of naturalness in streams, lakes, bays and marshes so that we may have time to think through where we are heading. Must we drain every acre of muckland for which there is an outlet and irrigate every acre of arid land for which there is water? Are we to develop every available reservoir site? Will we dredge a deep-draft channel in every coastal river and bulkhead the shores of every embayment? Must every road become a superhighway?

In short, are we going to meet every human economic desire, everywhere, regardless of the impact on the natural environment -- especially when meeting one kind of human desire precludes meeting another one? I believe we are coming to a public realization that we should not. President Johnson put this challenge to our generation in his remarks on signing the Assateague Island National Seashore bill:

> "If future generations are to remember us more with gratitude than with sorrow, we must achieve more than just the miracles of technology. We must also leave them a glimpse of the world as God really made it, not just as it looked when we got through with it."

Fortunately, technology is increasingly making it feasible to have both economic gain and natural beauty, by reducing the cost of preserving natural beauty. Extra-high voltage and direct-current transmission of electricity promise to enhance our ability to supply load centers from sources not seriously destructive of landscape beauty, and nuclear power at competitive costs will further enhance this ability. An experimental program of rapid rail service to transport masses of people in the crowded Northeast will shortly be undertaken and may have application elsewhere.

Advances in desalination technology are making possible serious consideration of salt water conversion as a source of water for coastal area populations. Restoration of eroded and worn-out lands, and greater production on existing lands reduces our need to bring new cropland into production. In fact, much more of our livestock and agricultural needs could be met in the humid regions without irrigating deserts where water may be more useful for urban and industrial purposes.

These are some of the developments that will make it increasingly feasible to consider alternatives to actions that would have severe adverse effects on our natural environment. Such developments are the continuing promise for a widened latitude of option available to coming generations -- a promise that will permit our generation, in many cases, to defer decisions that would irrevocably damage the landscape.

In this way we can give coming generations the priceless gift of choice, but only if we have the patience to wait today. I believe we must avoid the impulse to hasten into irrevocable decisions involving natural values at the first indication of economic need.

And these decisions are ones that you, the public, have a voice in. After all, practically all the actions that affect the beauty of our landscape are either supported by public programs or are controllable by public officials. Rivers are dammed and impoundments created by Acts of Congress, by our representatives. Highway locations, conversion of marshes to dumps and other actions result from decisions of public officials. If we do not like what is being done "in the public interest," let it be known what our interest is.

Similarly, what would do more to restore and maintain natural beauty than to rid our streams, lakes, estuaries, and seas of pollution? In correcting current practices that pollute water needlessly, we can make it once more aesthetically attractive. I see no reason why we should permit discharge of polluted water into the sea and into lakes. We have the power to see that water is cleaned up, kept clean, and re-used.

We are part of the public owners. We have the right of petition, but to use it is our decision. Strength has to be marshaled and applied effectively, as effectively as that of any skilled lobbyist for any special profit-making interest. This takes time, energy, brains, cooperation, and dedication. This is a cost. It must be borne if we are to live with beauty -- in our cities, in the countryside, in the wilderness.

President Johnson recognized the question that faces us tonight -- what price natural beauty? -- for he said:

> "Beauty is not an easy thing to measure. It does not show up in the gross national product, in a weekly paycheck, or in profit and loss statements. But these things are not ends in themselves. They are a road to satisfaction and pleasure and the good life. Beauty makes its own contribution to these final ends. Therefore, it is one of the most important components of our true national income, not to be left out simply because statisticians cannot calculate its worth."

# # #