U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION ALAN S. BOYD, BEFORE THE INTERNATIONAL AIR TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1968, MUNICH, GERMANY

It is a pleasure to join you today in speculating on the future role of aviation - a pleasure diluted only by something the humorist Mark Twain once wrote about speculation in the month of October.

October, he said, is one of the particularly dangerous months for speculation. Also dangerous, he said, are July, January, September, May and the other seven.

Mark Twain was talking primarily about stock speculation. I take it to apply to any form of conjecture that involves the future behavior of man, his politics, or his machines.

I know it holds true for predicting the demand for air travel in the United States where the best minds in aviation and government have consistently underestimated the annual growth in airline passengers.

Unfortunately, there are two ways to make sure that even the most reticent of men will talk. One is to ask about himself. The other is to ask how he views the future. And - since you have asked - I do just happen to have some thoughts on aviation in the 1970's and beyond.

The safest statement anyone can make about the future of aviation is that it not only will but must continue to grow and to bind the nations of the world closer together.

President Johnson said recently that of all of man's inventions, "the airplane. . . has done most to bring individual peoples of the world together in friendship." "War," he said, "leans on ignorance," and aviation makes possible the direct, widespread understanding among people that banishes ignorance.

Another safe guess about the future is that aviation can never again consider the sky the limit. From now on, the ground is the limit. And congestion on access highways and in parking lots and delay in terminals, on taxi ramps, and on the runways will continue to cancel out technological advances in aircraft until we apply as much talent and energy to solving the ground problems as we do to supersonic flight.

The future not only of aviation but of all transportation will depend also on how well we are able to soften the impact of transportation on a world whose people are increasingly crowded together; increasingly vulnerable to noise, pollution and disruption of their neighborhoods and lives.

Finally, I believe the future of aviation will rest in large measure on how well the industry and governments respond to the broadest concept of public interest.

All of these guesses have a direct bearing on the theme of this symposium - the integration of air transport into a total future transport system. It is an especially logical topic since nearly all air trips and nearly all air shipments involve at least one other mode of transportation. I have been asked to direct my comments especially to the total transportation picture in North America and to the role of air transport.

What I will ask of you today is quite simple. I ask

--That you be aware of the desires of aviation customers;

--that you be aware of the opportunities for exploiting new technology;

--and that you act with a true awareness of the impact of your actions on society as a whole.

We accept them because they are essential parts of a larger goal - the exchange of ideas that lead to greater understanding among nations; the exchange of goods which fosters economic development and higher standards of health and living for the people of those nations.

In making this exchange possible, transportation leads many lives. In one life, it represents the nation whose flag flies above its merchant fleet or is painted on the vertical stabilizer of its jets. And the showing of the flag is for great trading nations both a source of income and of pride.

Transportation in another life represents a challenge for the men who operate the system - who make up schedules, sell space, fly the jets and work through the night getting them ready for flight. This is the life of challenge; of the drama of the high-speed train, the giant liner; the sleek jet; that gives transportation romance for so many citizens of the world.

But the life we are here to consider is the life of service to people. A four-engine jet airliner has no intrinsic value. It is, of course, a work of art - but far too cumbersome for any museum now in existence. It has value - as does a car, a train, a ship - only in the service it provides.

Which brings us to the question of the customer.

In the U.S., we have trouble predicting how many there will be. Over the last decade we have continually fallen short with our air traffic predictions. The facts keep outrunning our forecasts. Between 1966 and 1967 the number of passengers carried by U.S. airlines increased by 21 percent while GNP advanced by less than 3 percent in constant dollars. Over the last five years air passengers have more than doubled while GNP increased by 27 percent in constant dollars.

The data are rather crude, but we estimate that passenger miles of intercity trips in the U.S. have increased by 25 percent over the last five years. The rapid growth of air traffic in the 60's has been single handedly responsible

for reversing a trend which was giving to common carriers a declining share of U.S. passenger mileage. The figures for intercity freight are even cruder but educated guesses indicate that the ton mileage has increased by about 27 percent over the last five years while the air cargo ton mileage has more than doubled.

Over the next five years we expect the number of U.S. air carrier passengers to grow by about 80 percent again and we cannot even hazard a guess about air cargo.

During the 60's there has been a kind of natural, self-reinforcing mechanism to boost the demand for air travel. Airlines converted to jets so that the air portion of the trip was substantially speeded up and made more comfortable while fares held steady or decreased. Flight services and advertising improved. And the public reacted. More and more people took their first flight; seasoned air travelers flew more and more. As demand increased, better service increased demand. Unless you take a second, closer look, you could easily believe this has become an automatic process. But that is not necessarily the case, or, if it is, it will not necessarily remain so.

One of the important factors for the future of the air carrier industry will be its awareness of transportation demand and its determinants. But an awareness of the number of customers will be far less important than an awareness of their desires. The potential passenger bases his decision of whether to travel and what mode to use on his view of the time, the cost, the comfort, the safety, the reliability and the convenience of the entire trip. This means, in the case of air travel, not only that he wants a comfortable, fast, and inexpensive flight but that he doesn't want to spend much time getting to the airport, buying a ticket, finding his baggage, or looking for a taxi or bus. The air shipper has a whole set of desires of which the industry must be aware. He wants rapid, reliable, damage-free delivery at a reasonable price and doesn't really care whether this is accomplished by better pickup and delivery service or faster and more direct flights. What he is concerned with is the total cost of distributing his products.

It is these kinds of factors which determine transportation demand in general and of air transport demand in particular. The industries which serve this demand must put themselves in the shoes of the customers and view the trip, as he would, from start to finish, from door to door.

Part of the industry's ability to meet the customer's needs will be its awareness of the opportunities for exploiting new technology. Nor can the industry concentrate on aviation technology alone. Advances in ground transportation have implications for air transport every bit as crucial as advances in airplanes.

We are now doing research on different systems of high speed ground transportation - systems such as vacuum tubes which are theoretically capable of speeds from 300 to 400 miles per hour. Tube systems with electro-magnetically suspended vehicles are capable of still higher speeds. These are experimental and prospects for implementing them are very uncertain. In contrast, the technology of tracked air cushion vehicles appears to be somewhat closer. The French have already conducted tests at over 200 mph.

Meanwhile, in the near future two of our railroads will begin high-speed passenger service over a 450 mile distance in the most densely populated region of the U.S., the Northeast Corridor. Two trains will be used - one powered by jet turbins and the other by an electrical system more advanced than any in current railroad passenger service in the United States.

We are also studying the place of short-takeoff and vertical-takeoff aircraft in the system. The prospect of landing and taking off within such short distances is indeed attractive given the value of urban real estate. The noise question will be a significant issue in the future of VSTOL. Because of this problem it might be difficult to exploit the inherent advantage of operating from downtown airports because of the unacceptable noise created there. We have reached a stage of development where we can afford to give up some commercial value or perhaps pay for more expensive suppression devices or less convenient airport locations for the sake of environmental quality.

At the same time, research is taking place on the components of automated highways, although we have yet to integrate the components into overall systems. A more feasible concept within the present state of the art is a program for transportating automobiles and their passengers on trains.

In freight transportation, the more promising areas for improvement to be either at transfer points and modal interfaces of different types or in streamlining of the documentation, paperwork and planning associated with shipments and with operation of large systems. Examples of innovations are automated sorters, cargo stackers and conveyors in airline cargo terminals; computerized information systems for keeping track of and routing railroad freight cars; ships designed to facilitate the handling of containers and designed to carry satellite barges; and air cushion pallets.

The use of multi-mode containers such as piggyback trailers has continued to increase though the rate of increase of piggyback loadings has slowed in recent years.

In air transportation, two innovations are on the horizon and of particular interest. One is the reduction in transport cost for both passengers and cargo particularly over longer ranges which will come about as a result of more efficient jumbo jets. The other but perhaps limited to overseas use is the reduction in trip times which will come about through the availability of supersonic travel. Evidence of this is the fact the U.S. airlines as of mid May had over 250 jumbo jets on order and have reserved 97 delivery positions for the two supersonic aircraft.

In parallel with these advances, the Department, through the FAA continues to automate air traffic control functions, with nationwide completion of installation scheduled for 1973. Meanwhile, we are testing an all weather landing system to further reduce the number of times airports are closed by poor visibility.

As a result of these and previous advances in air technology, the time and cost devoted to terminal activities and to airport access become increasingly important. It is to these matters that the Department of Transportation

is devoting more and more attention. Recently, the congestion at certain large airports, including JFK International Airport with which you are all familiar, has been so severe that the Department has had to propose rules limiting the number of hourly flights at these places. This is only a temporary expedient. In the long run the solution is better utilization of airport capacity and more airport capacity. Despite the fact that the new aircraft will be able to handle a larger number of passengers per flight we foresee a continued increase in the number of flights in our 22 large metropolitan areas. One study indicates that if present trends continue, the number of flights by scheduled air carriers serving metropolitan areas will have increased by 143 percent in 1980 in comparison with 1965.

Our policy in the U.S. Government has been that the development of air terminals is primarily a responsibility of the local metropolitan communities and the companies served by the terminals and that the users of such facilities should pay for their development. Federal aid has been only a small percentage of terminal development cost. The government is trying to encourage more, efficient terminal utilization through advocacy of the use of differential pricing so that landing fees can be effective in reducing peak hour congestion. We are also interested in better coordination with modes of terminal access. For example, we are conducting a before and after study to evaluate the effects of the new rail link at Cleveland Airport and have developed an airport terminal simulation model.

The industry should play an important role not only in the finance of new terminals but also in the development of innovations such as satellite terminals for buses and helicopters serving the airport and rail links to densely populated downtown areas. Improving conditions of airport access and terminal capability is in the long run the key to the continuing success of air transport.

My third point regarding what the industry should consider if it is to remain a competitive healthy member of the transportation community is that it should be aware of impact of its actions on society as a whole. This same fact holds true for all transportation industries.

There is renewed interest in the United States in improving the quality of our environment. We have for decades had an excellent National Parks program but it is beginning to dawn on us that most of our waking hours are spent, not in National Parks, but in and around metropolitan areas. It is also becoming clear that we must devote as much attention to the quality of the cities as we do to parks and wilderness areas. We have found that transportation facilities have in the past been built with little regard for their aesthetic qualities or for their relationship to the surrounding communities. We can no longer disregard these factors. In a number of cities we have sponsored special teams of architects, engineers, and sociologists to work out routes and designs for urban highways with maximum participation by the local citizens themselves in the planning and design process.

The problem of airport location is a case in point. Airports are very noisy neighbors. No community wants an airport located too close to its residential areas. New airports must typically be located at some distance from settled areas and provision must be made for nearby development to be more compatible with airports and more tolerant of the noise. New aircraft will not be allowed to land at existing airports if they significantly exceed current noise levels.

If the public is to benefit to the fullest from the improved service made possible by our economic growth and tecnological development the many autonomous, yet, in the final analysis, interdevelopment groups must work together. Perhaps the biggest challenge in the next 20-30 years is to find a way to pass on the benefits of technology to the public. It will benefit the public little if we merely design systems without defusing their practical application and use to the fullest extent. This is true not only in the field of aviation, but in relating aviation to the whole transport system. It may be difficult to see how an integrated transportation system can be achieved without regulation. Yet it is necessary for those responsible for the promotion and regulation of transportation to review the needs of the present and future to assure that transportation is not hampered by past controls. We must think anew how we can best develop a total transportation system and not be encumbered by the bonds of tradition and prejudice. If aviation is to become a meaningful part of an intergrated transport system airline operators must give more attention to the pasengers' whole trip and not assume that your responsibility is limited to carrying the passenger from one airport to another.

The airline passenger/cargo base is becomming larger and a concerted effort in developing the concept of total distribution may do much to further increase your markets. International aviation is no longer an infant industry. In fact, the development, on your part, of an enlightened and imaginative position in regard to the formulation of ideas and programs may well be the catalyst that is required to give impetus to a total transport system.

A transport system that will meet the demands of international trade and travel will, in all probability, be more than sufficient for the needs of a region or country. However, it does not follow that the transportation needs of a region or country will fully meet the needs of international trade and travel. Advances in technology are giving us the equipment to enable costs to be reduced. Yet these benefits are not enjoyed to the fullest because of man-made barriers. These range from the actions of narrow self-interest on the part of management to the broadest questions of national policy. Although we may understand these practical considerations, I wish to emphasize with all the power at my command that we must press for concepts in our international relations that will match in imagination the technology of today.

One major area in great need of development is the matter of facilitation. This subject cuts across all levels of trade and travel and requires the active consideration and action programs on the part of all those responsible for developing transportation. The fact that facilitation is so broad is, I am afraid, often used as an excuse for a segment of those responsible to pass the buck. I feel that the traveling and shipping public have been long suffering and deserve better treatment. We must act in improving the facilitiation of passengers and things between population centers and the airport, to and from the airport and the airplane, through the airway system and clearance over national borders.

Power, sophisticated metals, size of the system, and profits may be indicators of a total transportation system but in the last analysis, the facility of the movement of passengers and things is the real measure of the success - or failure - of a total transport system. Automated check-in and baggage handling for passengers; rapid movement of the passenger from the curbside to aircraft; containerization for express and freight; improved schedule, reservation and ticket data; and modernization of inspection formalities must be given more attention.

What does all this mean for IATA? First of all, IATA must recognize that the United States is firmly committed to the full exploitation of technological innovation and economic progress for the benefit of travelers and shippers. The importance of this position is accentuated at a time when we anticipate the introduction of new, high-capacity, more efficient aircraft like the 747 and the air bus. They hold out the promise of improved air service and lower fares. But that promise will only be realized for the benefit of the traveling public if IATA adopts a posture of policy leadership that is as advanced in matters of pricing and marketing as is aircraft technology in the development of new equipment. This will call for a considerably more aggressive approach than has prevailed up to now. It would be a disservice to our primary constituent, the public, to remain committed to policies that are calculated mainly to avoid disruption of the economic status quo.

In the past, I am afraid that point has sometimes been lost sight of, with the result that IATA - and its members - have become overly concerned with minimizing the destablizing effects associated with the introduction of new aircraft and new marketing concepts. The time has come to rid ourselves of that frame of mind and aggressively search for ways that will give the public its full share of the gains that stem from technological innovations. This clearly implies the need for a less restrictive market environment, with more flexibility in pricing and marketing of international airline service. IATA can, and should, take the lead in creating a far more competitive atmosphere - one that looks to the exploitation of modern technology. This will call for changes in many established policies and attitudes. I am convinced, however, that unless such changes are forthcoming, IATA may not be able to survive as a meaningful international economic organization in this advanced technological era.

I urge a renewed recognition of your essential founding principle - the promotion of "safe, regular and economical air transport for the benefit of the people of the world" - and all that that enlightened goal implies.

I realize that what I urge is no simple matter. Certainly it is difficult to bring about substantial change, and traditionally, many of us tend to be satisfied with a posture which reacts only to periodic crises. But let me here and now issue a call to all concerned - governments, management, labor, travelers, and shippers - to see that individual, organizational, and governmental thinking is restructured, refocused, and redefined - not merely for the sake of change - but in the interest of progress. You will find the United States a firm ally in this cause.

# # # #

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, ALAN S. BOYD, THE CARDINAL O'HARA LECTURE, NOTRE DAME UNIVERSITY, IN NOTRE DAME, INDIANA, ON TUESDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1968, 3:00 P.M.

I am delighted to have the opportunity to visit this great University on any pretext. I am honored to be here as a Cardinal O'Hara lecturer.

I have had more experience with plain old-fashioned speeches than I have with academic lectures. And when I was invited to join you today, I began trying to draw a line of distinction between the two.

It is not easy to do.

But I finally come to the conclusion that speeches have jokes while lectures have footnotes. And then - since I have read a good many footnotes that were funnier than most jokes - I decided to proceed as though there were no difference at all.

I suspect I should start from the very beginning - with a brief description of what the Department of Transportation is. It is difficult to explain what we are doing even if you know what we are. It is impossible to explain if you don't.

The Department is a cabinet-level department, created by the Congress 18 months ago at President Johnson's request, which has jurisdiction over all Federal transportation programs except maritime. Why that is so is another lecture, altogether. It includes the Coast Guard, the Federal Aviation Administration, the Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Railroad Administration, the Urban Mass Transportation Administration; and the St. Lawrence Seaway.

As nearly as we can tell, Thomas Jefferson's Secretary of Treasury, Albert Gallatin, was the first one to propose such a department, back in 1805. I do not think it would be fair to speculate that the idea spent 161 years going through various Federal clearance procedures.

The fact is that the country's transportation system served the nation well during most of its history - growing, as it did, as a series of independent networks of railroads, and harbors, canals and turnpikes. When this was a rural nation; when there was still land for homesteading and the crying need was for any kind of transportation that would get crops to market; it was difficult to promote such abstract notions as more efficient allocations of resources; more specific analyses of the system; broader consideration of alternative modes to meet specific requirements.

All of that has changed. Today, a man cannot grow strawberries in California for the eastern market without being concerned about the highway network on Long Island. Because he has to take into account how much of the time he saves by shipping his strawberries air freight is going to be eaten up in traffic at the other end of the line. By the same token - and because this is a complex industrial society - it is no longer possible to think simply in terms of the nation's transportation problem.

Transportation - as with so many other problems facing the nation today - has a way of ignoring Federal wishes; of spilling over from one jurisdiction to another; of refusing to adapt itself to established pigeonholes of organization charts and political subdivisions, and indeed, political prejudices.

Because it has a common impact, it requires common action. And, as we are discovering, we cannot deal with transportation in isolation - because the solution to the problems of moving people and cargo cannot be found without finding solutions to other problems as well.

The result is that neither in government nor in the private sector can we proceed with business as usual; or, more accurately, with business as it used to be - or at least as we fondly remember it.

Relations between the public and private sector have undergone radical alterations during the decade of the sixties.

For its part, the Federal government has deliberately designed its policies and programs - economic and social - to enlarge and enhance the role of the private sector in the pursuit of national goals.

And for their part, the leaders of the business world have come to realize and accept their responsibilities for helping solve the problems that confront cities and communities throughout the land as well as the nation as a whole.

Both government and business have discovered the remarkable feats they can accomplish when they work as allies rather than as antagonists - when they seek, not cause for conflict but common cause in the national interest.

And as more and more people crowd into proportionately less and less space - so that it gets hard to put your foot down without stepping on somebody's toe - and as anything that happens anywhere in the world is only an electronic impulse away, we discover that we must make more and more choices in common.

We begin to face up to the fact that the choices available to each of us individually depend on the kind of environment we create for all of us together. Our ability to make any genuine individual choices at all, in fact, will depend on how sensibly we act in building our educational and health and recreational facilities; upon our transportation system; upon the quality of the air we breathe and the water we drink; and upon the extent to which all of our citizens have ample incentives and opportunities for a decent education, a decent home and a decent job.

Transportation is one prime example of this sort of domestic domino effect. In the past, we have, in effect, exercised social choice in transportation without really knowing it - buying automobiles and building highways without taking fully into account the implications of these decisions.

No family, for example, considers a move to a suburban home with a two-car garage as having any consequences beyond the benefits it brings to the family itself.

Yet, the effect of a hundred thousand such decisions may be the relative decline of a downtown business district; relocation of firms; disintegration of the central city's school system; the isolation of the poor and the disadvantaged within the central city; removal of valuable land from the city tax rolls as more and more freeways are built; and many other adverse consequences.

The same pattern prevails in the spread of air and water pollution - and, most importantly, in the sometimes unintended but devastatingly effective isolation of the Negro American from even the most ordinary opportunities available to almost every other American of a different color.

The moral is very simple:

--First, both in the public and private sectors we are going to have to accept responsibility for the broad public and social consequences of all our policies and programs. We must foresee these consequences - and forestall those that threaten to undo any good result the program was intended to produce.

--Second, we are going to have to work together in this task, each of us doing what each can do best.

The private market works wonders - it is the most efficient and appropriate machine ever invented by man for satisfying individual needs. But it is not always so satisfactory in meeting public needs.

Unfortunately, no amount of Federal money - no panoply of Federal programs - can meet these needs either.

What is required - even for the success of the Federal programs - is that partnership I have mentioned between the

public and private sectors: The partnership President Johnson has termed "creative federalism" - federalism with a small "f."

And when we talk about transportation, we talk about people - for it is people that transportation is designed to serve - and cities - because that is where most people live and work.

And that means that when we talk about transportation, we talk first about all the problems people have in cities because that is where nearly two-thirds of our people are.

It means:

--First, that each urban area itself must decide what kind of transportation best serves and suits its particular needs. Obviously, the system that works best in Las Vegas or Los Angeles is not likely to be the system that works best in South Bend or San Francisco.

--Second, any assessment of the role of any segment of our urban systems must be made in the context of the system as a whole. We should not build airports without adequate access roads or rails - or undertake extensive road building to accommodate automobiles without taking into account the feasibility of rail or other mass transit.

-- Third, as I have suggested, transportation exerts as powerful and pervasive an effect upon the air we breathe as it does upon the way we live. It enables the affluent to enjoy the blessings of suburban living and convenient access to all the services of the city without really paying for it.

But that pattern of life condemns the poor to the inner city and cuts them off from access to the jobs and other opportunities they must have to sustain themselves; maintain their dignity. Because, therefore, transportation has such a powerful impact upon the total environment in which it operates, then that impact must be the most important factor in deciding the direction and shape a transportation system ought to take.

What we must do, therefore, is replace the old accidental approach to transportation planning with a systems approach - looking at transportation as a system, as an organic whole, whose job is to serve the city in which it operates and the people who live there.

And we must broaden the old cost-benefit formula to include a kind of social cost accounting - that considers the broad social costs and consequences and benefits of transportation decisions, as matters not of secondary but of supreme concern.

The Department of Transportation is engaged in hundreds of programs and projects and investigations to help the urban areas and the transportation industry achieve these ends. But we can do no more than help.

The urban areas must decide for themselves what kinds of transportation systems they need. And before they can do that they must decide what kinds of cities they want to be, how they want to grow and what shape they want to take.

We are encouraging these decisions. We are supporting them in their efforts to develop systems that suit their total needs and serve their people.

We are fully aware of the handicaps under which most of our urban areas labor - the overlapping and obsolete jurisdictions, the lack of funds, which increasingly impede their efforts to cope with the incredibly difficult problems before them.

We are also fully aware - in transportation and in other fields - that Federal policies have sometimes been in conflict and we are moving to provide better coordination of these policies at the source.

We have recently, for example, transferred the Urban Mass Transportation to the Department of Transportation so that the work of designing a total system for a city can be done under one roof.

We believe our next step should be to develop programs that would permit cities - backed by Federal assistance and free from rigid program categorization to define and attack their most urgent transportation problems as they interpret them at the local level.

We have laid the groundwork for such an approach. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968, for example, makes it possible for the first time for a city to get Federal funds

to improve its existing expressways instead of building new ones. Under this new program, money is also available for fringe parking facilities and computerized traffic signals and a variety of other methods of increasing the capacity of existing road systems at relatively low cost.

We hope in the months ahead to remove another restriction from the mayors of cities who have billions of dollars available for streets and freeways and only a few millions available for public transportation.

In the long run, the Federal Government should be able to make available - on even terms - an entire inventory of techniques and money so that a mayor could choose the approach that best suits his city's overall approach to transportation planning.

The city has priority in our study and deliberation because it is the most challenging area of American transportation. And it is the most challenging because it represents the most difficult problems. We have solved the problems of long distances. It is the short distances that are giving us trouble.

I have been concentrating to this point on the abstract phase of the work of the Department of Transportation. We have our share of hardware, too. And we are no more immune to its noisy charm than any American.

We are involved in studies of the use of laser beams for tunneling. We are sharing the cost of experiments with an air-gulping vehicle that, in theory, can move at supersonic speeds in tunnels. We are building an air-cushion vehicle that will be powered by a linear induction motor. And next Monday, we will accept delivery of two jet-powered trains capable of speeds up to 170 miles an hour. We will use them in a two-year test between Boston and New York to discover whether people who say they love to ride trains really mean it. And we are involved in studies of the uses of helicopters and helicopter-compounds; of airliners that can scramble into the air with half the take-off run of conventional planes.

But while there is no denying the fascination of a train roaring along a test track at 170 miles an hour with its air horn screaming, we are just stuffy enough to wonder after it

has gone by where it fits into the system. Because the train - like all components of the transportation network - has value only as it provides a service to people. And improving the service - making it easier and safer and less expensive for people to move from one place to another - is our mission.

Carrying out our mandate to improve the system is neither a short-term nor an easy task. It will involve listening more to endless columns of statistics compiled by economists than to train whistles. It will involve years of accommodation among pressure groups and of fitting together pieces of a network that is exceeded in complexity only by the people who use it.

The question - for example - is not whether we can build a fleet of radio-controlled, ocean-going container ships but whether labor's stake in the jobs that would be eliminated on the ships and on the waterfront would prevent our building them.

But I feel about the job much the way that the French Marshall Lyautey did the morning he walked onto the grounds of his estate to talk with his gardner.

He said he thought they ought to plant a tree in a corner of the grounds and the gardner said he would get around to it sooner or later. "After all," he told the Marshall, "it will take 100 years to grow."

"In that case," the Marshall said, "plant it at once."

Thank you.

# # # # # # #

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY STANFORD G. ROSS, GENERAL COUNSEL, BEFORE THE JOINT CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CASUALTY AND SURETY EXECUTIVES AND THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CASUALTY AND SURETY AGENTS AT THE GREENBRIER, WHITE SULPHUR SPRINGS, WEST VIRGINIA, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1968, 9:00 A.M.

This is a season for speculation. Everyone is guessing who will win the election in November, what a new Administration will do about Vietnam, crime, civil disorders and a host of other important domestic and foreign problems.

It is thus appropriate to discuss the Department of Transportation study of the motor vehicle accident compensation system -- for even though it is just beginning and a good deal of what can be said is no more than speculation, it is inevitable that all concerned must look ahead.

As you may recall, the Study was authorized on May 22, 1968, by a Joint Resolution of Congress; and the $1.6 million appropriation needed to carry out the study was first made available on August 8.

These two actions culminated many months of intensive consideration whether there should be a comprehensive study of the accident compensation system and, if so, the most appropriate way to conduct such a study.

The DOT Study may be traced back to October 1966 when a bill was introduced to establish a Federal Motor Vehicle Insurance Guarantee Fund to help protect policyholders from insurance company insolvancy. It soon became evident, however, that company insolvencies could not be treated in isolation. Hearings on that bill brought forth many citizens' complaints about a whole host of automobile insurance problems.

In June 1967, Senator Magnuson, Congressman Moss and Secretary Boyd began discussing the possibility of the Department undertaking a detailed study that would go beyond insurance industry practices and cover the entire automobile accident compensation system. While these discussions were going on the staff of a House Judiciary Antitrust Subcommittee started a preliminary automobile insurance study. In October 1967 they published a 183 page report recommending that further study be undertaken by the Federal Trade Commission. On December 14, legislation was introduced authorizing a DOT study to be conducted in cooperation with the Federal Trade Commission and other knowledgeable Federal agencies.

Hearings on this legislation were held during the early part of 1968. During the hearings it became clear that virtually everyone was concerned about the adequacy of the accident compensation system. But not everyone was agreed that DOT should be the one to undertake an in-depth study of the system. Some Congressmen believed that a detailed study would only hold up legislative correction of defects in the system they believed required immediate remedy. They felt the facts in some areas had been sufficiently developed to demonstrate serious problems that demanded immediate legislative action. Others, while admitting the need to develop the facts further, thought that an adequate study could be more quickly completed by a Congressional Committee, thus permitting more prompt legislative solutions. As an accommodation of some of these views, it was agreed during the hearings that the DOT Study would not interfere with a study of the automobile insurance business now underway by Senator Hart's Antitrust Subcommittee.

These hearings and other Congressional actions have demonstrated the National scope and importance of the problem and the public's urgent desire for prompt and sound corrective action. Congress, however, has also made clear that it wants to avoid hasty and ill-conceived solutions. It is now widely recognized that there must first

be a comprehensive analysis of the problems in all their aspects and a full and frank development of whatever steps have to be taken to meet the problems. And the DOT Study is a response to this clearly expressed National need.

With this background in mind, I would like to bring you up to date on the progress of the Study so far, set out our immediate plans, and speculate a little about the future course the Study is likely to take.

As managers of organizations, you will be interested in how the Department of Transportation is organizing itself to conduct this Study. First of all, a staff of economists, lawyers, statisticians, insurance experts, and others, is being assembled that will do the day-to-day work under the general supervision of the Assistant Secretary for Policy Development.

But organizing this staff effort is only a part of what must be done. The Study is under the law a responsibility of the Secretary of Transportation and the Department as a whole. Thus, the Secretary with the aid of Departmental officers will have the job of finally deciding what the nature and content of the Study will be. As General Counsel, I have particular responsibilities with respect to the legal aspects of the Study and its implications with respect to law.

It is interesting to compare the organization of this Study with that conducted by the President's National Advisory Panel on Insurance in Riot-Affected Areas, for which I served as Executive Director. There the Presidential Panel assembled the staff, and the staff's work was presented for action to the Panel. Under the DOT Study, the Secretary and the Departmental officers, with the help of Advisory Committees, will fulfill the role of the Panel.

A nucleus of a staff is already hard at work and additional recruiting is underway. Our efforts have been directed to acquiring the best possible people. We have been highly selective and so far very successful. It is expected that a full-time staff of 12 to 15 persons, representing some of the finest talent in the Nation, will be on board by November. A sizable roster of distinguished consultants is being established and extensive use of them is anticipated. Other Government agencies will also be called upon for major contributions.

We will shortly be appointing Advisory Committees that are broadly representative of various interested groups such as the insurance industry and legal profession, and of the public generally. These Committees will be kept fully informed of the work as it progresses, will make suggestions and will help to insure the kind of close cooperation that is vital to a successful Study.

But our lines of communication will not stop there. An "open door" policy will be pursued that goes much beyond the formal Advisory Committees. We feel every resource should be tapped. The Study staff is seeking as broad a spectrum of views as possible. No one should refrain from contacting the Study staff if he has information or views which he believes merit consideration. In brief, we do not want any individual or any group to feel excluded just because they were not invited to sit on this or that committee or attend this or that meeting.

As often happens with a major study, a certain amount of misunderstanding has already arisen over the scope of the work. Unfortunately, some seem to have concluded that the Study and the recommendations will be directed solely at them. That is not the case. The Joint Resolution calls for a "motor vehicle accident compensation system study", and, indeed, the Congressional hearings were concerned primarily with the "system." No single element of the system can be studied in isolation from the others. The entire accident compensation system must be examined; not just the law, the bar, and the courts; not just the business operations of the liability insurance industry; not just the myriad potential sources of collateral compensation available to accident victims; not just accident causation and safety; and not just the public regulation of insurance. Each of these and other elements are interrelated and must be analyzed together.

Thus, while insurance premiums and industry practices have often been the focus of much public criticism, our Study is not concerned only with an examination of the insurance industry. We fully recognize, as I know you do, that many of the industry practices and procedures that have been criticized were developed in response to other parts of the system. And it is in the workings of the system as a whole that answers must be found.

The Study basically will have two major aspects: One, the development of the facts; and two, the development of recommendations.

With respect to the development of the facts, we hope that by the time we are finished there will be general agreement by all concerned that the facts are as found by the DOT Study. Some "facts", of course, will be difficult to determine and will involve projections or estimates, but even here, it is our hope that any differences of view can be carefully defined and areas of dispute narrowed and agreed upon as just that: recognized areas of uncertainty on which informed people can reasonably differ.

I do not think we are being overly optimistic in believing that DOT's description of the existing system can achieve general acceptance. As Executive Director of the President's National Advisory Panel on Insurance in Riot-Affected Areas I have dealt personally with this kind of problem and know that regardless of one's politics, or economic position, or professional background, serious men acting in good faith can look at a situation and objectively describe it.

Assuming that this will be the case, what about the second major aspect of the Study: the development of recommendations. Here the level of speculation requires that I reach for my crystal ball.

I should say first, that we start with no preconceived notions about what the recommendations should be. We are approaching the study with an open mind. It must be recognized, however, that our task is to search for improvements in the system, not defend the status quo. One of the assumptions underlying the authorization of the Study was that something was wrong. In establishing the Study, Congress specifically cited in the Joint Resolution the "growing evidence that the existing system of compensation for . . . loss and suffering is inequitable, inadequate, and insufficient and is unresponsive to existing social, economic, and technological conditions," and called for a "fundamental reevaluation" of the system.

We recognize these are strong words. They signify the strong Congressional desire to develop a better system. It may develop that there is nothing radically wrong. But the major assumption underlying the Congressional mandate is that the system is not as effective as it should be. And it is central to our task to determine how the system can be changed to better serve the needs of the Nation.

With these thoughts in mind I see three basic trends which I believe form at least an outline of what will come: (1) The supremacy of the consumer interest; (2) public interest partnership of government and business; and (3) creative federalism.

First, the last few years under President Johnson have seen major and unprecedented advances made on behalf of the consumer. Automobile and highway safety legislation lead the parade of consumer programs that also include such matters as pipeline safety, fair packaging and labeling, flammable fabrics, and truth-in-lending. The accident compensation study is itself part of this new priority accorded the consumer interest.

These individual pieces of legislation, as I see them, add up to more than the sum of them individually. They constitute a fundamental recognition that the consumer interest must be the principal guidepost of policy.

The relevance of this to the outcome of the automobile insurance Study cannot be overemphasized. Determining what the consumer wants and how it can be provided will be critical. Of course, we all know what the consumer wants in a general way: He wants the protection and security that are the root of any insurance system, as cheaply and easily as possible. It is in the details that the problem lies and where much of our effort will be spent.

In the months ahead we will be examining the operation of the system as it affects the accident victim, especially the person who suffers bodily injury. What happens to him and to his family? Does he receive compensation? Is it too little, too late, or too much? What are the sources of compensation? How does the mechanism by which compensation is dispensed operate? And there are many other similar questions.

We all need to know, factually, how the compensation system is operating now, followed by an assessment of what might be done to make it operate more effectively and in keeping with the needs and desires of the public. While it is obvious that complicated problems cannot be solved solely by public opinion polls, the opinions of the consumers are important. What types of losses do people think it is essential be covered by insurance? How highly do accident victims value prompt settlement of claims? What do people expect as recovery for pain and suffering? These and other questions must be asked.

It will ill behoove anyone in government or private industry to lose sight of the supremacy of the consumer interest. I know, of course, that you are a consumer-oriented industry and are constantly aware of this consideration. But it is good for us all to recognize that it requires constant attention if the consumer is to be served and to know that this is being done.

Turning to the second trend -- the public interest partnership of government and business -- I am referring to the growing number of cooperative efforts by government and private industry to meet pressing social problems. One of the most dramatic is the National Alliance of Businessmen which through the Jobs program is finding, training, and employing hundreds of thousands of the hard-core unemployed. Here is a problem that could not be solved by government or by business acting alone, but is giving way to a massive, cooperative effort by government and business.

The urban insurance program developed by the President's Panel is another example of this trend. The insurance industry could not alone bear the financial risk of catastrophic loss from riots and civil disorders without some form of backup protection that only the Federal Government could ultimately provide. And this backup protection was needed before the industry could carry out the task of making property insurance readily available in our Nation's cities. As a result of this program approximately 350 insurance companies have now purchased reinsurance from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, paying in premiums for reinsurance of over $25,600,000. These premiums and the $250,000,000 authorized to be borrowed from the U.S. Treasury now provide the protection to insurers that was necessary to permit them to meet the urban property owners' needs for insurance.

These business-government partnerships have been entered into in an effort to help industry better serve the public interest. The government's role has been generally limited to those aspects which industry could not perform. Primary emphasis, however, has been placed on developing means to permit private industry to perform as much of the task as possible. While this approach has been given new emphasis in the last few years, it has long been deeply rooted in American society.

Although they refer to it by different names or in different ways, it seems clear that both major political parties are committed to this

approach. There are those, of course, who say government alone can do things better and those who say business should never get too close to government. But when the chips are down, they are not the voices that are listened to. And it is in this trend of public interest partnership -- this spirit of cooperation -- that I predict the DOT Study will ultimately arrive in seeking any changes. The insurance industry can expect, I believe, to be asked to perform as great a role in our accident compensation system as it can effectively perform and as it is willing to perform.

It is not too early for the industry to begin this partnership with government by helping to assist in the Study. Its help, however, should not be limited to supplying information. It should also thoroughly examine its own methods of operation and the environment within which it operates in order to make recommendations for changes it believes necessary. In this way the insurance industry can help assure that important avenues of approach are covered and that the Department and other interests are in a position to carefully analyze the recommendations which the industry, with its unmatched experience with the system, believes best serves the interests of the public.

In saying this I do not mean to imply that we are asking the insurance industry alone to solve the problem. Its help and thoughtful recommendations, however, can materially aid in all aspects of the study and may help pave the way for eventual solutions.

We know that you have already started on this essential task of self analysis. We want to compliment you on the voluntary action you have already taken to develop more publicly acceptable underwriting standards and more responsive policy cancellation standards. But while these efforts are commendable, they represent only a beginning. Your stake in the accident compensation system is large. Your active contribution to developing solutions to the problem should be equally large.

Turning to the third trend -- creative federalism -- I refer to the growing pattern of cooperation between federal, state, and local government and the diminution of traditional tensions between levels of government. There have been times in our history when it was generally thought that the Federal Government could always do a task better. At other times it has been believed that only state or local

government should act. But today and particularly as a result of what has been pioneered in the past few years, the trend is toward decentralized responsibility and intensive inter-governmental activity. In numerous areas from crime control to highway safety, the pattern is for Federal aid to strengthen local action. Indeed, this trend has already affected the insurance area.

The underlying administrative approach of the National Insurance Development Program is to provide a Federal benefit -- reinsurance against the riot hazard -- as a stimulant for vigorous industry and state action to create a strong urban insurance market. Through this program the Federal Government has sought to lend its aid to strengthen the ability of the states to adopt programs to meet their own property owners' insurance needs.

I suspect the same cooperative approach will result with respect to automobile insurance. I do not believe the issue ultimately will be state or Federal regulation. Rather, the issue will be what can and should the states do and what can and should the Federal Government do, to best meet the consumers' needs. The focus will be on the formulation of creative relationships to solve the problem.

In saying this I do not mean to infer that some Federal regulation in the automobile insurance area is inevitable. That certainly is not the case. The tradition of state regulation of the insurance industry is deeply rooted in our system and is likely to be changed only on a strong showing that there is a necessary role which only the Federal Government can fulfill. Indeed, there may be no Federal regulation recommended. The Federal Government role might well be to provide, for example, improved safety standards, increased aid to the states for traffic control or perhaps a new statistical gathering mechanism, uniform laws, or a whole host of other possible roles. The essential task will be to identify those roles which each unit of government, working together, can best perform to provide the public with the fairest, most efficient and responsive accident compensation system possible.

I would be remiss, however, if I did not observe a cloud that looms over these basic trends. These are troubled times and our Nation at home and abroad is in a period of testing. I do not need to labor this with a group of distinguished insurance representatives like yourselves. For these troubles show up in your immediate business in a variety of

ways. Because of riots and disorders and too much substandard housing in some of our center city areas, it is harder to provide adequate fire and extended coverage insurance. Because of the mounting crime, it is harder to write burglary, theft, and the crime lines. Because of increased auto accidents, more expensive repair costs, rising medical expenses, it is harder to write automobile insurance at the same rates that once prevailed.

And surely if riots and disorders cease, and our cities are revitalized so that all have good housing, and the incidence of crime and accidents is brought down, then the insurance mechanism will function more efficiently for everyone in all these areas. For when the risk is brought down, the rates may be brought down, and the availability may expand.

But unfortunately, these good days are not yet in sight. And we must deal with the world as it is. This leads to the challenge of the DOT automobile insurance study: To get general agreement on the facts and the contours of the problem, to work out solutions that meet these problems, and to provide a framework for all concerned -- the insurance industry, lawyers, government at all levels, and above all, the consumer -- to cooperate to carry out that solution.

You ask, but what will the exact solution be. And I answer, it is impossible to tell until we get the facts established and are in a position to analyze carefully the effects of proposed changes in the system. There are at this point too many disputes over the facts to be clear exactly where the problems lie, and too many suggestions for change to even hazard a guess at specific solutions. The only thing that is certain now is that the Study will be conducted impartially and objectively. Everyone will be given an opportunity to present his views, and when the recommendations are made there will be a clear articulation of the reasons for each one, so that all will know that they have been dealt with fairly and can take an enlightened position on the recommendations.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, ALAN S. BOYD BEFORE THE SOCIETY OF EXPERIMENTAL TEST PILOTS, EMPIRE ROOM, BEVERLY HILTON HOTEL, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, ON THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 1968, 7:00 P.M.

It's good to be here tonight, making my contribution to the generation gap.

I hadn't realized how much aviation had changed until I got your invitation and down in the corner, where it should have said, "silk-scarf," it read, "black tie."

But that is the trend today. You take a new plane out and load it down with G's. You iron out the wrinkles and hand it over with all of its mechanical miracles in perfect working order -- redundancy of back-up systems, high-lift wing, high ratio by-pass engines. And then they paint it purple and the stockholders give Pucci all the credit for it.

But we are making progress. Silk scarf or black tie, you and the men who came before you have turned aviation from a chancy business to a functioning system, although you can still get into trouble if you're not careful. For example, the consulting engineer from Washington who had to go to a conference in Chicago and decided to save some money by using one of those "take me along" ticket plans for his secretary. How was he to know his wife would get a letter from the promotion department of the airline, saying: "We hope you enjoyed your trip to Chicago with Mr. Thompson." Or that the safety board investigators would file a report on his case, saying: "Probable cause, Mrs. Thompson."

There is not much the Department of Transportation can do for the Mr. Thompsons of America. But we believe we have made a good start in the past year and a half on the job that President Johnson and the 89th Congress asked us to do: To try to pull together the various subsystems of American transportation into a better coordinated, total system; to make it safer to travel, easier to ship cargo, and less frustrating to get from here to there.

Let me be absolutely clear about one thing. We have made no more than a start.

Our system of transportation is, by any standard, mammoth. It represents an investment of some $500 billion. It meets the needs, with varying degrees of effectiveness, of 200 million people. It accounts for one of every six dollars in the economy; provides jobs for 9 million people; and unites a continent.

Yet the increasing demands on this system already strain its capacity in some areas and the growth to come - compounded by concentration of that growth - could bring it near collapse. Take the year 1975 as a yardstick of growth - a good year because it is so close you can almost reach out and touch it.

By then, the number of private aircraft will have nearly doubled. Commercial air travel will have tripled. Automobile traffic will be up by 40 percent. Railroads,

which now haul 750-billion ton miles a year, will be hauling one-trillion ton miles. Trucks, now carrying 400-million ton miles, will carry 50 percent more. In fact, if the demand for transportation continues to match America's economic growth, we will have to double in less than two decades the capacity of a system that has taken the lifetime of a nation to build.

President Johnson and the 89th Congress read the danger signals of increased delay, congestion and cost two years ago. They called for more intelligent planning, more research and development and more prudent investment of transportation funds. And they created the Department of Transportation and gave it responsibility for leading the effort to make this country's transportation system conform to the needs of the people rather than forcing the people to continue to conform to the system.

To do this has required starting virtually from scratch on the most complicated analysis of a system ever undertaken by anyone. We are involved in jobs never before attempted - trying to measure not only the efficiency of the railroads, for example, but to relate them to air and to set some criteria for future investment of transportation funds.

We are trying to establish a perspective that cuts across the various modes; the kind of perspective that says, for example: if we really want to reduce the hazards in experimental flying we should concentrate on the most dangerous phase of your work - the drive to the airport.

The growth in transportaton demand is exerting great pressures today on aviation.

This country's airlines carried 70 million passengers in 1963 and will carry 150 million this year. Five years ago, everyone predicted a 28 percent growth for the period. It was actually 114 percent.

The number of scheduled passengers is doubling every five years, and by 1977 one million people will board commerical airliners every day. General aviation will grow even faster - from 100,000 aircraft today to an estimated 150,000 by 1973. Traffic control centers, which last year handled 15 million flights, will have to manage 30 million within five years.

This rate of growth severely challenges the Federal Government as operator of the airway system, and state and local governments as operators of the airports.

Clearly, we need more airports, better traffic control and more efficient terminals, and we need them yesterday.

In the next few years we must achieve better integration of surface and air travel.

We must improve the control of traffic and the precision of navigation. And this will mean computer control of landings and takeoffs at high-density airports; automatic detection and avoidance devices; and advance processing of flight plans in digital form.

But I think parts of the air transportation system will need radical redesign to take into account diminishing air and ground space and the increasing psychological and economic value of time in our industrial society.

And one element of this redesign will certainly be STOL and VTOL aircraft. Straight thinking in a few years may not be nearly as important as thinking straight up.

Nearly 80 percent of all commercial flights are made between cities less than 500 miles apart. This is not really an efficient distance for the use of many of today's jetliners; not to speak of tomorrow's so-called "elephant" planes. What we need are mid-range aircraft that can land where the action is and eliminate the long trips between the runway and the business district.

Today's 25-passenger helicopters - the ones used in Los Angeles and New York City and San Francisco - have proven a real need for this kind of service, even with relatively high seat mile costs and without precision landing aids at the stops away from airports.

There are also a few 10-20 place STOL craft available. These vehicles - such as the DeHavilland Otter, the Dornier Skyservant and the Helio Courier are characterized by low wing loading and high lift and drag devices. They have been employed for years by the military; in the bush; by entrepreneurs; and for special industrial purposes. Recently, high density passenger configurations have been marketed. The Skyservant is now flying a run between Dulles, National and Friendship Airports in the Washington area.

But what can we expect beyond STOL air cabs and the helicopters which have been hauling people commercially since the early 50s?

The question is complex. Other than the helicopter, there is no VTOL aircraft to build systems around. We only have a check list of interesting possibilities to be developed or tested.

But working with this check list government and industry are already starting to block out the components of a VTOL aviation system. Various aircraft concepts are being developed by industry, the military, and NASA.

Eastern Air Lines and McDonnell Douglas, with the help of local governments and the FAA, are experimenting with a STOL aircraft, the Breguet 941, in the Northeast Corridor to help work out STOL and VTOL operational problems.

The CAB is initiating a hearing on the usefulness of V/STOL in the Northeast Corridor and the result may be an authorized route in this heavily traveled region.

The FAA is studying the air traffic control problems and navaids required for these aircraft. Industry and FAA are developing requirements for V/STOL airports. Local governments are trying to find good sites for V/STOL ports.

As these systems components are clarified, we will be able to see where action by the Department of Transportation can expedite one piece of the system or demonstrate the feasibility of complete systems.

The industry has had long experience with the helicopter, which has followed a steady curve of improvement. Adequate operational concepts and design standards, including FAA certification requirements, have been developed, so that we can now move toward more sophisticated V/STOL aircraft.

The designer of STOLs has now the proposed civil certification criteria for these aircraft. We hope to be able to define certification criteria for VTOLs in the near future. What they will look like; how fast they will travel; how many people they will carry; all of these are

questions that only time, design and testing can answer. All we can say for sure at this point is that it appears that STOLs and VTOLs will utilize similar airspace and operating procedures up to the point of touchdown.

One thing we do know - the popular concept of VTOL aircraft wheeling in the skyscraper canyons of our cities, maneuvering like flying bicycles, is valid mostly for comic books. True, these aircraft are more maneuverable than conventional aircraft and will approach at slower speeds, but they probably will operate into small airports or pads with clearly prescribed approach zones free of obstacles. Glide slopes of 6^{o} to 9^{o} will be utilized even for VTOLs that touch down vertically from a few feet above the pad.

The most serious problem, inherent in any technology on the horizon, is noise. The whole point of STOL/VTOL is to get in close for convenience. Yet the roar of jets and blades might very well be unacceptable in many downtown areas, where there is enough noise already.

Maximum noise tolerances will have to be established; VTOLs will have to operate in such a way as to minimize the nuisance; and the miniports themselves will have to be situated with great care - perhaps as aquadromes on bodies of water adjacent to business districts where feasible.

The full potential of vertical landing and take-off will not be realized until the total environment is acknowledged in system planning. If ignored, the noise factor could stunt the growth of an infant service that has already had a long gestation and a difficult delivery.

Finally, the price of the ticket will have to be acceptable if VTOLs are to be more than a silk stocking service. It costs up to 25 cents per seat-mile to operate transport helicopters but this is an intracity taxi operation. Studies indicate that an intracity VTOL bus service may cost only 3 to 4 cents per seat mile. Such costs would permit fares to drop low enough to attract a large percentage of medium distance passengers.

Our interest in STOLs and VTOLs stems from one of our basic responsibilities under the law that created the Department. It directs us to promote technological development with the objective of improving the nation's transportation system. During the past 16 months, our work has defined a number of gaps in the existing transportation complex. One of these is in what very generally can be called the corridor situation.

What we find in the U.S. is a trend to urbanization - but not the sort of urbanization that, in years past, congregated people in densely populated central cities. The new form of urban development is characterized by a wide dispersal of population within vast metropolitan regions. This is not simply a process of suburbanization. It is a process that leads to a pattern of many medium-sized communities, scattered about a large geographical area. The most famous of these is the Northeast Corridor, stretching from Richmond to Boston. Another is the band stretching from Chicago-Milwaukee east to Detroit, Cleveland, Pittsburgh and Buffalo. Still another is along the West Coast. And a fourth, with special properties, is in the Southeast, with its center at Atlanta.

In all of these areas there is intense urbanization, but the most rapidly growing centers of population and industrial development are not the big cities, they are the medium cities.

Translate these trends into transportation demands and it is apparent that we need better links among these dispersed corridor cities. The automobile has a role, of course, but it has limitations for trips of more than 150 miles. The present fleet of aircraft also has its advantages, but it does other jobs better than serving points that may be only 150 to 300 miles apart. Trains may have a much larger role to play than is commonly recognized, but their fixed roadbed inhibits their utility.

There, then, is where the STOL and VTOL aircraft may have a vital part to play in our future national transportation system. As I have indicated here today, the STOL is flexible and efficient; it can link up the scattered points that make up the sort of metropolitan region which is likely to be the distinguishing feature of the U.S. in the next decade. Recognizing this, we are prepared to do our part in working with industry to build STOL and VTOL in our transportation system.

The VTOL problem is one of the problems that come with growth and progress. They are actually opportunities in a society that is rapidly moving beyond affluence.

The story of VTOL and of aviation in general, to which your efforts have contributed so much, is paralleled by the progress we have made as a whole in this country during the last seven years.

Naturally, dramatic change can produce uncertainty, disorder, and even resentment. Some people cry and caterwaul for the good old days. They demand that the world be stopped so they can get off.

They forget the historic lesson that a society without growth and diversity and dissent is either a sick society or a dead one, and certainly not worth living in. They need moral courage as dauntless as the physical courage of a man who steps into an untested airplane and lifts it toward the sky with confidence in himself and his destiny.

# # # # #

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

REMARKS OF M. CECIL MACKEY, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION FOR POLICY DEVELOPMENT, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA, AUGUST 7, 1968

As lawyers we are, by the very nature of our profession, social reformers -- do-gooders if you prefer -- for we are always tinkering with existing legal arrangements so as to better adapt our jurisprudential system to the changing needs of a highly dynamic social order. We are, of course, not reformers in some grand ideological or theoretical sense. Quite to the contrary -- we tend, as a group, to be intensely practical men, accustomed to facing problems objectively and devising improved ways of coping with them. Mr. Justice Holmes put his emphasis on "experience," but the life of the law has been the dynamic, if not dramatic, accommodation of rules and institutions to the changing needs of our civilization.

It is in this conceptual framework that I want to talk with you today about automobile insurance -- or, more specifically, the matter of motor vehicle accident compensation. Here we have what I think is one of our most serious, most complex social problems -- one that demands the close attention of everyone, especially the bar. The basic issue is very simple to state: Do we have as just, as efficient a system as we can devise for providing compensation to those who sustain losses as a result of motor

vehicle accidents? If we do not -- if the present system is, as so many commentators say, inadequate to the challenge -- how do we create a better system? Those are the questions before us -- the questions that are at last beginning now to receive the formal scrutiny of the Government and of the bar.

Let me try to put the problem in perspective. In the truest sense, we have become an automotive society -- a nation literally on wheels. Today in the United States there are approximately 100 million vehicles being operated about a trillion miles a year by more than 100 million licensed drivers. This enormous number of trucks, buses, and automobiles are involved in an estimated 10 million accidents annually. Those accidents take the lives of more than 50,000 people a year and injure more than 4 million. The consequent economic losses, putting to one side the matter of psychological trauma, are staggering. Injuries alone result in medical expenses of at least $600 million a year. Wage and compensation losses come to another $2.5 billion. Property damage and loss add an additional $3-1/4 billion. And these figures, let me emphasize, are only the top layer. More than $3 billion a year is spent by the insurance companies simply for the processing of claims and related administration. Additional hundreds of millions of dollars in tax funds are spent for the operation of the courts and the police traffic services for handling auto accidents and their aftermath.

While the scale of auto accidents is large today, it is unfortunately almost certain to reach even greater proportions in the future. At recent rates of purchase, there could be nearly 300 million vehicles on the nation's streets by the end of the century. The number of drivers could double. The traffic and motor vehicle safety programs established by Congress in 1966 and signed into law by President Johnson offer very heartening evidence that we may be able to reduce significantly the number of deaths and the severity of injuries sustained through auto accidents. Still, it is not yet clear that auto accident deaths and injuries in absolute terms will not continue to rise. These are facts -- the cold, hard prospects we must fully accept in thinking about the motor vehicle accident compensation problem.

Auto-related deaths, serious injuries, and losses have already assumed a scale that almost strains the imagination, but how good is the system we have for providing compensation? The ingredients of the "system" are well known. They rest on a combination of the traditional rules of tort liability, backstopped by insurance. Those who sustain losses must either shoulder the burden themselves or attempt to shift it to someone whose fault can be defined. Proof of fault, often determined with finality

only in court, is a prelude to recovery, with insurance providing contingency insulation for the "wrongdoer."

How, in fact, is the existing tort-insurance system performing? While opinions differ on some details, the general impression of most analysts is that the system is performing poorly and inefficiently, getting worse rather than better. Some feel that it is under such severe stress that it is actually in danger of collapse. Consider these highlights: auto insurance premiums have for years been soaring steeply and steadily. Net premiums advanced from $2.6 billion in 1950 to more than $9 billion in 1966. In two decades the premium on a typical insurance policy has almost tripled -- in some areas it has increased much more than that. Since 1958 insurance premiums have increased 2 and 1/2 times faster than the consumer price index, a rate of inflation that simply would not be tolerated if it characterized the economy as a whole.

Despite the explosively rising cost of auto insurance, the distribution of compensation has become the focus of increasingly sharp criticism. For one thing, less than half of the dollars collected in insurance premiums are paid out to the intended beneficiaries. Fifty cents of the premium dollar, thus, disappears in administration and other costs. This is really rather striking, and in a way puzzling. Compare it with the situation in social security or Blue Cross, where 90 cents or more of every dollar paid-in is paid-out to recipients.

Not only is less than half of premium income paid out to those who have sustained losses, but the distribution of compensation is uneven and frequently inequitable. Perhaps as many as 50 per cent of all those who experience losses in auto accidents receive nothing at all in the form of tort-related compensation. Of the rest, some receive more than the amount of their out-of-pocket losses, some receive significantly less. The exact pattern appears to depend upon a host of random factors, ranging from the jurisdiction in which an accident occurs to the social status of the victim.

What's more, although auto accident victims get only 50 cents of every premium dollar, by the time they pay their attorney fees they receive substantially less than even this would imply. Of the 50 cents paid out to claimants, as much as a third is drained off for legal expenses. Moreover, the impact of legal fees and related expenses tends to fall more heavily on the victims of the more serious accidents -- those who typically recover smaller amounts relative to their losses anyway. Of course, lawyers respond to these facts by saying that if it were not for their services and

skills, accident victims would wind up with still less. That may well be true, but if it is, it constitutes perhaps the most severe possible indictment of the present tort-insurance system as a means for dealing with the human losses sustained in auto accidents.

In the allocation of compensation, the process of settlement is generally regarded as lethargic, cumbersome, and bureaucratic. The necessity of frequent recourse to litigation not only makes the plight of the victim more difficult and costly but places the courts in the position of becoming foils for the bargainers. Regular invocation of the adversary process slows the pace of settlement at the same time it burdens the courts with the job of resolving many random factual disputes. Laymen understandably become annoyed with a tortured process which often seems designed to reward only the rich and the persistent.

From another standpoint, consider the situation as it pertains to the auto insurance policyholder. His complaints are at least as serious as those of accident victims. Premiums have been rising steeply: that is one common grievance, but it is only one among many. Increasingly, many people are having difficulty getting insurance at all, and when they are able to secure coverage, frequently they have little assurance that they will have it for any meaningful period of time. The number of policy applications that are rejected and the number of cancellations are rising steadily. If one is white, middle-aged, middle-class and suburban, has a good driving record, no young children and happens to have the "right" kind of a job, insurance will probably be available -- at least initially. But if one is young, or old, or black, lives in the center of a major city, has the "wrong" kind of a job -- which may include being a member of the clergy -- or happens to have been divorced, it's a different story. Insurance is hard to get or keep. This, let me emphasize, is without reference to an individual's specific driving record. An accident in the past, even one which was not the applicant's fault, can make a bad situation worse. Often, when insurance can be obtained by motorists in these large groups, recourse must be made to so-called high-risk companies -- companies that may in fact be better described as high-premium than high-risk. As the Pennsylvania State Insurance Commissioner, David Maxwell, said recently, buying a car only takes money -- but getting auto insurance is "more like joining a country club."

In many ways the automobile insurance issue epitomizes today's popular demand that government intercede in the traditional economics sphere wherever necessary to redress an imbalance between private power and individual human welfare. In thinking about the recent instances of civil

unrest, one common cause for complaint is man's feeling that he is caught in a mechanistic system of which he does not approve and yet which he is unable to change. For years most people accepted this condition as inevitable and resigned themselves to it. Today that mood of passivity is being replaced by a new tone of popular activism. People to an unprecedented degree expect -- indeed demand -- that their elected officials will respond creatively to their protests. Whether it be a university official, a city council, a Congress or a President, the constituency is now insisting upon both sincere consideration of its complaints and a voice in seeking a solution. They expect their institutions and their administrative procedures to facilitate, not retard, the accomplishment of social objectives. This attitude applies to the auto insurance system as much as it does to Civil Rights and rightly so, for the facts hardly portray a system that is well-adapted to the problem or is as good as we can develop.

Understandably, many people have reached the conclusion that the present tort-insurance system is inequitable, often capricious, inefficient, cumbersome, and simply ill-fitted to an auto-oriented society such as ours. If you follow Bob Dylan's advice and "tell it like it is," you must agree that the arrangement we now have for providing compensation for motor vehicle accident victims is a mess. It pleases practically no one, aside, perhaps from those who have a substantial economic stake in the status quo. But status quo-ism, though it often has superficial appeal, usually proves to work in no one's long-term interest. Our job is to take a hard look at the total problem and come up with a better approach.

Admittedly, the issues are complex, interpretations not easily made, alternative solutions neither free of ambiguity nor free of challenge. Recognizing this, President Johnson's request to Congress earlier this year for authorization of a detailed study of the entire motor vehicle accident compensation problem constituted a sound, responsible answer to what is a crucial social problem. His request has now been translated into law and the Secretary of Transportation has been charged with the duty of carrying out such a study and presenting it, with his recommendations for reform, to the Congress early in 1970.

In conducting this inquiry we in the Department start with no neatly-defined notion of where we expect to come out. We have no panacea. We are, nonetheless, convinced that the present system is seriously deficient and that the symptoms, to which I have alluded, reflect deep underlying disorders. Many details must be explored carefully to find out the precise dimensions and character of the malady and to delineate more sharply

the symptoms themselves. We plan to probe deeply and we will not hesitate to recommend whatever reforms appear to be warranted by the facts.

The demand is for a system that is efficient -- one that is just and equitable -- one that has the capacity for continued growth in a nation where motor vehicles play so large a role. Fundamental changes in the system we now have are inevitable. These changes will vitally affect the courts, the plaintiffs and defense bar, and the insurance industry.

Lawyers quite obviously have a large stake in any improved system that might be devised for providing motor vehicle accident compensation. Let us hope, however, that we have learned something from our colleagues, the doctors, from the drug companies, and from the automobile manufacturers -- all of whom resisted reform, only to find themselves engulfed by a wave of public indignation. The historic role of the bar is one of dealing with problems in a responsible practical way. That is precisely what is needed in creating a better means of providing compensation to the victims of motor vehicle accidents.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION ALAN S. BOYD, BEFORE THE AMERICAN TRIAL LAWYERS ASSOCIATION AT THE SHOREHAM HOTEL ON TUESDAY, JULY 23, 1968, 12:00 NOON IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

It's good to be here, I think. And I hesitate because of your letter of invitation, which was pleasant and persuasive - until I got to the bottom. There, in bold blue print was the motto of the American Trial Lawyers Association: "One good law is worth a thousand speeches."

Every lawyer - no matter what his specialty - has a sneaking admiration for the trial lawyer. I am no different. Yours is, after all, the real stuff of the law. I am indebted to one trial lawyer for advice that I have always found useful when doing business in Washington. It's Henry Clay's advice to an anxious client:

> "I cannot, at this juncture, clearly foretell the outcome," he said, "but I counsel you to cultivate calmness of mind and prepare for the worst."

Our newest assignment in the Department of Transportation - the comprehensive study of automobile insurance - is of special interest to trial lawyers. Our purpose will be to seek a fair and efficient means of compensating victims of automobile accidents. And we shall need your help.

President Johnson requested the study because the subject is of immediate concern to almost every American family. This concern was made evident in thousands of letters received by the White House, the Congress, and the Department of Transportation.

We are beginning the study with no predisposed opinions. Our aim is to gather facts, analyze them, and make necessary recommendations. The two-year program will be conducted by a core of government staff experts and non-government specialists. To work with them, I shall appoint an advisory group of representatives from the insurance industry, from the bar, from state insurance commissions and from consumer organizations. Our success will depend on the full cooperation of all interested parties. We shall be calling on your association and on your individual members for help. And I know we will be able to count on you.

Of all transportation problems, those of the urban area are most perplexing. The pattern is familiar - congestion in the central business district, rush hour traffic jams, not enough parking space, deteriorating mass transit systems and the conflict between freeways and city residences and parks. One fact underlines the meaning of these problems. In many urban areas, vehicle travel miles are increasing at more than double the rate that the population is increasing.

The city and its transportation problems are, then, our number one priority.

We have begun work on each of these problems.

For several months we have been working with a number of cities to see whether we could break up congestion and traffic jams without costly new expressway systems.

Under a program known as TOPICS - Traffic Operations Program to Increase Capacity and Safety - we have been experimenting with a number of relatively minor adjustments in street systems.

We are working with these cities to improve traffic signals. We are adding left turn lanes. We are looking into building overpasses and creating special turn-out areas where trucks can load and unload.

We are helping cities create special lanes for busses so that they can load and unload passengers without blocking the movement of cars; and so they can keep moving along the streets without getting caught in the automobile traffic.

All of these steps are based on the theory that our city streets can be used more efficiently than they now are.

So far, the tests show that with relatively inexpensive improvements in the street system, the capacity of the streets can be increased by 15 to 25 percent.

We are persuaded that this improvement program will pay dividends and we were successful in our bid to the Congress for matching funds to aid cities in carrying out these improvements. The principle was accepted by both sides of the Congress and the amount to be authorized - somewhere between $125 million and $250 million - is now being discussed in a joint conference committee.

We were successful, again, in our request to the Congress for Federal funds to build public parking spaces outside the central business district.

Until now, the Federal government has offered no help to cities that find more and more cars heading downtown and less space for parking them.

In our bill, we asked for funds to help pay the cost of fringe parking if it is built to tie in with a mass transit system that will cover the downtown area. Again, both sides of the Congress accepted the measure and the amount to be allocated is in conference committee.

But in our biggest cities, all the programs for improving downtown traffic will be of little value without a healthy growing mass transit system. We have been continually emphasizing in the Department of Transportation the necessity to look at transportation problems from a systems approach - from the viewpoint of the total job to be done and what function each of the component parts can serve. From this angle, it is apparent there is no substitute for mass transit.

Yet, most of these mass transit systems are in difficulty. They are losing passengers. Rail rapid transit lines had 700 million fewer passengers in 1966 than they had in 1940.

Mass transit is just able to make ends meet. In the same period these same rapid transit lines saw their net revenues decline by over 50%.

Mass transit is not growing. In 1945, the total trackage of our rapid rail transit system was 1222 miles. Today it is 1255 miles.

The same story of stagnation is true of most other urban mass transit systems. In the greatest era of urban growth, they have been losing ground - losing passengers to the family car.

Yet their value is incalculable. President Johnson said it best. "In the next 40 years, we must completely renew our cities. The alternative is disaster. Gaping needs must be met in health, in education, in job opportunities, in housing. And not a single one of these needs can be fully met until we rebuild our mass transportation systems."

These local subways and bus companies must be helped. This is the task of the newest member of the Department of Transportation - the Urban Mass Transportation Administration. Our assistance begins with grants and loans to help develop or expand local mass transit facilities. We are also doing research to reduce downtown congestion and sponsoring advanced city transportation studies. The Administration also helps train transit officials and technicians. There is no more important priority.

I recently completed an inspection tour of the transportation systems of eight of our larger cities and I was again impressed with the need for transit improvement. I learned, too, that a major share of aid money in the big cities must come from the State or Federal Government. The cities are having trouble just meeting payrolls, improving schools and providing health services. There's very little left for the vast capital outlay modern transportation requires.

I also learned that big massive projects aren't necessarily the answer in every case. Soap and water would cure some of the rapid transit problems I saw. I remember, too, the people who seemed to be enjoying themselves most weren't riding on anything. They were walking. It seems to me that our goal should be to plan cities so that you need a minimum of transportation in central business districts and a maximum of good, fast, clean transportation everywhere else.

There is a phase of our work that must be clearly understood. We are aiding cities. We are helping them solve their transportation problems. But we can do no more than aid.

Our urban areas must decide for themselves what kind of transportation system they need. And before they can do that they must decide what kind of cities they want to be - how they want to grow and what shape they want to take.

We are encouraging them to make these decisions. We are supporting them in their efforts to develop systems that suit their total needs and serve their people. Our community approach to the location of proposed urban highways is a case in point. In four cities - Baltimore, Chicago, Phoenix and New York - we are sponsoring design concept teams that will work with the communities involved. These teams of engineers, economists, architects, sociologists and other experts are meeting with local political and community leaders and individuals to get local views - to find out where local people think highways should be located. We in the Department have no intention of forcing local decisions. Our policy is to make it possible for these cities to develop their own local priorities, make their own decisions and determine their own transportation destinies.

There is a special urgency to these city transportation problems. A few facts will emphasize this urgency.

In the technological revolution that has been changing the nation during the past two decades, three million American farms disappeared.

Twenty million rural Americans migrated to the cities.

In the past 15 years alone, 5 million Negroes left the rural South for the cities of the North. This resulted in a doubling of the non white population in the central cities Often more than double. At the same time, the growing enrichment of our people enabled the white middle class to buy new houses in the suburbs. While the population of the central core of our large cities remained the same, or declined, the suburban population was increasing in many cities by as much as 600 percent.

Thus - the birth of the ghetto.

The difficulties and frustrations of the ghetto are many. Transportation is one of them.

In the nation as a whole, 80 percent of all American families owned an automobile in 1966. The proportion is slightly higher today. Yet, half of all Negro households own no car at all. And more than half of these Negro households have two or more wage earners. The Negro worker, then, is dependent on mass transit - and it is not serving him well. For a resident of New York's Harlem to commute by public transportation to an aircraft job in Farmingdale, Long Island costs $40 a month. South Central Los Angeles is only 16 miles distant from the employment center of Santa Monica. To make the trip by public transportation, however, takes an hour and 50 minutes each way, requires three transfers and costs $33 a month.

Such are the frustrations of the ghetto.

It is not only the Negro who suffers in our society from poverty. But, as one observer has pointedly put it: "No one is poor in America because he is white. Many people are poor because they are black."

In today's world we can isolate neither problems nor people from each other - neither private nor public decisions.

If we could see no other way, we could see by the flames that lit the skies over many American cities in recent months that we cannot separate the future of white America from the fate of black America.

Leveling stores and homes in the ghettos with a torch is not the answer. Nor is leveling the blame. And the one sure way to fail to find the answer is to hang out signs that say, "Business as usual."

Let us all condemn riots; let us never condone violence.

But, above all, let us understand. Let us insist on law and order. But let us be equally insistent for equal justice.

Stanley Baldwin, in a moment of obvious frustration, told the House of Commons 30 years ago that "one of the weaknesses of a democracy is that until it is right up against it, it will never face the truth."

I believe that our democracy and everything for which it stands is right up against it today. But I believe also that we now have a chance to demonstrate the strength that matches Mr. Baldwin's finding of weakness. And that is that once the people of a democracy face the truth, their decisions go deep and last long.

The truth is that we have for too long expected the people in our ghettos to match the achievements of other Americans without extending to them the opportunities that the rest of us take for granted.

The truth is that this must change in order for the United States to prosper morally or materially.

It must change in the schools. It must change in the hiring halls. It must change in the way we plan transportation; a way which too often ignores the needs of the poor. It must change in such basic ways as the recognition of the rights of others - not just in court; or in a textbook on civics; but on the job and on the sidewalk.

It must be a change that goes deeper than law, although the law is an essential part of it. President Johnson has said: "Wherever the Federal Government is involved, it must not be even a silent partner in perpetuating unequal treatment." That is a good place to start.

But the change I am talking about is the change that will come from facing the truth as we are facing it in this country today.

And the truth is that the source of America's strength and the basis of its power is simple human justice - man to man.

Thank you.

# # # #

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, ALAN S. BOYD, BEFORE THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF PLANNERS, ARLINGTON HOTEL, HOT SPRINGS, ARKANSAS, ON FRIDAY, JULY 19, 1968, 12:00 NOON

It was not long ago that taking a national point of view on transportation - let alone projecting such a viewpoint 50 years into the future - would have seemed an exercise in fantasy if not in futile speculation.

But events have a way of making yesterday's fancies into the options of today and the demands of tommorrow. The expectations of the traveling and shipping publics are rising, if not superheated. Delays and frustrations that were once tolerable are unacceptable to the America of the 1960's.

Witness Washington Irving in 1824 on the subject of transportation: "There is a certain relief in change," he wrote, "even though it be from bad to worse; as I have often found in traveling in a stage-coach, that it is often a comfort to shift one's position and be bruised in a new place." That sort of long-suffering attitude toward travel is hard to find these days.

So it is that President Johnson has called on us to take a hard look at our transportation facilities from a national standpoint, and to determine how we shall turn them into a system - a system that is up-to-date, modally integrated, socially responsible and relatively free of bruises.

The objective cannot be reached by continuing to treat transportation as an afterthought, a limited means to an even more limited end. The massivenss of change predicted for the next 50 years precludes an ad hoc approach to the design of transportation systems.

By the turn of the century we shall probably have at least 280 million people in our country, perhaps as many as 350 million. If present patterns persist, about 35 percent will inhabit 10 supercities ranging from five to more than 20 million people. Some 40 percent will reside in 285 metropolitan areas of 100,000 to five million individuals. Perhaps 15 percent of the population will be located on farms or in small towns - mostly the latter.

Today these smaller communities are to some extent isolated from the rest of the nation. I do not think that will continue to be so after the next 30-50 years.

The gathering of the American people in supercities is bound to evoke a compensating emphasis on regional development. Integrated, continuous freight systems - which would permit dispersal of manufacturing - could bring outlying regions within the orbit of the megalopolitan system. Automated highways, tube trains, and vertically rising aircraft could turn all of America into one continental city.

It is obvious, of course, that the same process of rationalization is bringing us ever closer to remote regions overseas. By the turn of the century, let alone in 50 years, the transportation and communications revolutions will have physically unified the world, with consequences that are incalculable.

But the biggest changes of all are forthcoming in the concepts, organization and social conscience of transportation. We have begun to ask the right questions about our goals. We can see that transportation shapes the pattern of community development whether we direct its growth or not. And there

seems to be a growing consensus that it ought to be directed if it is to serve man instead of dominating him.

This is something new in the wind - a sense of what an enormous creative force our roads, rails and airways could be if we conceived of them as tools to enforce rational land-use planning - as weapons in the endless war to better the conditions of life for all. In the democratic countries of Western Europe transportation design is already starting to be used in precisely this way. It may be doubted that we will long admit ourselves to be less civilized than they.

Naturally, we seek cheap and efficient means of moving people and products. But cost of hardware cannot be the sole criterion. Decisions based solely on dollars and cents could well result in an urban form which wastes or destroys the natural environs which sustain human life - environs which are shrinking at a rate of over a million acres, or 1700 square miles, per year as urban areas expand.

We must learn to spend wisely, and be prepared to spend as much as needed, to ensure the amenities of life - clean air, ambient beauty, recreation, contact with unspoiled nature, and ready access to transportation for all citizens whether they are affluent exurbanites or residents of urban and rural slums. Our aim should be to reduce the inconvenience of shifting between the modes of travel, to integrate communities instead of segregating them, to safeguard historical sites and cultural resources.

It won't do us any good to triple our purchasing power and cut by half our work-days if, at the same time, we triple the congestion, pollution and delay and cut by half the amenities of the world we live in.

We have come late to the notion of treating transportation as a social system because of the very successes of our transportation industry. We did very well without planning and we always solved our problems one at a time. The trouble is that answers derived that way in a period of rapid social change and technological development don't match up very well. So far we have done best in the area of high speed, long-distance transportation but have done less well in the development of high speed short-distance transportation, particularly in and around the cities.

At this point a warning is usually in order. Some specialists like to design transportation networks de novo - brand new from concept to equipment-on-line. Alas, the real world is much more intractable. We have huge investments in aircraft, airports, guidance systems, highways, automobiles and railroads that make it necessary for us to start building where we are, not where we wish we were.

We have equally large hidden investments in public attitudes and habits. I cannot conceive of anything that in the foreseeable future could coax the average American out of his automobile. The auto is a part of America and it is here to stay until some other system provides comparable low-cost mobility.

What is equally clear is that in some of the nation's more densely populated regions, the auto as we know it today cannot continue to have first claim on available space indefinitely without producing intolerable adverse effects of congestion, distorted land use, and air pollution. Exhaust controls will doubtless become stricter in the years just ahead. We may even turn to steam, electric or fuel-celled cars within a shorter period than many now envision. We will certainly automate our highways in order to get more people to and fro without the near traumas produced by today's driving conditions.

From this point, there are very few flat statements that can be made about transportation in the future, but there are some.

One is that the odds are against transportation's looking very much different than it does today. It will be quieter. It will move people as efficiently over short distances as it now does over long reaches. It will be better coordinated. And we will have reached the point where we face up more squarely to the actual costs of traveling or shipping by various modes so that each will be performing the work for which it is best suited. But it will still consist largely of wheels, wings and rotor blades.

Another fairly safe statement about the future is that the transportation system we have in the year 2018 depends in large measure on decisions we are making today.

The New York subway opened 64 years ago. The bridges we are building today will still be there 50 or 100 years from now unless we knock them down. As a result, we have already made a number of commitments about the transportation system of the year 2018.

I believe the number of those decisions to be made at random without careful study of the long-range consequences will diminish in the next ten years as transportation planning by federal, state and local governments becomes more closely coordinated.

I think, also, that we will see - within the next ten years - some kind of research and development center for transportation in which government and private industry will pool their talents to design and perfect better systems.

The Department has already begun some of this work - sponsoring some 400 projects of research and demonstration in nearly every field of transportation.

The development of new hardware is an essential part of this effort. For example, the Department is currently

-- financing a study of a four-mile highway in Milwaukee County, Wisconsin, to be used exclusively by buses, but integrated with existing rapid transit operations. Special attention will be given to urban design and landscaping along the road and adjacent areas.

-- supporting high speed train experiments along the Atlantic seaboard. Such innovations as a turbine-powered train may provide alternatives for travelers in densely populated areas over intermediate distances.

-- financing an analysis of signs and signals for all modes of transportation, with a special focus on port facilities, air terminals, and bus depots. Street and highway signs and signals, too often illegible, nonconforming, poorly designed or missing, will also be studied.

-- proposing Federal aid to help cities ease traffic congestion by building fringe parking lots as part of a plan to encourage the use of public transit in crowded central cities.

-- helping to finance planning for a proposed linear city of schools, housing and shops to be built in the airspace over six miles of the Cross-Brooklyn Expressway in New York City. The highway would be the backbone of a unique experiment in urban living.

The linear city should obviate a great deal of traffic by providing shops and schools close to people's apartments, yet facilitate whatever movement is necessary. In contrast to conventional highways, this type conserves land, and may become more popular as cities try to achieve greater land-use density and provide more open space for recreation or redevelopment.

The Linear City is the most ambitious of several projects underway or planned in major cities in which a design concept team is being used to plan segments of the Interstate Highway System.

The design team brings together highway engineers, architects, city planners, economists, government officials, sociologists and community leaders to plan the highway so that it does more than carry vehicles - so that it actually enhances the areas through which it moves, sometimes by adding park space; sometimes by making available new sites for schools and housing.

The design team looks at transportation in terms of its impact upon the total environment of man. It gives local people a say in what happens to their hometowns and neighborhoods. It means recognition that transportation planning - or lack of it - can affect the quality and character of life, and can make the difference between isolation and social opportunity for millions of people.

The design concept teams already at work in Baltimore and Chicago and about to start work in other cities are dealing with what might be called the fourth dimension of transportation - the impact that it has not only on the people and goods it moves but on the area through which it moves them. As I have said, we have long since recognized the fact that transportation can have harmful effects unless we foresee them and plan to prevent them. We can and must reverse that order by planning benefits beyond that of movement into every transportation project.

Sweden has recognized this untapped power of transportation. In Stockholm, the subway system has become the backbone of the city's master plan for land use and community development. Each station is decorated by a different artist and becomes a neighborhood center attracting a wide variety of clienteles. In contrast to our own cities, the environs of the stations are especially active - and safe - at night. It is easy to see that thoughtful mass transit design and planning can help solve many seemingly intractable urban problems.

A subway, of course, is not the only transportation system that can be used as a device for guiding growth and development of a region. A highway will serve as well. A network of hybrid helicopters could serve the same function on a regional basis. The point is that transportation can serve as the guiding force for creating new urban areas and for reviving old ones. We must move in that direction during the next decade.

However, the integrated transportation system speeding Americans to work and guaranteeing leisure-time access to varied pleasures, providing a road to opportunity from the ghetto to where the jobs are, insuring rational land use and protecting our heritage of natural beauty and historical sites - such a system will not come about automatically. It will not come about at all unless we develop a sense of urgency and plan how to bring it about step by step over the next 50 years. We must get started soon if we expect to reach our goal within the span of generations now living.

More than in any other nation, our transportation network has shaped the destiny of this land. Our roads and rails - and now our airways - have beckoned the American people to a personal mobility unequalled in history. They have made of our lives continuous movement, change, and adventure. They condition our attitudes and provide outlets for our vitality and seem to justify our congenital optimism. They make restlessness fashionable.

At the same time, this easy mobility has encouraged a prodigal attitude toward the land and has enabled us to create unmanageable urban amoebas that now engulf both sea coasts and threaten to spread to the heartland as well. In large areas the balance of nature is being altered. The results are ugly - morally and aesthetically - and may be dangerous as well. Perhaps the analogy is not properly the amoeba but the cancer cell.

We have always thought of automobiles and planes simply as means to get from one place to another - and seldom acknowledged their impact on communities, or the limits they impose on creating new kinds of communities capable of fulfilling the complex human needs that arise when we move "beyond prosperity." We do not know yet what price we will be compelled to pay for our lack of foresight, but it will be a very heavy one unless we drop the frontier ethos that the land is for exploitation.

The American Institute of Planners can help to effect the necessary changes in public opinion that must precede a wiser policy. It is a truth of human nature that a given change is actively desired only when it is seen as really possible. It is our job, and yours, to make long-range environmental planning respectable - and thus possible - within a democratic decisionary framework. Then the transportation network can be employed as a positive force to lift the minds and lighten the hearts, to improve living and working conditions and broaden the perspectives, of all Americans.

# # # #

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

REMARKS BY FRANK W. LEHAN, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, AT THE MEETING OF THE CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH OF THE ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT (OECD), CHATEAU DE LA MUETTE, PARIS, FRANCE, JULY 10-12, 1968

I am grateful on several counts for the opportunity to represent the United States Department of Transportation at this important meeting.

First, when you think you have the biggest problems in the world it is comforting to discuss symptoms and remedies with people who share the same headaches. I expect to learn a great deal in dialogue with this knowledgeable group.

Second, it gives me a chance to acquaint you with our relatively new Department of Transportation, commonly referred to as DOT, and to find out how we can work together to facilitate international transportation and to solve our mutual problems.

And third, of course, a legitimate reason to make a trip to Paris is always an incentive bonus.

Many of you no doubt have visited the Department during the 16 months we have been in business. To those who have not, I extend a cordial invitation from Secretary Boyd to come see us whenever you are in our area. Take a taxi - even around the Department of Transportation, there's no place to park.

We are still not completely settled. In self-defense, it is not every day that a Department is born with 95,000 employees, with field forces operating at 3,000 locations in the United States and in 40 foreign countries, with the responsibility to administer expenditure of a $6 billion annual budget. Just getting organized and defining goals and policies has taken time.

Briefly, our principal mission is to plan and direct the development of a better-balanced, coordinated transportation system responsive to the economic, social, political and defense needs of the Nation, and to insure improved safety on all segments.

That only takes a few seconds to say. It may take several lifetimes to accomplish.

If we were just to design a transportation system for the future, starting from scratch, modern technology coupled with today's experience in what not to do would make the task relatively simple. Instead we are painfully aware that whatever we build must rest on what we already have. We must start with the here and now. And here and now we have many problems.

We are faced with the prediction that total transport capacity in our country must double in 13 years to meet the projected volumes of passenger and goods traffic. As early as 1975 our railroads will be hauling more than a thousand billion ton-miles of freight and our motor carriers more than 600 billion ton-miles of freight annually. More than 126 million licensed drivers will be operating an estimated 118 million motor vehicles over our streets and highways. By 1977 a million passengers a day will be boarding commercial airliners.

I cite these figures not as a bragging American but as partial definition of the problem. When you look at the congestion and frustration in some of our airports today - when you are caught in rush-hour traffic on our city streets - the idea of a 100 percent increase defies belief.

Our situation differs somewhat from that in most of your homelands in that almost all transportation services are privately owned and operated. The Government acts as a catalyst between the transportation industry and the transportation user, providing whatever element - frequently, money - is necessary to a compatible operation. The result is a hybrid network, where private automobiles use public highways, private aircraft fly from public or private airports over Government-controlled airways, and private ships and barges ply public waterways. Most private railroads were made possible by public land grants. Under this system, Government may recommend and regulate but it must not coerce. Our mandate from Congress is that a coordinated transportation service is "to be provided by private enterprise to the maximum extent feasible."

Transportation is the second largest industry in the United States. It employs 13 to 14 percent of the labor force. Between 18 and 19 percent of our total Federal taxes come from transportation sources - about $24 billion in 1966.

Yet in many areas transportation has been technology's stepchild. At present, less than 1 percent of the annual Federal research budget goes to transportation research, most of that in aviation. Transport companies spend less than one-half of one percent of their revenues on research. Fragmentation of the industry, which is characterized by a comparatively large number of relatively small companies, is the main deterrent. For the typical trucker, investment in R&D is viewed as uneconomic, as it is. A research budget of $100,000 would be a major item for the typical transport firm and that is too small to permit much useful basic scientific inquiry.

Automobile manufacturers of course spend great sums every year in the development of new models. Until very recently, most of that research has been devoted to increasing the speed and modifying the lines of new cars to attract men buyers. Or developing a new shade of blue or pink paint that will attract the ladies. Their research, in other words, has not been directed particularly toward improving safety or reducing air pollution. This emphasis has shifted somewhat since our Department issued its motor vehicle safety standards, as I'll explain later.

Our R&D budget in the Department of Transportation for fiscal year 1969, exclusive of the supersonic transport project, is $99 million.

I shall stress our highway situation because the United States is a nation on wheels. Four out of every five persons old enough to drive have a driver's license. Production of automotive vehicles outpaces our national birth rate. We are buying automobiles at the rate of 8,000,000 a year. In 1967, more than 81 million passenger cars and 16.5 million trucks and buses traveled 967 billion vehicle-miles over our 3.7 million miles of streets and highways.

For this growing tide of traffic, much of it concentrated on major routes and in cities, the Federal Government and the States, as partners, have underway history's biggest peacetime program of public works - construction of the 41,000-mile National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. Criss-crossing the nation with freeways, the Interstate links more than 90 percent of our cities having populations of 50,000 or more, as well as many smaller cities and towns. It is now more than 60 percent constructed. When completed, it will carry 20 percent of all the nation's traffic on a little over 1 percent of the total road surface. Experience on sections in use indicates that safety features in the Interstate System will save about 8,000 lives a year.

This is important but it is not enough. The affinity of the American for his automobile has led to tragic casualties on our highways—about 1,000 deaths per week. Unless the present trend is reversed or slowed, highway accidents will claim 100,000 lives a year by 1977. Economic losses due to accidents average a billion dollars monthly.

Reducing this toll has first priority in our Department programs. The consolidation of the Bureau of Public Roads, the National Highway Safety Bureau, and the Bureau of Motor Vehicle Safety within the Federal Highway Administration gives us an effective instrument with which to make a total assualt on the problem - safety of the roads, the vehicles, and the driver, plus accelerated medical care for those involved in accidents.

A new set of safety standards for highway construction has been developed in conjunction with the American Association of State Highway Officials. Spot improvements are being effected at high-hazard locations throughout the country and a special program is under way to increase the capacity and efficiency of urban street systems.

One interesting experimental project is testing the usefulness of electronic systems to control the entry of vehicles onto high-speed freeways. At selected locations in Houston, Chicago, and Detroit, vehicles are held on the access ramp until the electronic device measures the traffic flow and signals time for a safe entry. Results to date indicate that this system will reduce accidents caused by merging traffic and will accomplish a more efficient loading of freeway traffic.

Another development that may interest some of you is breakaway supports for highway signs and light poles. Breakaway supports, built with a slip plate at the base and a hinge joint seven feet above ground, are designed to move forward and upward out of a car's way at impact. A 27-month tally kept by the Texas Highway Department showed only one fatality in 117 collisions involving signs mounted on breakaway supports, as compared to 80 fatalities involving rigid signs in 1965 and 1966.

One of the first important accomplishments of the Department was the issuance of 13 Federal Highway Safety Standards which set forth the background, purposes and elements of a State highway safety program. As these are adopted and enforced throughout the 50 States they should reduce our accident rate appreciably.

New Motor Vehicle Safety Standards, requiring such items as seat belts and collapsible steering wheels, understandably were protested at first by the manufacturers because they added to vehicle costs. As it became apparent that buyer interest now centers on safety almost as much as on color and style, manufacturers began competing to innovate safety measures over and above those required by DOT.

General Motors recently announced it would put 50 pounds of steel into the doors of most 1969 models as sort of a hidden guardrail to protect riders in side collisions - a major safety advance. Then Ford said it would offer a skid control device on at least some of its 1969 models. This system consists of sensors at the rear wheels that feed wheel turning speed to a small computer beneath the glove compartment. When the signals read "skid" the computer orders an actuator in the engine department to start altering the brake-fluid pressure to the rear wheel brake; in effect, to pump the rear wheel brakes 35 to 40 times a second, allowing the rear tires to roll just a bit and grip the roadway as the car stops. Instead of swerving, the car stops in a straight line. The system applies only to skids that start at the rear wheels from a sudden stop or braking on a slippery road. It isn't perfect but it is a very important first step. Other manufacturers are diverting research funds to new safety projects.

This chain of events illustrates the role of DOT as a catalyst serving the public through private industry, to the ultimate benefit of both.

The Federal Highway Administration conducts continuing research to obtain basic data on motor vehicle structures and their performance - on the drivers - on the role of alcohol and environmental factors.

As a result of all of these efforts, over a period of the next 10 years we should be able to measure lives saved in the hundreds of thousands.

Being so long on highways and automobiles has made us increasingly short on railroad passenger service. Many of you can give us lessons in this field.

Right here I'd like to tip my professional hat to our friends from Japan for their exceptional Tokaido Line. I suspect it was somewhat responsible for spurring us to investigate the possibility of developing high-speed ground systems to relieve the traffic glut in our metropolitan corridors.

You may have heard that we have run into difficulty with our initial models of an electric Metroliner and a jet Turbo-Train. Many people kid us about our "too slow fast trains." Actually, both models have been operated - at speeds in excess of 150 mph for one and 170 for the other - but they are undergoing further tests and improvements to work out any bugs before they are put in experimental service in the Northeast Corridor. This megalopolis extends from Boston, Massachusetts to Washington, D.C. It has a population of 40 million, produces 30 percent of all American manufacturing, and accounts for 50 percent of the country's financial activity. Convenient train service from city center to city center along this route, if it met with public acceptance, might relieve highway congestion and, by making the railroad competitive with the airlines on trips of several hundred miles, reduce the pressure on metropolitan airports and the air traffic control system along the corridor. Airport-to city travel now usually adds one hour at each end of an air passenger's trip.

This disparity in convenience between air service and connecting ground service typifies the results of the imbalance in research expenditures. Technological breakthroughs in the aerospace industries have led to explosive growth in aviation. On the ground, the airports and the connecting services are not prepared to handle this growth.

Members of the airport operators council recently met to discuss how they would manage the traffic flow to and from such jumbo jets as the 400-passenger Boeing 747. Asked his opinion, the operator of the Baton Rouge Airport replied, "Man, if that airplane lands on our field it will be the terminal."

Many airports must plan to accommodate twice as many aircraft and more than twice as many passengers by 1973. Air route traffic control centers - which last year handled 15 million planes - must somehow prepare for twice that many by 1977.

To enable it to cope with these mounting demands, FAA is developing an automated air traffic control system. The system design calls for a sophisticated central computer complex, input and output devices, radar, and radarscopes showing for the aircraft blips on them the vital third dimension of altitude along with the identity of the aircraft in alphanumeric tags electronically attached to the blips. Expected to be fully implemented by the early 1970's, this advanced system will not eliminate the human element from air traffic control, but it will greatly relieve the present burden on the air traffic controller by performing automatically a variety of tedious chores that are now manual - and it will perform these chores faster and with greater accuracy.

We have established a special office and program for study of aircraft noise abatement. Expenditures for R&D in this area will amount to about $9.7 million in fiscal year 1968 and we plan to budget about $20 million for it in fiscal year 1969. Studies will concentrate on suppression of fan noise, modification of inlet and discharge ducts, use of absorptive liners, and landing and climb-out procedures. A major effort is directed toward development of aircraft noise standards by which to measure compliance of aircraft power plants with noise limits to be established as a condition of FAA design certification.

Both the noise problem and the traffic control problem will be aggravated when V/STOL aircraft in scheduled service start complicating the traffic mix. Yet there is a growing need for them.

The VTOL has many advantages, since it requires little or no runway space, but it is still too noisy. It needs to be quieted before the public will accept it in already loud midtown areas.

Airlines estimate that of the more than 34 million passengers using New York City's three major airports last year, some 13 million, or about 40 percent, were making trips suitable for a STOL plane. A workable system needs planes capable of carrying from 50 to 120 passengers. Airlines and cities interested in this short-haul service are working on several novel ideas for STOLports in metropolitan areas.

Our Federal Aviation Administration is studying the potential flight characteristics, acceptable noise levels, workable V/STOL airport design needs, and navigation, approach, and landing aids required for low-flying intercity traffic. The FAA is working on the premise that such a system will be in effect in the 1970's or early 1980's.

This very brief report on DOT's RD&D interests and endeavors is far from complete. I have not discussed the important work of our Coast Guard or of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, nor our joint research efforts with he Maritime Commission.

The Urban Mass Transportation Administration was just transferred to our Department this month. I hope to be able to tke back for their guidance a report of the study you are concluding on this subject.

Today's technology can accomplish almost anything that needs to be done. What is required in many areas is a change in attitude - a realization that if the old way isn't working, perhaps we'd better try something new. Too many people in transportation still believe that dogma is a man's best friend.

We must face the fact that the soft jobs in transportation are behind us. Accommodating the forecasted growth is no longer as simple as doubling our highway mileage or tripling our runways. The job is more difficult because we can no longer afford to ignore the fourth dimension in transportation - its effect on the environment.

In the next three years all of U. S. industry will spend at least 51 billion dollars for research and development. We plan to encourage expenditure of some of those funds to improve safety in our transport network, to clear the air, to clean the waters, and to better the quality of life in our cities.

You and I have been brought here by a common concern that what we have today <u>should</u> be better and that what we have tomorrow <u>must</u> be better. Together, I think we shall manage it.

Thank you.

# # # #

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY, FRANK W. LEHAN, AT THE 17th ANNUAL NATIONAL SYMPOSIUM OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTANTS ASSOCIATION, 2:30 P.M., JUNE 20, 1968, DENVER HILTON HOTEL, DENVER, COLORADO

As a transplanted westerner about to endure the rigors of a Washington summer, I was particularly happy to receive your invitation to come to Denver.

After accepting with an alacrity that surprised my staff, I began to wonder just what business a research scientist had addressing a group of accountants. What subject is of particular interest to both of us? One answer of course is that most popular of American topics - money. And there are always death and taxes.

So today we are going to talk about money, death, and taxes. Officially, I find, the subject is "The Cost of Transportration Progress."

In 1903 Dr. H. Nelson Jackson and his chauffeur started out from San Francisco, without benefit of road map, to drive to New York. They made it in 63 days - the first coast-to-coast trip by automobile. Now we can drive it comfortably in five to eight days - or fly it in less than five hours.

I doubt that anyone can accurately measure all the costs - or the benefits - of the intervening progress.

Dr. Jackson's Winton reportedly was stuck 18 times in one day in buffalo wallows. He may not always have known where he was - but you may be sure he saw the sights of America during his 63 days on the road.

That's one of the prices we pay for our speed. Barreling down the Interstate at 70 or 80 miles an hour, we lose touch with the countryside. We never know the America revealed to John Steinbeck in his leisurely "Travels with Charley." We are wholly preoccupied with the grim business of keeping alive at a pace that takes a heavy toll for human error.

Or we hop a plane, open our briefcase or magazine, and stay immersed in paper, with perhaps time out for a drink or a meal, until we touch down at destination.

As what sometimes seems like ceaseless mobility becomes a way of life, we lose much of the wonder and practically all of the delight of travel. I count that a cost.

On the credit side, we arrive comparatively refreshed. We have not had to stop and change tires four times in a hundred miles. Or we have not had to reach for the little white bag as our non-pressurized aircraft bobbed around in low-altitude air currents. We have also saved a lot of time, for whatever that is worth. And we practically never get stuck in a buffalo wallow.

You are the accountants - you balance the books.

A more serious cost is in accidental deaths and damage. Did you know, for instance, that in 1966 1,318 persons died in pleasure boat accidents? That's only 23 fewer than were killed in all types of aviation accidents. Railroad accidents claimed 819 and commercial ships 390.

Highways of course are the great offender. Already in this century the automobile has taken the lives of 1.5 million Americans - more than we've lost in battle in all the years since the founding of the Republic. Unless we reverse the trend we'll probably be averaging 100,000 a year by 1977. Worldwide, automobiles now kill 200,000 persons a year.

Cumulative cost of personal injuries and property damage is incalculable. Last year, however, on U.S. highways 3.6 million people were injured and 24 million vehicles were damaged, with total economic losses running to $13 billion. How do you balance those cost figures on your ledger?

Yet you never hear of a mass demonstration against automobiles - and, lest I be misunderstood, let me hasten to add that DOT isn't advocating one!

My point is that transportation as it is, rather than as it could or should be, has come to be taken for granted like the weather. Education is needed to counteract that apathy.

When the Department of Transportation was born last year, Secretary Boyd immediately mounted a frontal attack on highway safety problems. Now we have some evidence that public education is carrying at least one of these programs forward under its own power.

The first regulations to require various safety features on automotive vehicles were understandably met with something less than enthusiasm by the industry, to whom they represented added costs. Then came the period when vehicles were called back for correction of certain defects. People all around the country read about these call-backs and began to wonder how safe their cars were. Now safety is very big in Detroit. The dream of automotive safety engineers of the day when manufacturers would vie for a competitive edge in safety, as well as in styling and horsepower, seems nearer.

General Motors recently announced it would put 50 pounds of steel into the doors of most 1969 models as sort of a guardrail to protect riders in side collisions - a major safety advance. Then Ford said it would offer a skid control device on at least some of its 1969 cars.

Pontiac is planning a new type defroster-deicer for rear windows on some 1969 models. Ford is trying to do the same for its 1969 Thunderbird. Oldsmobile won that race by putting the hot glass in cars this month.

An interesting point is that, according to the New York Times, one year ago Ford engineers said skid control was three years away. Now everyone is hurrying to perfect it sooner.

This is the competitive system at work in the best sense and we're glad to have provided the stimulus. In all honesty we should probably share any plaudits with one Ralph Nader for his part in also exciting public and congressional interest in automotive safety.

Meanwhile our Department, through the Bureau of Public Roads, has been working with the States to identify and correct accident-prone locations on our highway systems. A new program has been recommended to Congress to permit expenditure of Federal funds to increase safety on metropolitan streets. Additional safety features are being specified for all new construction. Other programs are underway to identify the causes of accidents and to provide more immediate care when accidents do occur.

With safer cars and safer highways, we still have one large trouble factor - the driver. And he is the real miscreant.

Unfortunately you can't legislate common sense into an individual. Someone has figured it out that if all the automobiles in the United States were lined up bumper to bumper they would stretch for 250,000 miles - and 93 percent of their drivers would immediately pull out to pass. From my personal experience on California freeways, I'd say that estimate is a little low.

Even if we can't legislate common sense, our laws and regulations could certainly stand some improvement.

In 30 of the 50 states, there's nothing to prevent a blind man's driving; licenses are renewable by mail. In one Midwest state, a check of blind pensioners turned up 136 who had driving licenses. A man stopped for driving down the middle of the road in one of the Southern states explained that if he didn't straddle the white line he couldn't see where he was going. A man who drove into a tree was totally blind. Apparently the sighted passenger who was directing him had let his attention flag just before the car hit.

Recent studies show that drinking is involved in slightly more than half of all fatal accidents. In the single car, run-off-the-road type of accidents, about 70 percent of the drivers were excessively drunk. Sweden and Great Britain have both proved that effective laws properly enforced can cut this toll significantly.

I didn't come here primarily to talk on safety but we can't ignore the mounting death rate in calculating the total cost of transportation progress. On this point I'll simply indict us all with St. Thomas Aquinas' dictum: "He who allows certain events to happen which result in homicide by imprudence becomes guilty in a certain manner of pre-meditated homicide."

That brings us to money and taxes. Research scientists are supposed to be ivory-tower types who don't understand such subjects. I just happen to have owned a rather prosperous little business before joining the Department of Transportation - and frankly I'm concerned about the accepted management practices that apparently are not practiced in at least some agencies of government.

Let's talk a minute about transportation as a business. Probably first we should know its size. Measured by any standards, it is huge. It accounts for 20 percent of the gross national product. It contributes more than $33 billion annually in Federal and State taxes. By contrast, Federal and State government agencies expended about half that amount - $16.4 billion - for transport facilities and support services in 1966 - almost 88 percent for highway programs.

The nation's freight bill jumped from $48.3 billion in 1962 to $70.5 in 1966. Of that $70.5 billion, 73 percent relies on highway transport.

Similarly, costs of passenger travel rose from $60.3 billion in 1962 to $81 billion in 1966, and highway travel accounted for 91 percent of the 1966 figure. This includes travel by private automobile and private aircraft, as well as urban transit.

From the standpoint of employment, transportation and its related industries account for 13 to 14 percent of the total employed civilian labor force. This means that roughly one of every seven working Americans is engaged in some aspect of the business of moving people or goods.

Of the 9,360,000 people so engaged in 1965, actual transportation services accounted for 2,389,000. The biggest manpower users are trucking and warehousing, with 963,000, and the railroads, with 735,000. By comparison, the airlines employ only 211,000.

In addition to transportation equipment manufacturing and such transportation-related industries as gas stations and highway construction, the total includes 760,000 employed in government. Of these, some 90,000 were moved under one administrative roof when the Department of Transportation was activated in April of last year, making it the fourth largest of the 12 Executive departments.

At that time, 95 million motor vehicles were streaming over 3 million miles of streets and highways. Commercial airlines flew 1 billion miles a year and, together with general aviation, crowded the airways with more than 100,000 aircraft of all types and sizes. Americans each year traveled almost a thousand billion passenger-miles between cities, 89 percent by private auto. More than 1.5 trillion ton-miles of freight moved annually by rail, truck, air, pipeline, rivers, canals, and the Great Lakes.

Any way you look at it, transportation is big business.

The Association of American Railroads recently figured that by the end of this year the Federal, State and local governments will have invested almost $300 billion in all modes of transport. Maybe it's quixotic, but I consider an investment of this size worthy of the most efficient management practices.

Let me zero in for a minute on the budgeting process of the Federal Aviation Administration because I am most familiar with the flight industry. The FAA has established an excellent record for air safety and for efficient management. What worries me is that during the early sixties, we allowed a major reduction in our facilities and equipment funding at a time when operations at FAA control towers were on a steady rise. We have every reason to expect that these towers will have responsibility for about 140 million aircraft operations by 1977, up from 45 million takeoffs and landings in 1966. We just can't handle that volume without installation of highly advanced technological equipment.

Had we been utilizing the accounting and investing techniques of business, I do not believe this imbalance would have resulted. For example, had we adopted a realistic depreciation account, we would have immediately noted the necessity for far greater investments just to avoid obsolescence.

One of the major efforts of the new Department of Transportation will be the adaptation of such techniques to its requirements. We are attempting to build a data base

that will tell us where we are out of line, where we need to spend more money, what old facilities should be shut down, and what new facilities are needed. In other words, we are seeking to develop a system similar to that in industry where financing data is used to provide real management control and understanding of an operation.

In my brief experience in government I've had the feeling that these tools are not being used to their full advantage. You fellows will probably set me straight in a hurry before the day is over - and if so, for once I'll be glad to be wrong.

I've noticed that government, much more than industry, has been moving toward PPBS. Systems analysis is an important part of this activity and I see you are being addressed by experts on this subject. Systems analysis is sometimes defined as common sense cranked into a computer. However, it has also been said that systems analysis is like arsenic - properly used in small doses under direction of a wise physician it is a valuable medicine; improperly used in large amounts by non-experts - with or without old lace - it becomes fatal.

Earlier this year Professor Sol Golomb of U.S.C. wrote a tongue-in-cheek article in which he listed 10 "Don'ts" of Mathematical Modeling. A few of these are:

Don't believe that the model is the reality. In other words, "Don't eat the menu."

Don't distort reality to fit the model. My own illustration of that would be the totalitarian government that sets its pattern for society. If society doesn't conform to the pattern, the government changes the society.

Don't fall in love with your model. Or, don't reenact Pygmalion.

My friend Sol concluded with a cartoon idea to sum up the best overall advice to those employing mathematical modeling. It shows a rocky road, filled with potholes, and a large sign in the foreground, warning: "Proceed - With Caution."

I seem to have digressed from the costs of transportation progress. Yet they are becoming so astronomical that the necessity to carefully apply all available means to reduce them needs stressing.

The other costs are in noise and air pollution and in urban detritus. We experience them every day and I don't propose to take you on a busman's holiday with anymore figures.

Having determined the costs, we reach the question of who is going to pay. I've already talked too long but bear with me while I tell you about our recent experience with airway user taxes.

You are all familiar with the Bureau of the Budget's mandate that executive agencies are to recover, where practicable, the full cost of providing services benefiting identifiable groups or individuals.

As of now, the airlines are paying about 85 percent of their cost of FAA support services. General aviation - corporate aircraft, air taxis, flight schools, crop dusters, helicopters, blimps, gliders - all non-airline aviation - pays about 4 1/2 percent of its share. Recently, at President Johnson's suggestion, DOT sent to the Hill proposed legislation imposing taxes to bring the airlines up to 100 percent of their share and general aviation up to about 20 percent of its share, all it could probably bear within the prescribed time frame.

You may have mistaken the reaction from the aviation industry for a sonic boom. The airlines thought their share was too high; general aviation thought its share was too high. Actually it's a fair, well-reasoned bill - and I suspect they all know it. When you consider that only 10 to 20 percent of the people in this country have ever been up in an airplane, it doesn't seem right to expect the other 80 or 90 percent to lend too much support to the industry out of general taxes. Especially not now, when those taxes are needed for so many other services.

Anyway, they got together and decided if the aviation industry was going to pay more taxes they had to be earmarked in a trust fund. At a luncheon last week I told them there was some doubt that this was the best way to run a government. If all the money from liquor taxes, for instance, were invested in bars, Congress might have the happiest constituency in the world - but we'd be a little short on such things as postal services and schools.

I hope they'll come around to our way of thinking because FAA really needs the money to modernize our airways if the airlines are going to double their business in five years - and aircraft in general aviation are going to jump from 100,000 to 150,000.

In assessing the costs of transportation progress it sometimes sounds as if we're knocking our transportation industry. We shouldn't. Even the much-maligned automobile is one of our most treasured possessions. Think how you'd feel if someone decreed that, starting right now, you'd have to get along without yours.

We have the only transportation system in the world essentially owned and operated by private enterprise. It's great - and DOT's sole purpose is to try to make it better. As President Johnson has said, "In a Nation spanning a continent, transportation is the web of union." Our business at DOT is to help strengthen any weak spots in the web.

One of the benefits of transportation progress is that without it we couldn't take the time to cross the country to attend meetings of this kind. In my book of life, I'd count that a loss.

Thank you.

#####

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY ALAN S. BOYD, SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION AT THE U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS, THE PALMER HOUSE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, THURSDAY, JUNE 13, 1968, 11:00 A.M.

My son graduated from college last week and for one brief moment I thought I had gotten my last letter saying things were going fine, send more money. Then I remembered that we are about to start administering the urban mass transportation program. So I will still be getting plenty of mail.

As a matter of principle, it will be very welcome mail. During the past year, the Department has been trying to get one basic point across: that Americans must look at their transportation for what it really is -- an integral and important part of the total structure of society -- the moving part, if you will.

We have been telling anyone who would listen that it makes no sense to lay out locations for factories and offices and apartment buildings and then go back and fill in the blank spaces with streets and expressways. Nor does it make sense to plan public transportation systems without blending them with highway networks and airports.

So we are glad to start practicing what we have been preaching -- a coordinated approach to all transportation facilities that serve metropolitan areas.

I suspect we will never be able to stop the argument among planners about whether a city should be planned around its transportation network or the transportation network planned around the city.

But the important thing is that they cannot argue without talking to each other and that will be an improvement. The important thing is that the architects and the economists will be together, along with the transit men and the highway engineers, the planners and the landscapers, the sociologists and the politicians. And they will all be looking at the same map and reading the same blueprints.

And that is important because, as transportation made the city possible, it can also make the city impossible. It not only moves people and goods, it can affect our health, our attitudes, our pattern of life, our physical and social environment, the very air we breathe.

It is as dangerous to generalize about America's cities as it is to generalize about people. The city is all things to all men -- centers of art and thought to some; traps for others; exciting places of opportunity for some and the end of the road for others. And the frames of reference are -- and should be -- as diverse as those of the artist and the Vermont farmer who was trying to sell him a house. "Does it have a view?" the artist wanted to know. "A good view is important to me." And the farmer said: "Well, from the front porch you can see Ed Snow's barn but there's not much beyond that except a bunch of mountains."

But there are some things about our cities on which all men can agree. The air is too often too polluted. The crime rate is too high, the streets are often beyond congestion and closer to saturation; too much of the housing is neither decent, nor safe nor sanitary; and in the slum areas it is not so much that the children fail in school as that the school fails the children.

And perhaps the most serious transportation problem the cities have ever dealt with is the availability of it -- transportation that made it possible for people to abandon the city. And as a result we have drained our cities of too much of the human and financial resources they need to stay alive.

We have, except for an atoll of affluence here and there, abandoned the cities by night to the poor and underprivileged. We have engineered good networks that make it possible for us to get to the city to earn the incomes that we take back with us to the suburbs. But we have engineered almost nothing in the way of transportation to take the poor to the jobs that have joined in the flight to the suburbs.

I have not come here today to tell you your troubles. Nor do I have any all-purpose plans for solving the urban problems in transportation or in any other field.

I do know that President Johnson is the first American president to see the problem of the cities in scale and to make it possible for us to begin to deal with the problems of the cities. As a result of his programs, there is now help available on a larger scale than ever before -- help in dealing with disease, poverty, ignorance and blight.

The model cities program provides federal help for improving not just housing but whole neighborhoods. Rent supplement program makes it possible for people to use them. City schools have more money available, and more creative programs on which to use the money -- programs like the Teacher Corps and others. And among these programs is our own Department of Transportation.

In his message to Congress calling for creation of the Department, the President pointed out that there is no true system of transportation in this country. There is, rather, a haphazard collection of systems that grew to meet needs as they arose but not always to meet each other. As a result, he said, "both people and goods are compelled to conform to the system as it is..." And he saw the Department's primary job as that of reversing that order to make the system conform to the needs of people.

In general, we are working toward coordinating the future growth of all modes of transportation so that people and cargo can move from one to another with a minimum of delay and a maximum of comfort and safety.

Our role in the cities is no different. A taxicab, a bus, an expressway serve the same purpose as a school, an art gallery or an office. They are there because people who work or live in cities need them to live well. Our job is to help make them work as well as possible.

A good place to start on this job, I think, is to recognize that in most American cities for the foreseeable future the dominant form of transportation will continue to be rubber over roads.

But the question is how much rubber over what kind of roads. We have reached a point where we can no longer ignore the fact that the price of allowing the automobile free rein in some cities -- at the expense of other values and means and considerations -- may well be higher than we want to pay. Arthur Palmer, the transportation administrator for New York City, put it this way recently: "The advantage of the motor vehicle," he said, "as a flexible and freely moving mode of transportation has been lost in its own uncontrolled and unprovided for abundance -- like a herd of protected elk reduced to starvation by its own proliferation on a limited range."

We have not yet reached the point where we are required to make an absolute choice between the automobile and the city.

Nor have we reached the point where we must choose between the automobile and public transportation. But we have reached the point -- at least in central business districts -- where we must face up to the fact that we do have a limited range. We must begin to temper our romance with the automobile with a strong dose of reality.

Reality, of course, also requires that we recognize the rather pathetic state and severe limitations of existing alternatives to the automobile. And we must recognize that the reason most Americans have too little choice is that neither at the public nor the private level have we spent anywhere near the time, money or imagination on public transportation as we have lavished on the car. In terms of Federal contributions we spend as much on highways every 25 days as we have spent in the nearly seven years since the Urban Mass Transportation Act was passed.

As I have suggested, the answer is not to forget about automobiles and highways and focus all of our energies and funds on alternatives./ The answer, instead, is to begin to focus on transportation as a system,

made up of interdependent modes, whose job is to serve the city in which it operates and the people who live there.

The answer is to start dealing with transportation more in terms of the people it serves; to start shaping it to give them access to the opportunities that cities alone can supply.

And that means:

--First, that each urban area must decide for itself what kind of transportation system best serves and suits its particular needs. Obviously, the system that works best in Omaha or Denver is not likely to work at all in New York or Boston.

--Second, that we look at our various transportation modes as mutually inclusive rather than mutually exclusive. We have to stop thinking of alternatives in the sense of one mode or another and start thinking of alternatives in terms of varying combinations of modes.

--Third, that we evaluate alternative transportation systems, not in narrowly economic or engineering terms, but in terms of the total urban environment in which they operate and which they so deeply affect.

--Finally, that we accelerate the process by which the Councils of Governments and others have begun to move toward regional planning of comprehensive transportation systems.

My department is engaged in hundreds of programs and projects and investigations to help you approach your transportation problems in terms of your total needs. But we can do no more than help.

Each city and each metropolitan area must decide for itself what kind of transportation system best suits its needs. And before it can decide that, it must decide what kind of city it wants to be.

I realize that many of you are already putting in long, hard days just meeting payrolls and holding the city together without getting into such abstracts as the kind of city you want to be.

But I will pass on to you one of the more instructive things I have heard from mayors -- this from Mayor Erik Jonsson of Dallas. "People," he said, "tend to forget that there is a difference between a goal and a plan. A goal is where you want to go. A plan is how you get there."

I am aware, also, that overlapping and obsolete jurisdictions can frustrate the best of itentions -- as can federal policies which must bear some of the blame for creating your problems.

The Federal Government, for example, has at one and the same time established programs to rebuild and restore our central cities and programs that have contributed to their decay and decline.

But we are moving toward more comprehensive and better coordinated Federal-aid programs. And I think the transfer of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration to our Department is one sign of that. The transfer, in and of itself, will not solve your transportation problems. But it is a step toward reshaping Federal programs to respond more fully and more flexibly to the needs of your cities.

Currently, for example, our transportation demonstration programs are designed to deal mainly with individual pieces of hardware rather than with systems and to serve very broad rather than very particular needs. And they have a way sometimes of being applicable everywhere in general and nowhere in particular.

We may well want to consider a radical revision of our whole approach to demonstration grants -- a revision that would enable them to serve both more inclusive and more unique purposes, both more comprehensive and more concrete needs.

One approach would be to permit the cities -- backed with Federal funds and free from rigid program categorization -- to define and deal with their most urgent transportation problems as they see them, not as we see them.

Today, you are severely restricted in what you can do with Federal transportation aid. Billions of dollars are available to streets and expressways and they are available now. A few millions of dollars are available for mass transit and there is a waiting list. So you are really faced with the same choice the American commuter is faced with -- take the car now or wait for the train. Yet, freeways and mass transit are only two ways of dealing with just a few of the urban transportation needs.

A city may well decide, for example, that it requires, not new highways or mass transit, but more fringe parking, or better airport access, or a new computerized traffic control system, or more grade separations.

This year, we have asked the Congress to make available funds for fringe parking and for adjustments to city street systems. But they still would be categorized. And the approach I suggest might well be the next step -- making grants available to meet urban transportation problems in almost any way -- however novel -- that bears a rational relationship to a city's overall transportation planning. It would, as I envisage it, help cities meet their immediate needs as well as improve their comprehensive transportation system planning.

We look forward to working closely with all of you to make our programs more responsive to the real needs of your cities. We share your sense of urgency for meeting those needs -- in education, in employment, in renewal and in transportation.

We believe America's cities are one of its great resources, and we have no illusions that conserving them and improving them will be an easy job for any of us. It is fashionable these days to talk of the cities much as we talk about old automobiles, that ought to be traded in periodically for new models.

I prefer to think of them the way President Johnson did when he said: "We must seek, and we must find, the ways to perpetuate in the city the individual, the human dignity, the respect for human rights...that has been part of the American character and the strength of the American system."

This country has always risen to the challenge of the frontier. I suggest that the frontier today is the city. And President Johnson has said it best: "The challenge of changing the face of the city and the men who live there summons us all -- the President and the Congress, Governors and Mayors.

"The challenge reaches as well into every corporate board room, university, and union headquarters in America.

"It extends to church and community groups, and to the family itself. The problem is so vast that the answer can only be forged by responsible leadership from every sector, public and private.

"We dare not fail to answer -- loud and clear."

Our purpose is to join with you in providing answers.

Thank you.

# # # #

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

REMARKS OF JOHN E. ROBSON, UNDER SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT THE INSTITUTE FOR RAPID TRANSIT'S URBAN TRANSPORTATION CONFERENCE AT THE PARK PLAZA HOTEL IN TORONTO, CANADA, JUNE 12, 1968, 4:30 P.M.

It is a great pleasure to be here today. It was very kind of you to invite me here to speak to our future creditors.

Since the Urban Mass Transportation Program does not formally shift to the Department of Transportation until July 1, I feel a little like the prospective father expounding the joys of family life. But this gives me a privilege rarely enjoyed by a public official -- which is to tell his constituency how things could or should be without having to take the blame for the way things are. No doubt this is the last time I will be able to address you in that enviable state.

It is appropriate, I think, that responsibility for the Urban Mass Transportation Program comes to us in the month of July, the month which marks the Declaration of Independence for the United States and the proclamation of the principles of freedom which serve as the very basis for our national existence. These

principles are quite relevant to the subject of urban transportation.

For the foundation of freedom is the right to choose -- your politics, religion, ideas, job, and where and how you will live. All the elaborate machinery of our democracy is grounded on the idea that making choices is good for people -- that in the exercise of choice we develop according to our own bent to our fullest potential.

And it is choice which should govern the kinds of cities we live in and the kinds of life we can lead there: the goals of those cities, the quality of their environment, and the kinds of transportation and other services they can provide. It is free choice which should allow each city to develop according to its own bent and to its fullest potential.

So, constitutionally, we are free to choose. But practically -- insofar as our cities and urban transportation systems go -- I doubt that we have fully exercised that right.

For to choose means a conscious selection among possible alternatives.

I question whether we have always had the political will even to create real alternatives for our cities. And where there have been alternatives, the consequences of choosing one or another of them often have not been sufficiently illuminated for the people and their political leaders.

We have created urban areas where the only choice is between leaving and suffering. And many have voted with their feet.

It is said that the purchase of a new car is the exercise of a transportation choice. It is certainly a choice among different kinds of cars. But it is hardly a meaningful choice among different modes of transportation. For many living in metropolitan areas there are no real transportation alternatives to the car. And there is little confidence among those who deeply feel the need for a real transportation choice that their communities or political leaders will provide those alternatives.

I do not believe that the private automobile is the last outpost of individualism or self-expression. And the choice to build highways to accommodate the cars which have and will come is not so much a choice as a necessary reaction.

But choices can be made -- if we have the will to make them. There is a town down in Virginia where, sometime around 1900, the Norfolk and Western Railroad considered building its shops. The people in the town decided that they didn't want the people and the activity which the railroad would bring. They decided that they liked their town as it was. So the railroad moved to Roanoke, then about the same size. Today Roanoke is twice the size of its neighbor.

During the Second World War this same town achieved what was, by local standards, a distinction. It was "the only town of its size in Virginia which had neither war industry nor military installations." For many towns this would be a Congressman's nightmare, the despair of a Chamber of Commerce.

This town, however, knew what it wanted. The community had made the choice and, whether you agree or disagree with the choice which they made, it was theirs. And this is important. They rejected economic expansion and instead chose the course they believed would assure that their town would continue to be the way they liked it.

This is, of course, a rare incident. But it illustrates the thesis that choices can be made and that the main task ahead for those of us in transportation is to create a favorable environment for choice.

There are several levels and aspects of the choices I am talking about, each linked to and dependent upon the other.

At the bottom -- and I say this with a melancholy deliberateness -- is individual choice. A family agonizes over choosing a home -- making sure that it is in a "nice" neighborhood. But I doubt that that same family spends very much time making sure that the city it lives in is pursuing a path which insures that there will continue to be any "nice" neighborhoods.

The difference is that people know they are making a choice when they pick a place to live. But in many cases they do not know that they can help make choices to shape the city's future. Instead, people often assume that they and their communities are carried along by irresistible forces. In the transportation field, for example, we often are told that the demand for a given type of facility will be at a certain level twenty years from now, and the clear implication is that we had better start now to build that facility to meet the projected demand.

But the obvious fact is that the demand will depend on the decisions we make now -- including the decision whether or not to build that very facility.

The point is that projections are not yet reality, and trends are not irreversible. The very existence of an Urban Mass Transportation Administration is a commitment to that principle.

But prophesies can become self-fulfilling, and trends can gather great momentum. The first step in reversing them is the recognition that there are alternatives.

Across the Nation, commuters daily sit in traffic jams. Silently, or not so silently, they protest what is happening and ponder whether there is another way. In a Nation as rich and resourceful as ours, surely there are solutions to his problem. The commuter should know how much these solutions might cost. He should know how possible alternatives might affect his property taxes. He should know enough about the way the system works to identify the steps which he as an individual, as a member of the community, as a taxpayer, might take to make the alternatives not just possible but available.

Most important, he should have the means for evaluating the cost of not having an alternative in terms of pollution, accidents, environmental quality and urban values. He needs to know what the alternatives -- or the lack of alternatives -- might cost in terms of the preservation of neighborhood unity within urban diversity. He should be made aware of the possibilities which real alternatives might offer -- possibilities like access to training and jobs for ghetto dwellers, and access to community facilities for the aged, the handicapped, and the poor.

But who is asking our not-at-all-hypothetical commuter what alternatives he wants to pursue? Who is illuminating the implications of each alternative? Who is meeting the argument of the citizen who objects paying for a transit system which runs a few blocks from his home because he thinks it is too remote to do him any good? In many communities, I fear that no one is.

I am now talking about the second level of choice -- community choice. Certainly among people who have devoted any thought to the problem there is no serious debate that communities must have and articulate goals. But who is to set them, and whose goals are they to be? Perhaps most important, do we have the mechanisms to set these goals through planning processes -- or if you will, choice processes -- which involve the people and their political leaders, as well as all the special interests, so that goals, if not perfect, are at least realistic?

Lincoln told the story of a piano accompanist who remarked after a particularly excruciating concert with an enthusiastic but untutored female vocalist that he had heard them sing on the white keys, and he had heard them sing on the black keys, but this was the first time he had ever heard anyone sing in the cracks.

I think that in the setting of community goals and related transportation objectives we have often been singing in the cracks. The people and politicians are frequently not involved in the planning processes. The necessary relationships between all the contiguous communities and governmental agencies which must be involved in sensible planning are often inadequate. Yet it is clear we have long passed the point where the suburbs can say to the city -- as one passenger in a rowboat was heard to remark to another -- "Say old man, your end of the boat is sinking".

For suburbanites and city-dwellers are clearly in the same boat. Suburbanites are intimately affected by diseases of the city, as those of us in transportation know only too well. Suburban ears are assulted by airport noise; suburban skies are polluted by the same pollutants which have damaged city air; suburban countryside and cityscape alike are increasingly given over to meet the demands of imbalanced transportation systems.

What can we in the transportation community do to help people and cities work out their own destinies in an environment of free choice? Plainly, we must begin by acknowledging that the function of transportation is to serve other community goals. Do we occasionally find ourselves arguing for the preservation and enhancement of the central business district so that transit may be preserved -- instead of arguing for the preservation and enhancement of transit once the community has decided it wants a significant and viable central business district? If we do, we lose credibility as advocates of community choice.

Next, we can improve the quality and attractiveness of the alternatives we offer. Do transportation planners and operators really work for integration with other modes so that the benefits of each will be complementary, not competitive? A great deal of effort has been expended in the past on the promotion of one form of transportation over another. Too little effort has been devoted to a critical examination of the means for relating all modes to the total systemic needs of the community.

Finally, we can contribute significantly in bringing to public consciousness an awareness of the alternatives. What are transportation planners and operators and their labor groups doing about individual and community choice? Are we really making the alternatives known to the people -- and to the mayors, the city councils, business, labor, and the state legislatures?

I raise these questions not because I think the transportation community has been laggard but because the issues are so critical. Already the range of choices open to communities is in some respects narrower than it was a few years ago. Because of the reliance in many areas on the automobile as virtually the sole form of transportation available, land use patterns have accommodated to its demands. As reliance upon the automobile continues and increases in default of an alternative, the problems of creating that alternative become ever more difficult.

I remind you that already 28% of our city space is devoted to cars. In some cities, over half of the downtown area is used for driving and parking. Los Angeles already has 700 miles of freeway. It plans 622 miles more.

Choices are constantly being made by the city, state, and federal governments as to where their resources will be allocated. The urban areas are well represented in Congress and in the state legislatures; reapportionment should increase that representation. Reapportionment will, I think, ultimately be seen as one of the chief tools of advancing urban transportation causes -- if enough people who care about urban transportation make sure that their representatives are aware of the alternatives.

Choices are going to have to be made by my Department and its Urban Mass Transportation Administration. We think those choices should be made in accordance with criteria which assure to the extent possible, the investment of federal transportation resources in a way which will bring

-- maximum safety and efficiency

-- maximum integration and coordination with other elements of the transportation system

-- maximum services to identified community goals and environmental values, and

-- the development of creative and innovative approaches.

We cannot judge the entries, like a coupon contest, on clarity and neatness.

The Department of Transportation stands ready to work with you in searching for new ways of financing urban mass transportation needs. We know those needs exist and we will be receptive to your ideas in trying to satisfy them.

When President Johnson asked all Americans to join him in an attack on urban problems as a part of a program of building a Great Society, he said:

> "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."

And the President has labored long and hard to encourage that kind of cooperation.

I leave you with the thought that there is no richer opportunity to see freedom of choice flourish than in urban transportation. But it will not flourish unless the environment for choice is improved. That will require hard work, vision, and willingness to compromise. It means keeping our eyes both on the stars and on the ball. We in the Federal Government can help. But you must carry the brunt of the burden. I am confident it can be done. And, gentlemen, the choice is yours.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

REMARKS OF JOHN E. ROBSON, UNDER SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BEFORE THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE ON INDUSTRIAL TRAFFIC OF THE DIVISION OF TRANSPORTATION, AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE, ATLANTA, GEORGIA, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 1968.

Mr. Donnelly, thank you. You gentlemen who are involved with industrial traffic and the Department of Transportation share many concerns, and I welcome this opportunity to discuss some of them with you.

The Department of Transportation -- it's just a year and a half old -- was created at the crest of a new wave of cooperation between business and government. Our nation has the only privately owned and operated transportation system in the world. None of us think it should be otherwise.

What, then, is the government's role? My Department believes that the mobility of people and goods can best be improved, not through extended government controls, but through extended cooperation with industry.

We see an urgent need for increased planning, so that the transportation system can expand efficiently to serve a growing economy. And as we double the size of that transportation system in the next

two decades -- which we must -- we will have to pay serious attention to its effect on man's environment.

Problems caused by hazardous materials are not new in our industrial society. There are even instances where something not ordinarily hazardous has caused a great deal of trouble when things went wrong.

Few people remember the Great Boston Molasses Flood. It happened in 1919. There was an explosion in a molasses warehouse, and an ocean of molasses swept -- or maybe oozed -- into the streets of Boston. Some places, it is said, were three feet deep in molasses -- one of the messiest industrial accidents in history. A very proper Bostonian, legend has it, got into trouble with his wife. He was late getting home because of the flood. And when his wife asked where he had been, he answered with what must be one of the greatest strayed husband excuses in history: "Why, dear, I was trapped in a flood of molasses."

Matters have become much more complicated since that simpler time. American chemical research develops about 25 new products each day. An enormous variety and quantity of explosives, exotic fuels, nuclear materials, flammables, poisons, corrosives, and other hazardous materials move about this country. Developing them takes great industrial sophistication. So does transporting them.

As you know, the basic law dealing with the transportation of hazardous materials is the Transportation of Explosives Act. Responsibility for administering it was transferred to the Department of Transportation on April 1, 1967. In the year and a half since, we have worked to provide uniform, workable regulations. Secretary Alan Boyd has given high priority to this task.

Individual administrations within the Department are responsible for their part of the regulations -- depending on whether hazardous materials are moving by rail, highway, air, or water. Yet, obviously, regulations have to be developed jointly.

So we have established the Office of Hazardous Materials, operating under the Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology.

The Office of Hazardous Materials develops regulations, which are then proposed to the proper administrators for adoption. People in the Office of Hazardous Materials also provide technical assistance to the administrators and make sure that regulations are properly tested and evaluated.

We believe this basic effort should be carried further. "Coordination" can become a cliche in government, but in a program which involves so many different interests and purposes, it is crucial.

Our goal is a single set of carefully drawn national standards. As the initial step to coordinate the Department's regulatory program, we have set up a Hazardous Materials Regulations Board. The Board is made up of representatives of the four operating administrations, which regulate air, water, rail, and highway transportation. The Department's General Counsel serves as the board's legal advisor.

So much for organization. What do we hope to accomplish in the near future? As many of you know, we have given notice of our intention to revise the current hazardous materials regulations, aiming for changes that will give us something simple and effective to work with.

As we accomplish this, we will be especially concerned with four main areas: classification and labels, handling and stowing, placards and emergency procedures, and general packaging requirements.

You gentlemen know better than I how fast things change. There is a constant stream of new products, many of which require new handling systems. At the same time, there are new, improved packaging materials and operating techniques. There is a trend toward more bulk shipments. The needs of the aerospace and missile industries especially, change constantly. So must our regulations.

In the past, efforts to regulate hazardous materials were concerned mostly with the properties of materials themselves -- what are the chemical characteristics" -- and less with the types of hazards which arise from the conditions the materials are subjected to in moving them from one place to another. We intend to reverse this emphasis.

What happens to hazardous materials while they are in transit? Are they bumped, shaken, heated, cooled? And what effect does this have on them? We know a great deal, but we have a great deal more to learn about transportation environment.

What else? Techniques of transportation themselves change constantly. Carriers innovate, and seek to operate more efficiently and profitably. Our regulations must stay in step with these changes.

What are the responsibilities of shippers? Of course, they must package hazardous material properly and identify it clearly. Material and container must always be compatible -- "the right juice in the right can."

Proper documentation of shipments is an absolute necessity. If documentation is incomplete or wrong, proper action cannot be taken at the scene of an accident by fire and police officials. Of prime importance is a full, accurate description of the commodity on the shipping paper. For example, a recent shipment of Class B poisons which had leaked on food products was listed simply as "five gallon cans." This in no way alerted anyone to the seriousness of the accident or even warned of the danger of death or injury. Unfortunately, this was not an isolated incident. In the past six months there have been 77 reported accidents involving Class B poisons, many in circumstances where the shipping paper did not show the hazard.

The best safety tool available to shippers and carriers is the proper reporting of an accident. If the Department knows what the trouble is, it can take action to remedy the problem, or tell someone at the scene what he should do.

Currently we are developing regulations which would require reporting of accidents to the Department by all shippers and carriers.

Some materials escape regulation altogether. Should we have additional classifications? For example, certain cryogenic materials are not regulated. Neither are molten metals. Yet all, in the right, or I should say the wrong circumstances, these can be extremely hazardous.

Finally, we think it is extremely important to consolidate present separate sets of regulations, each written for a specific mode of transportation, into one set of regulations that covers all modes. Increasingly we find that shipments are intermodal, and regulations should simplify this process and its interchanges as much as possible.

There is no question in my mind or in yours, I am sure, that government regulation serves the public interest. Thankfully, we are past the time when government and business lived in a car-and-dog world of mutual antagonism.

As Secretary Boyd told the American Petroleum Institute last November:

> "The Federal government is well aware that corporations do, indeed, have an obligation to their stockholders. At the same time, private industry has come to realize that obligation is not necessarily in conflict with its obligation to society. Indeed, the social obligation has proved to be excellent economics in the long run."

In this sense, then, it is as important to you as it is to the public that there are adequate standards and safeguards when hazardous materials are transported. The record so far has been adequate, but we must seek perfection.

These standards cannot be written and imposed by the government acting on its own, even if the government wanted to -- which, of course, it does not.

Instead, we must work in close partnership with people such as you. We need your technical resources and experience. We need first-hand and continuous knowledge of your problems. To get these things, we must consult with you constantly. Equally important, we must have your considered comment on proposed regulations and the operation of regulations already in effect.

We are counting on you, and I assure you we will listen.

Thank you.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY ALAN S. BOYD, SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION BEFORE THE 50 CLUB AT THE UNION CLUB OF CLEVELAND, OHIO, ON MONDAY, JUNE 3, 1968, 6:30 P.M.

I had the pleasure of coming to Cleveland several months ago to talk to the Greater Cleveland Development Association - and to discuss with Mayor Stokes and some of your city officials the transportation problems that Cleveland faces.

I'm delighted to visit Cleveland again - and to meet with a group that can, I am told, do more than any other 50 or 500 or 5,000 men in the entire area to help Cleveland cope with its problems in transportation as in other fields.

The one thing that Cleveland shares with every other metropolis in America is problems - problems of poverty and slums, of deliquency and crime, of schools, of housing, of racce relations, of traffic and transportation, of polluted air and water.

Here, as in urban areas throughout the nation, these problems have a way of ignoring all boundaries, of spilling over from one jurisdiction to another, of refusing to adapt themselves to the established pigeonholes of our organizational charts and political subdivisions, or indeed our political prejudices.

For these problems, in short, affect us all in common - and their solution will require that we act in common. And, as we are discovering, we cannot deal with any of these problems in isolation - the solution to one cannot successfully be sought without seeking the solution for the others as well.

The result is that neither in government nor in the private sector can we proceed with business as usual - or more accurately, business as it used to be; for relations between the public and private sector have undergone radical alterations during the decade of the Sixties.

For its part, the Federal government has deliberately designed its policies and programs - economic and social - to enlarge and enhance the role of the private sector in the pursuit of our national goals.

And for their part, the leaders of the business world have come to accept and exercise their responsibilities for helping solve the problems that confront cities and communities throughout the land as well as the nation as a whole.

Both government and business have discovered the remarkable feats they can accomplish when they work as allies rather than as antagonists - when they seek, not cause for senseless conflict, but common cause in the national interest.

And this is not simply a pious proclamation. It is - and must increasingly continue to be - a fact of national life.

Recently Dr. Harvey Brooks - Dean of the Harvard Engineering School - put it this way: "One of the central issues of our time is how to deal with our pressing social problems, the problems brought about by the growth of population, urbanization and the rapid application and diffusion of technology itself. These are public problems. They represent needs that cannot currently be expressed in terms of a market demand that can be satisfied for somebody's profit."

"There is," he goes on to say, "no lack of ideas for dealing with many of these problems, but there is nothing analogous to the pull of the market to induce the development of solutions, or to do the sorting out of alternative innovations that is achieved more or less automatically through the probing of the market in the private sector."

Economists tell us there are two kinds of goods: private goods and social goods. Private goods each individual buys for himself are a matter of entirely free economic choice. Social goods we own and buy in common: like national defense, education, clean air, flood control and the like.

Not too long ago we could make fairly clear-cut distinctions between these kinds of goods and these kinds of choices.

But those days are gone forever.

As more and more people crowd into proportionately less and less space - so that it's getting hard to put your foot down without stepping on someone's toe - and as anything that happens anywhere in the world is only and instant electronic impulse away, we are beginning to find out that we are having to make more and more choices in common.

We are beginning to face up to the fact that the choices available to each of us individually depend on the kind of environment we create for all of us together. Our ability to make any genuine individual choices at all, in fact, will depend on how sensibly we act in building our educational and health and recreational facilities; upon our transportation system; upon the quality of the air we breathe and the water we drink; and upon the extent to which all of our citizens have ample incentives and opportunities for a decent education, a decent home and a decent job.

Transportation, for example, is one of the great choice mechanisms of our society. In the past we have, in effect, exercised our choice without really knowing it - buying automobiles and building highways without really being aware of many of the implications of these decisions.

For these are private decisions with immense public consequences - consequences we can no longer avoid or ignore.

No family, for example, considers a move to a suburban home with a two-car garage as having any consequences beyond the benefits it brings them. Yet the effect of a hundred thousand such decisions may be the relative decline of a downtown business district; relocation of firms; disintegration of the central city's school system; the isolation of the poor and the disadvantaged within the central city; removal of valuable land from city tax rolls as more and more freeways are built; and innumerable other adverse consequences.

The same pattern prevails in the spread of air and water pollution - and, most importantly, in the sometimes unintended but devastatingly effective isolation of the Negro American from even the most ordinary opportunities available to almost every other American of a different color.

The moral is very simple:

--First, both in the public and private sectors we are going to have to accept responsibility for the broad public and social consequences of all our policies and programs. We must foresee these consequences - and forestall those that threaten to undo any good result the program was intended to produce.

--Second, we are going to have to work together in this task, you in the private sector and we in government, each of us doing what each can do best.

The private market works wonders - it is the most efficient and appropriate machine ever invented by man for satisfying individual needs. But it is not always so satisfactory in meeting public needs. At the same time, no amount of Federal money - no panoply of Federal programs - can meet these needs either.

What is required - even for the success of Federal programs - is that partnership I have mentioned between the public and private sectors: the partnership President Johnson has termed "creative federalism" - federalism with a small "f".

And when we talk about transportation, we talk about people - for it is people that transportation is designed to serve - and cities - because that is where most people live and work.

And that means that when we talk about transportation we talk about all the problems people have in cities.

It means:

--First, that each urban area itself must decide what kind of transportation system best serves and suits its particular needs. Obviously, the system that works best in Las Vegas or Los Angeles is not likely to be the system that works best in Philadelphia or San Francisco.

--Second, any assessment of the role of any segment of our urban systems must be made in the context of the system as a whole. We should not build airports without adequate access roads or rails - or undertake extensive road building to accommodate autos without taking into account the feasibility of rail or other mass transit.

--Third, as I have suggested, transportation exerts as powerful and pervasive an effect upon the air we breathe as it does upon the way we live. It enables the affluent to enjoy the blessings of suburban living and convenient access to all the services of the city without really paying for it. But that pattern of life condemns the poor to the inner city and cuts them off from access to the jobs and other opportunities they must have to sustain themselves; maintain their dignity. Because, therefore, transportation has such a powerful impact upon the total environment in which it operates,then that impact must be the most important factor in deciding the direction and shape a transportation system ought to take.

What we must do, therefore, is replace the old accidental approach to transportation planning with a systems approach - looking at transportation as a system, as an organic whole, whose job is to serve the city in which it operates and the people who live there.

And we must broaden the old cost-benefit formula to include a kind of social cost accounting - that considers the broad social costs and consequences and benefits of transportation decisions, as matters not of secondary but of supreme concern.

And my Department is engaged in hundreds of programs, and projects and investigations to aid our urban areas and our transportation industry achieve these ends. But we can do no more than aid.

Our urban areas must decide for themselves what kind of transportation system they need. And before they can do that they must decide what kinds of cities they want to be, how they want to grow and what shape they want to take.

We are encouraging them to make these kinds of decisions. We are supporting them in their efforts to develop systems that suit their total needs and serve their people - witness our support of so-called "design concept" teams in Baltimore and Chicago.

We are fully aware of the handicaps under which most of our urban areas labor - the overlapping and obsolete jurisdictions, the lack of funds, and so forth, which increasingly impede their efforts to cope with the incredibily difficult problems before them.

We are also fully aware - in transportation and other fields - Federal policies must bear some of the blame for creating these problems as well as compounding some of your difficulties in dealing with them.

The Federal government, for example, has at one and the same time established programs to rebuild and restore our central cities and programs that have contributed to their decay and decline.

We are moving, in the field of transportation at least, toward more comprehensive and better coordinated Federal-aid programs. The authorization by Congress - just a few weeks ago - of the transfer to the Department of Transportation of the Urban Mass Transit Administration is a step in that direction.

But we do have a long way to go before we can say that our Federal programs are so structured and shaped that they respond as fully and as flexibly as they should to the needs of our urban areas.

Currently, for example, our transportation demonstration programs are designed to deal mainly with individual pieces of hardware rather than with systems and to serve very broad rather than very particular needs. And they have a way sometimes of being applicable everywhere in general and nowhere in particular.

We may well want to consider a radical revision of our whole approach to demonstration grants - a revision that would enable them to serve both more inclusive and more unique purposes, both more comprehensive and more concrete needs.

The approach I have in mind would, for the first time, permit cities - backed by Federal assistance and free from rigid program categorization - to define and attack their most urgent transportation problems as they interpret them at the local level.

Today, by contrast, city mayors are severely restricted in what they can do with Federal transportation aid. Billions of dollars are available for urban streets and freeways and a few million dollars are available for mass transit. Yet freeways and mass transit are only two ways of dealing with just a few urban transportation needs.

A city may well decide, for example, that it requires - not new highways or mass transit - but more fringe parking, or better airport access, or a new computerized traffic control system, or street grade separation, and so forth. But today no Federal money is available for any of these purposes. As a result, our city mayors all to often find themselves restricted to Federal transportation programs with little relevance to their most urgent transportation problems.

The approach I suggest would make grants available to meet urban transportation problems in almost any way - however novel - that bears a rational relationship to a city's overall transportation planning. It would, as I envision it, help our cities meet their immediate needs as well as improve their comprehensive transportation system planning.

This is but one way in which we - at the Federal level - can make our programs much more responsive to the real needs of our cities.

And those needs are urgent - in transportation, in education, in employment, in every aspect of urban life.

But, as I have said, while Federal efforts can aid immensely by responding to urban needs, they can only aid - they can only encourage.

For transportation decisions -- like those involving most of our pressing public problems - are essentially local political decisions - they must be made by the citizens of these local areas themselves and by the officials they have elected to run their governments.

I know that many of you strongly supported efforts to make local government workable. I urge you not to retire before the job has really begun.

I am absolutely convinced that, in transportation as in all other aspects of urban planning, businessmen and other laymen must get involved in the politics of planning - they must get involved in the substance as well as the selling.

Certainly we need the experts - but urban planning, like other things, is too important to leave entirely to the experts. And far too many businessmen seem satisfied to serve as sidewalk superintendents and suburban sharpshooters.

Nor is it enough to wait until you've got a package already wrapped up, and then go out and sell it - which businessmen have done, and done superbly, in a number of cities throughout the nation. By and large, the businessman has been reluctant to get involved in the earlier and messier stages of the planning process.

One reason, I suppose, is that he does not feel qualified.

Another is that businessmen tend to think of the decision-making process in a democracy as something different from the process in business.

If that were true, every new product would have gone on the market without a whimper from the sales department. Every store would have been expanded without a word of warning from the treasurer. And you could say of the board of directors room that there never was heard a disparaging word.

The fact is that the difference between the politics of the community and the politics of business is one of degree and of market. Elected officials deal not with one unified market or even several neatly identifiable markets but with a multitude of markets, all contending for a different share of the available product. And they must work - shape their programs and products - within the free-for-all of these contending pressures and often with resources utterly inadequate to the problems they face.

They need all the help they can get - and they need your help most of all.

#####

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION ALAN S. BOYD, AT THE COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES AT MARSHALL UNIVERSITY, HUNTINGTON, WEST VIRGINIA, 2:00 P.M., SUNDAY, MAY 26, 1968

Cardinal Newman once said: "A university...is a place which wins the admiration of the young by its celebrity, kindles the affection of the middle aged by its beauty, and rivets the fidelity of the old by its associations."

But that, as the poet said, was in another time and in another country -- long ago, and far away from Berkeley, or Columbia, or Berlin, or the Sorbonne.

And nowhere, I suppose, do the sentiments of that eminent nineteenth century English churchman and thinker seem so long ago and far away ~~than~~ as at that most ancient and abiding of rituals -- the college commencement.

I must confess that the whole idea of commencements -- and particularly commencement speeches -- has, since at least the day of my own graduation, seemed to me as good an example as there is of the ultimate indignity. The condemned man must walk one last mile; the "commencing" man must sit through one last lecture.

(more)

Yet, here I am -- no more successful in resisting the occasion than you have been.

For what I cannot really resist is the temptation to speak to young people -- to a generation of young people that seems less inclined than any in memory to accept, without scorching scrutiny, the words and the world of an older generation.

Yet I did not come prepared to admit that I am old enough to be part of any generation gap or that you are young enough to insist that one exists.

Life changes so fast these days that the young must always be older than their years and the old always younger just to remain relevant to the world around us.

No sooner do we learn to deal with one environment, one situation, one set of circumstances, than we have to start learning all over again.

We are all inescapably caught up in events and experiences whose pace and scale seem -- in contrast to earlier eras -- so much larger than life.

It is no longer possible for any of us to pursue our dreams alone and apart from the world around us -- if it ever was.

The automobile, the airplane, the telephone, the television set have all but abolished space and time -- and have involved us all in an incredibly complex network of interaction and interdependence.

The experts say we are moving toward a "loss of insulating space."

We can see and sense that trend in every aspect of our lives.

There is the phenomonal growth in the nearness and number of people -- more and more people crowding closer and closer together. There is the fact that anything that happens anywhere in the world is only an instant electronic impulse away -- and in living color at that. Everything and everyone is here and now. In a very literal sense, we are all neighbors.

One of the most crucial consequences of this loss of insulating space -- of this living in increasingly close quarters -- is that those choices we make in common will assume increasingly greater importance in our lives.

Each of us can, for example, buy his own suit of clothes or his own car -- but none of us can buy his own share of clean air, or his own stretch of clear highway.

(more)

There is a whole host of such choices which, in the past, we have left simply to the mechanism of the market place, or to the experts, or to chance -- and which we now have to make together, deliberately, as matters of conscious political decision.

We are beginning to face up to the fact that the choices available to each of us individually depend on how willing we are to make choices in common. Our ability to make any genuine individual choices at all will depend on how sensibly we act in developing our educational and health and recreational facilities; upon our transportation system; upon the quality of the air we breathe and the water we drink; and upon the extent to which all our citizens have ample incentives and opportunities for a decent education, a decent home and a decent job.

I have no doubt we will find these choices difficult to make, for we are used to making most of our choices individually -- and only with extreme reluctance do we make choices in common.

We are equally reluctant to recognize that a great many of our private decisions have enormous public consequences -- consequences we can no longer avoid or ignore.

No family, for example, considers a move to a suburban home with a two-car garage as having any consequences beyond the benefits it brings them. Yet the effect of a hundred thousand such decisions may be the relative decline of a downtown business district; a radical relocation of industrial and retail firms; the isolation of the poor and the disadvantaged within the central city; the removal of valuable land from city tax rolls as more and more freeways are built; and much more.

This same pattern prevails in the spread of air and water pollution -- and, most importantly, in the isolation and exclusion of the Negro American from even the most ordinary opportunities available to almost every other American with a white skin.

In a world where everybody rubs elbows with everybody else, where you can't put your foot down without stepping on somebody's toe, we can no longer refuse responsibility for the public costs and consequences of private decisions.

Old approaches simply will not work in a new and entirely different environment. What worked in a world of economic scarcity, where change was slow, space ample and distance long, will not work in a world of economic abundance, of change so rapid it seems more and more to outrun our capacity to respond, of scarce space and instant access to all parts of the globe.

In a relatively short space of time, we have succeeded in America in creating an economic abundance, a standard of living, a technological wizardry and a managerial genius that have earned us the envy and admiration of every other nation in the world.

(more)

Yet, in the words of one of our most acute social observers: "The teeming, disorganized life of impoverished slums has all but disappeared among the North Atlantic democracies -- save only the United States. ...it can be said with fair assurance that mass poverty and squalor, of the kind that may be encountered in almost any large American city, simply cannot be found in comparable cities in Europe, or Canada, or Japan."

In the generation that has passed since the Great Depression we have reached levels of affluence high enough so that we can afford, many times over, to offer to every American ample opportunity for a decent home, a decent school, and a decent job.

But we have yet to measure up to the standard that Franklin Roosevelt set for us over thirty years ago: "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much, it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

The current issue of Fortune magazine reports on the aims and attitudes of the affluent American. An income of $25,000, says Fortune, represents the threshold to genuine affluence -- before it is reached, wants tend to outrun income, but after it is reached income tends to outrun. Currently, the magazine estimates, one taxpayer in 50 has crossed that threshold -- by the end of the century, one out of four Americans will have done so.

After a probing exploration and analysis of the goals of these Americans, of what it is that has motivated them to earn this income, of what it is they wanted it for, the magazine selected as the most succinct summary of the aims of these Americans the remark of an upper-income Illinois housewife: "We're very blessed...I have all the major appliances that anyone would want and my husband has a workshop that is out of this world."

There are those who wonder and worry about whether we are, indeed, in danger of being anesthetized by affluence.

There are those who fear we are approaching the point where our growing mastery of means -- of technology, of production, -- is matched by an increasing emptiness of ends.

There are those who are disturbed by what they sense as an increasing equation among too many Americans of the good life with the mere accumulation of goods.

There are those who find our passion for law and order a little less than persuasive when so rarely is it accompanied by a passion for justice.

(more)

There are those who are far less impressed with the prosperity so many Americans enjoy than with the poverty so many Americans endure.

There are those who cannot rest easy with the contradiction of a nation prosperous beyond parallel in the memory of man, but which -- in the words of one commentator -- "offers millions of its youths a kind of experience new in history: the peculiarly ironic and unsettling one of living out an impoverished life in the midst of a country actually perplexed about what to do with its agricultural and industrial capacities. Under these circumstances poverty is not an unavoidable fact of the world, a shared struggle for an entire nation, but a matter of willful carelessness or dishonorable apathy for the majority of us who are comfortable. For those living the threadbare life of migrant farmers or sharecroppers, or attempting survival in the rat-infested ghettos of our cities, it is almost a matter of being singled out for condemnation."

For as long as we have been a nation -- and longer -- one group of Americans has enjoyed infinitely less than its share in the building and the blessings of American socity, and infinitely more than its share of poverty and privation, of humiliation and hatred.

I speak of the American Negro.

It is not only the Negro who suffers in our society from poverty and privation. But, as one observer has pointedly put it: "No one is poor in America because he is white. Many people are poor because they are black."

The nine year old white boy in the north Georgia foothills knew the difference when he said: "I'm sure glad I wasn't born colored, but to be rich I think I should have been born some other place."

I have said that in today's world we can isolate neither problems nor people from each other -- neither private nor public decisions.

If we could see no other way, we could see by the flames that lit the skies over many American cities in recent months and years that we cannot separate the future of white America from the fate of black America.

Leveling stores and homes in the ghettos with a torch is not the answer. Nor is leveling the blame. Andthe one sure way to fail to find the answer is to hang out signs saying, "Business as usual."

Let us all condemn riots; let us never condone violence.

But, above all, let us understand -- and let us act.

Let us understand that, for at least a century, white America has insisted that if everyone would just sit still -- if "outsiders"

(more)

and "agitators" would stop interfering and stirring things up -- time alone would eventually remove the race problem from our midst.

But the Negro knows -- and we ought not to forget -- that time hardens, not heals.

Let us understand how the deep frustration of men long denied can find expression in the incendiary rage of men who will no longer be denied.

Let us understand how those who have suffered sustained and systematic exclusion from American society do not always feel bound by its constraints.

Let us understand that it is not the Negro alone who is warped and wounded by our indifference and our animosity -- for those who would deny the degnity of another must thereby degrade their own.

Let us understand that we cannot expect those in our ghettos to equal the achievements of other Americans when they do not enjoy the opportunities the rest of us take for granted. We cannot ask from them -- as we often do -- the kind of utterly heroic effort few of us who are far more fortunate manage to achieve.

Let us understand -- and let us act. Act to change our attitudes and our institutions. Act in our schools and in our hiring halls -- in our jobs and on our sidewalks -- in our neighborhoods and throughout our nation -- in our society and, above all, in ourselves.

We have passed the point of no return on the racial problem in America. We have reached the point where the ability of each of us to live a full and free life rests, in fact, upon our ability to insure the same opportunities to all Americans.

"Mankind," T. S. Eliot once said, "cannot bear very much reality."

We have a way, indeed, of always wanting to see and savor our world sunnyside up. But things are changing. A new generation of Americans is emerging that -- far more than the old -- seems to insist on seeing and saying it like it really is.

It seems a generation that questions the assumptions of the old as severely and stringently as it questions its aspirations.

It seems a generation that takes with a new seriousness the old admonition of Socrates that "the unexamined life is not worth living."

It seems a generation less frightened by the prospect of the manipulation of man by machine than by the practice of the manipulation of man by man.

(more)

It seems a generation unwilling to respond to new situations by wrapping itself in the security blanket of old sterotypes.

It seems a generation increasingly committed to the creation of a genuinely personal world -- in which all conversations and contact can be conducted person-to-person and man-to-man.

It seems a generation far better able than mine to fashion an environment in which man can live and thrive.

That's the way it seems to me. How it seems to you will have a profound impact on the course of this country in the decades ahead.

# # #

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION ALAN S. BOYD, BEFORE THE AEROSPACE INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC., TIDEWATER ROOM, WILLIAMSBURG INN, WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA, 6:00 P.M., WEDNESDAY, MAY 22, 1968

I had originally planned to discuss some of the natural laws of air transportation tonight -- such laws as: "What goes up must come down, except during peak hours at Kennedy." Or: "The shortest distance between two points is to stay away from Washington National."

But this week, as you may know, we sent to the Congress a new program we believe will enable the airways and airports of the Nation to keep pace with the incredible demand for air services.

As you may also know, the plan was welcomed with open arms -- some of them of rather large caliber.

So I thought it would be appropriate tonight to discuss some of the calculations and philosophy that guided us in drawing the program as we did.

There is no question that the high rate of growth in aviation presents a challenge to all of us who are involved in it -- to the Federal Government as operator of the airways system; to the state and local governments as operators of the airports; and to the manufacturers and operators of aircraft.

During the past five years, the number of passengers carried by scheduled airlines in this country nearly doubled. The number will double again in the next five years and by 1977, an average of one million passengers will board scheduled airliners every day of the year.

The growth in airline activity will be matched, and in some ways, exceeded, by the growth in general or private aviation. There are more than 100,000 aircraft being flown for business or pleasure today. In five years, there will be more than 150,000.

Air route traffic control centers -- which last year handled 15-million planes, must be prepared to handle twice that many by 1973. Many airports must plan to handle twice as many aircraft and more than twice as many passengers by that time.

And growth on the airport will require growth off the airport as well. New access roads and transit systems will be needed to move passengers and cargo to and from the terminals.

Nobody questions that this growth is coming. Nor is there any real question about our technical ability to handle it. We know how to build terminals. We are learning to build better ones. Our air traffic control system has provided the country with a remarkably good safety record.

But there are questions about financing the system required to deal with the growing demands for air service. There are questions involving national priorities and the weight to be given to the needs of air transportation as against the needs of education, defense, the cities and the control of crime and pollution of the environment. There are questions involving the assignment of priorities within the aviation industry itself.

Last September, President Johnson asked us to review both the plans for expanding our airways and airports network and the methods of paying for it. Recognizing the need for additional investment in the systems, the President also said:

"Those who will benefit most from such expenditures, the aviation industry and the flying public, should pay their fair share of the costs of the system needed to handle the increase in air traffic while maintaining a high level of safety. I do not believe the general taxpayer should be asked to shoulder this burden."

Acting within that framework, we have reviewed present policies; we have re-evaluated the priorities in air transportation; and we have produced what we believe is an equitable plan for meeting the challenge of the growth in aviation.

There are no ribbons on this package because there are no gifts in it. It is not designed to make the job of expanding our air system painless; only to make it possible.

In our plan, we propose to increase expenditures for facilities, equipment, research and personnel to operate the air traffic control system. This will include:

--automation of air route traffic control centers so that they may handle more aircraft with greater safety;

--more long-range radars to extend the area in which all aircraft are directed and separated by control from the ground;

--more instrument landing systems to increase safety and decrease delay in operations in bad weather;

--automation of more of the air traffic controllers' workload in the terminal area to make better use of the airspace and to reduce delay;

--radar service at more airports;

--more control towers at smaller airports which are used by feeder lines and air taxis;

--expansion of the Federal Aviation Administration's research and development program to accelerate the development of new systems and techniques for controlling planes;

--and more trained personnel to install, operate and maintain the system and to monitor pilots and planes.

At the present level of taxation, revenues for 1969 would be some $261 million -- far less than half of what we need to begin such improvements to the airways system. To help close this gap, we are asking the Congress to make four changes in the tax laws:

We ask for an increase in the passenger tax from the present five percent to eight percent.

We ask for a new tax on freight waybills of eight percent.

And we ask for an increase in the tax on general aviation gasoline from the present two cents to ten cents by 1972; and for a tax on jet fuels of seven cents in 1969, rising to ten cents by 1972.

This new tax schedule would produce about $500 million in revenues to help meet the civil share of the 1969 budget; and about $760 million by 1973. There would still be a substantial contribution from the general taxpayer.

The reaction from the private fliers of the country is bound to bend the needles on all of our noise abatement equipment. But I believe these proposals are fair and I do not believe they will place an undue burden on any segment of aviation. President Johnson made it clear in his directive to us that there can be no new program without new taxes.

I should, perhaps, make it clear at this point that we do not intend to compromise the safety of the airways in the United States. The jumbo jets with passenger capacities of 400 or more are just around the corner. A single aircraft accident involving one of those would be a national disaster. And it is our intention to reduce the chances of such a catastrophe to the barest minimum. The most effective way would be to improve and expand the air control system and the best way to underwrite that improvement is -- in my judgement -- to follow the plan we have sent to Congress.

But if we cannot maintain a satisfactory level of safety by improving the system, then we shall be required to do so by regulatory action. We simply do not have a choice.

The three percent increase in passenger tax will amount to an average cost of about $1 per trip.

The 10-cent tax on fuel will add about a half-cent a mile to the cost of flying a single-engine private plane -- a cost that already is some 18 cents a mile. We estimate that in most cases, the fuel tax will add less than three percent to operating costs.

As to equity, there are these facts to consider. Under the present tax schedule, the commercial airliners pay about 82 percent of the costs involved in providing them with the airway facilities and services they use. General aviation pays about four percent of the airways costs that can be attributed to private flying.

In addition, nearly 80 percent of all general aviation flying in this country is done in connection with business so it is tax deductible. Therefore, actual costs to the owner may well be only half of the paper costs. As to the question of ability to pay, Time magazine did a profile of new plane buyers in 1963 which showed a median income of $33,000. Seventy-five percent of those surveyed told Time they intended to use their planes for business. Those are the most recent figures available, but there is no reason to expect the figures have changed very much.

The program we have sent to the Congress proposes a new Federal approach to the country's airport problems.

The Federal Government owns and operates the airways system, but most airports are owned and operated by state and local governments or by private concerns. They are financed largely by those who use the airports and by the communities they serve.

For the past 20 years, the Federal Government has encouraged local communities to develop airports through a grant-in-aid program that is currently running at a level of some $70 million a year.

The evidence indicates that most airports no longer need this Federal grant assistance. With few exceptions, the direct users of airports are able to bear the full cost of development and operation. This is certainly the case at airports where the unsubsidized airlines operate.

We find, also, that with the exception of a handful of major airports, most airports in this country are operating below capacity. At those hubs where traffic is straining capacity, private money is available to finance expansion. And in some cases, money is not the problem at all. In New York, for example, no amount of money could solve the problem of finding a site for a fourth jetport.

Very few of the smaller airports charge any landing fee for general aviation. In a survey of the airports in six states, we found only 1.3 percent charging landing fees. In another sample of 41 general aviation airports which had control towers and which received Federal grants from 1962 to 1966, we found that all but seven could have amortized those grants as well as the local costs by charging a landing fee of less than a dollar. A $1 fee would increase the cost of single-engine airplane operation by about a half-cent a mile.

As a result, we have proposed that the Congress suspend the Federal Aid to Airports Program in 1970 and replace it with

a combination loan-and-grant program. This program which would meet the needs of those few airports which cannot make it on their own or those where there is an established national interest in airport development.

We have asked Congress to establish a revolving fund from which we could make loans to a maximum of $1 billion to airports that meet our criteria but were unable to find money on reasonable terms except through the Federal Government.

The criteria would include the charging of adequate landing fees; an airport plan consistent with comprehensive planning for the development of the area; and reasonable assurance that the airport would generate enough revenue to repay the loan.

In another section of this proposal, grants would be available to airports whose only certified service is provided by subsidized local service airlines. They would be made on a matching basis from an initial fund of $100 million in cases where money was not available from private sources on reasonable terms and where the airport met roughly the same criteria that would apply to loans.

Our airport proposal also calls for the preparation of a plan for a National Airport System. The plan would forecast for a ten-year period the kinds of airport facilities and their costs that would be required to meet national needs.

The first of these would be prepared within two years after passage of the bill and would be updated by the Department of Transportation every two years after that.

That is our plan. We base it in part on the fact that the aviation industry has reached a new stage of maturity; a stage at which it is able to pay a fair share of the cost of maintaining safe and efficient service.

We believe the program will provide the capacity which the Nation's transportation requires; that it will increase aviation safety; that it will promote local decisions affecting air service and facilities; and that it will put airways and airport financing on a sound basis.

The partnership of government and industry in the aviation industry is perhaps the best example we have in America of the public benefits of a sensible sharing of responsibilities in transportation. It has enabled this country to build a commercial and private fleet unequalled anywhere.

We do not want to dissolve that partnership. We are, in fact, seeking only to strengthen it. I am confident that these proposals will achieve that goal and will make it possible for American aviation to maintain the world leadership it has earned and deserves.

Thank you.

# # #

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION ALAN S. BOYD, BEFORE THE DENVER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, MAIN BALLROOM, DENVER HILTON HOTEL, DENVER, COLORADO, 12:00 NOON, FRIDAY, MAY 10, 1968

Before the days of television and jets, it was not uncommon for people in the Midwest to grow up and pass their lives without ever seeing an ocean.

But, while we don't hear very much about them, there were also those who grew up - and over the hill - without ever seeing a mountain.

So the one group, I imagine, thought of the ocean as sort of a wet prairie - and the other thought of a mountain as kind of a dry tidal wave.

I was born and raised in Florida. And a good deal of my youth had gone before I saw some real mountains. At least I thought they were real - until I came to Colorado.

Nowadays, everybody knows that nobody's ever really seen a mountain who hasn't been to Colorado - or ever really seen an ocean who hasn't been to Florida.

So, in this political season, I feel pretty safe in saying that everybody who doesn't vacation in Florida this year will vacation here in Colorado.

I'm not, unfortunately, here on vacation, but I've always considered a business trip to Denver better than a vacation trip to most other cities - and I'm awfully glad to be here.

We have come a long way - in this country and in this city - since the days when, in a good many places, there was no more reliable, efficient and economical form of transportation than that sulkiest of sopranos, the Rocky Mountain canary - known to the more pedestrian among us as the burro.

Yet pedestrians and motorists alike - in some of our more densely populated urban areas - would give a lot for some form of transportation as good as the burro was, or even for a burro itself.

It isn't that we haven't made tremendous strides in transportation in the last half century or so. The problem is that - unlike our Olympic teams of recent decades - we have performed spectacularly in the long-distance events, and poorly in the dashes and the relays.

We aren't the first nation in history to have that problem. The Romans were as famous for their vast road system as we are for our Interstate Highway System. The trouble was that all roads did, in fact, lead to Rome - and the resulting traffic congestion on Roman streets was so bad that, in 44 BC, Julius Caesar banned all private traffic from city streets during the daylight hours.

But the Romans had relatively simple transportation systems to deal with - no internal combustion engines, no airports and - unless you want to count the aqueducts - no pipelines. In our time, not all of our transportation problems are caused by congestion; nor do they all have wheels on them.

For example, President Johnson has proposed a comprehensive program of safety standards for the transmission and distribution of natural gas. The Senate, last year, passed a bill which would accomplish most of the action requested by the President.

But the House has not yet responded in a similar fashion. Indeed, the first step taken last week by the House Commerce Committee repudiated what the President had requested and what the Senate had already done.

The bill which has been proposed by the House Commerce Committee is worse than an empty gesture. It is a dangerous deception.

It would be bad enough if the bill simply failed to provide protection for the public. But it goes beyond failure to encouraging violation of the very standards we believe are essential for that protection.

There are some 800,000 miles of gas pipeline of varying sizes and capacity already in the ground. And another 30,000 miles will be constructed this year. The net effect of the House bill as it now stands, will prevent any effective regulation of the 800,000 miles already under ground and allow only token regulation of what will be constructed this year.

Potentially, the most dangerous transportation of natural gas is through the miles of pipe beneath our city streets. Some of that pipe has been in use for better than a century. Most of the pipe has been in the ground for at least a decade.

Yet, state and municipal regulation of such pipeline is minimal. And what regulation there is does not utilize the latest technology in testing, maintenance and repair or replacement. Yet the House bill would prohibit any effective reform of such regulation.

The bill calls for a system of enforcement which not only would be ineffective but would represent a continuing invitation to violate whatever standards that are imposed. Under the penalty section of this bill, a violator will first be given notice of his violation and then will be given an opportunity to come into compliance before any penalties can be levied.

This system of enforcement would be unique in Federal regulation; and I believe would be almost unheard of in most state and municipal regulation.

A man could know that he was deliberately not complying with a standard with the full knowledge that the only sanction he faced would be notice of violation and a demand that he come into compliance. Only after failing to observe that notice could he be fined for continued non-compliance.

These are just two of the major deficiencies which are now present in the bill reported by the House Commerce Committee.

Fortunately there were a sizeable number of members on the Committee who tried to undo the mischief that had been done. They have indicated their intent to carry those efforts to the floor of the full House. I have told them that I will do everything that is legally within my power to assist their efforts.

It has always been my view that there is one thing worse than legislative refusal to meet a serious problem - that is a legislative response which is meaningless.

The bill which has passed the House Commerce Committee will be held out to the public as a protective measure. The truth is there is no protection in it.

Returning to the problems of urban congestion, I have not yet heard anyone seriously suggest so radical a solution to our transportation problems as Julius Caesar imposed. But it is no longer surprising to come across proposals from some of our more respected and desperate urbanologists that call for the total or partial ban of the private automobile from central city streets.

If such proposals seem both extreme and unwarranted - and I am convinced they are - let me assure you they become, at least, more understandable the more you encounter, as I do, those interests and attitudes that refuse even to consider any solutions except more of the same.

What, then, is the problem - and what can we do about it?

A good place to start, I think, is with the recognition that in most American cities for the foreseeable future the predominant form of transportation will continue to be rubber over roads.

The question is: Will these be roads to eventual urban ruin, or roads to urban restoration and revitalization?

I need not detail before this infomed audience the difficulties so many of our urban areas have had over the past ten years or so in trying to accommodate the automobile.

In the words of one observor, "...every major city in the United States has suffered major disasters at the hands of freeways whose only planned function was to move traffic, without concern for other values."

As a result, we are coming to realize, in city after city across the country that freeways do more than move us about - they also help to mold the very shape and form of our cities.

We have reached the point where we can no longer ignore the fact that the price of allowing the automobile free rein in our cities - at the expense of other values and means and considerations - may well be higher than we want to pay. For, it is a price that must invariably include not only the irreversible erosion of urban areas themselves but the inevitable loss of those very qualities of convenience and freedom that attract us to the automobile in the first place.

I am not suggesting that this is the only choice we have - an absolute choice between either the automobile or the city, between either the automobile or some other means of transportation.

What I do suggest is that this is the only choice we will end up with if we follow the advice of those who would have us meet the transportation needs of our urban areas by an essentially unlimited and open-ended process of accommodation to the automobile.

What I do suggest is that the time has come - in our urban areas - to temper our romance with the automobile with a strong dose of reality.

Reality, of course, also requires that we recognize the rather pathetic state and severe limitations of existing alternatives to the automobile.

But we must also recognize that the reason most Americans have so little choice is because - neither at the public nor the private level have we spent anywhere near the time, money or imagination that we have lavished on automobiles.

As I have suggested, the answer is not to forget about automobiles and highways and focus all our energies and our funds on alternative modes of transportation.

The answer, instead, is to forget all about this narrowly modal approach to transportation - in which one mode serves only at the expense and to the exclusion of the others - and start focussing on transportation as a system, made up of interdependent modes, whose job is to serve the city in which it operates and the people who live there.

The answer is to start talking and thinking and dealing with transportation in terms of people and in terms of cities - for it is people that transportation is designed to serve, by giving them access to all the opportunities that cities alone can supply.

And that means that when we talk about transportation we talk about all the problems people have in cities.

It means:

-- First, that each urban area itself must decide what kind of transportation system best serves and suits its particular needs. Obviously, the system that works best in Pittsburgh or Denver is not likely to be the system that works best in New York or Los Angeles.

-- Second, that we look at our various transportation modes as mutually inclusive rather than mutually exclusive. We have to stop thinking of alternatives in the sense of one mode or another and start thinking of alternatives in terms of varying combinations of modes.

-- Third, that we evaluate alternative transportation systems, not in narrowly economic or engineering terms, but in terms of the total urban environment in which they operate and which they so deeply affect. Transportation, we are beginning to realize, exerts as powerful and pervasive an influence upon the way we live as it does upon the air we breathe. It enables the affluent to enjoy the blessings of suburban living and convenient access to all the services of the city without really paying for it. But that same pattern of life condemns the poor to the inner city and cuts them off from access to the jobs and other opportunities they must have to earn a decent living and live a decent life.

My Department is engaged in hundreds of programs and projects and investigations to help our urban areas approach their transportation problems in terms of their total needs. But we can do no more than help.

Each urban area must decide for itself what kind of transportation system best suits its needs. And before it can decide that it must decide what kind of city it wants to be, how it wants to grow and what shape it wants to take.

We are encouraging the cities to make these kinds of decisions. We are aiding them in their efforts to develop systems that serve their total needs - witness our support of so-called "design concept" teams in Baltimore and Chicago.

Let me - at this point - acknowledge, with admiration and applause, the proposal sent to me over a month ago by your Mayor, Tom Currigan, for an integrated transportation and urban design study in the Denver metropolitan area. We still have the details of that proposal under study, and it is too early for me to say what final response we can or will make. But I can say that its aims and objectives have our unqualified endorsement. And I can assure you that we want to help in any way we can.

We are fully aware of the handicaps under which most of our urban areas labor - the overlapping and obsolete jurisdictions, the lack of funds, and so forth, which increasingly impede their efforts to cope with the incredibly difficult problems before them.

We are also fully aware - in transportation and other fields - Federal policies must bear some of the blame for creating these problems as well as compounding some of your difficulties in dealing with them.

The Federal government, for example, has at one and the same time established programs to rebuild and restore our central cities and programs that have contributed to their decay and decline.

We are moving, in the field of transportation at least, toward more comprehensive and better coordinated Federal-aid programs. The authorization by Congress - just a few days ago - of the transfer to the Department of Transportation of the Urban Mass Transit Administration is a step in that direction.

But we do have a long way to go before we can say that our Federal programs are so structured and shaped that they respond as fully and as flexibly as they should to the needs of our urban areas.

Currently, for example, our transportation demonstration programs are designed to deal mainly with individual pieces of hardware rather than with systems and to serve very broad rather than very particular needs. And they have a way sometimes of being applicable everywhere in general and nowhere in particular.

We may well want to consider a radical revision of our whole approach to demonstration grants - a revision that would enable them to serve both more inclusive and more unique purposes, both more comprehensive and more concrete needs.

The approach I have in mind would, for the first time, permit cities - backed by Federal assistance and free from rigid program categorization - to define and attack their most urgent transportation problems as they interpret them at the local level.

Today, by contrast, city mayors are severely restricted in what they can do with Federal transportation aid. Billions of dollars are available for urban streets and freeways and a few million dollars are available for mass transit. Yet freeways and mass transit are only two ways of dealing with just a few urban transportation needs.

A city may well decide, for example, that it requires - not new highways or mass transit - but more fringe parking, or better airport access, or a new computerized traffic control

system, or street grade separation, and so forth. But today no Federal money is available for any of these purposes. As a result, our city mayors all too often find themselves restricted to Federal transportation programs with little relevance to their most urgent transportation problems.

The approach I suggest would make grants available to meet urban transportation problems in almost any way - however novel - that bears a rational relationship to a city's overall transportation planning. It would, as I envision it, help our cities meet their immediate needs as well as improve their comprehensive transportation system planning.

This is but one way in which we - at the Federal level - can make our programs much more responsive to the real needs of our cities.

And those needs are urgent - in transportation, in education, in employment, in every aspect of urban life.

But while Federal efforts can aid immensely by responding to urban needs, they can only aid - they can only encourage.

The President has said it best: "The challenge of changing the face of the city and the men who live there summons us all - the President and the Congress, Governors and Mayors. The challenge reaches as well into every corporate board room, university, and union headquarters in America. It extends to church and community groups, and to the family itself. The problem is so vast that the answer can only be forged by responsible leadership from every sector, public and private.

"We dare not fail to answer - loud and clear."

# # #

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

REMARKS BY DONALD G. AGGER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT THE SPRING SEMINAR OF THE RAILROAD TRANSPORTATION INSTITUTE, AT THE MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., THURSDAY, MARCH 28, 1968, 11:30 A.M.

What I propose to do this morning is tell you about something you may not have heard about yet. I want to tell you about a legislative proposal which the Department of Transportation sent to Congress just two weeks ago. We're calling this proposal the Trade Simplification Act of 1968. But we're not very concerned about the title, really, except for the part that says "1968."

We'd like very much for the bill to be passed this year. We'd like for 1968 to be remembered by transportation people as the year when joint rates from inland points in the United States to inland points abroad were made possible. We'd like for 1968 to be remembered as the year when single bills of lading became familiar documents, regardless of how many different kinds of carriers might be involved in a shipment. We'd like for 1968 to be remembered as the year when the transportation industry was given a legal foundation on which to construct, through private action, a uniform liability system.

Let me start at the beginning. For many years, and especially during the last few years, it has been apparent that we need in the United States some mechanism which will permit different kinds -- or different modes -- of common carriers to join together into what might be called a single system of international transportation.

One way to state the problem is to say that our technology has caught up with our traditions. Traditionally, in this country, the transportation of freight is either interstate commerce -- trains and trucks and barges regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission; or it's ocean transportation, governed by the Federal Maritime Commission; or it's air transportation, governed by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

But technology sometimes doesn't seem to have a great deal of respect for tradition. Modern container technology has made it physically possible to weld land, sea and air transportation into one system of international transportation. Today, it is physically possible to pack goods into a container at a manufacturer's plant in Kansas City; and move the container by rail or truck to a seaport or airport; and ship the container overseas; and then move it to a destination inland in Europe, all without once breaking the seal on the box. And the shipper -- which is to say, the customer -- likes to think of all this movement as a single journey.

In the Department of Transportation, we think it is our responsibility to help you in the transportation industry give the shipper what he wants and needs. Let's examine some of those needs.

Joint rates is one of them. I'm sure most of you would agree with me that one reason trade flourishes in the United States -- one reason for our economic success and our high standard of living -- is the fact that a manufacturer in Schenectady can offer his products for sale in Phoenix with an exact knowledge, in advance, of what his transportation costs are going to be. Purchasing transportation services from state to state or through a group of states is a relatively simple matter.

But what happens when that manufacturer in Schenectady decides to try to open a new market in Europe? One of the first things that happens is that his transportation planning becomes far more complex and uncertain. And rather than try to untangle all those complexities, he might well decide to stay out of the export business. Thus the nation suffers because its international income is diminished and its balance-of-payments position worsens. Our goal is simple -- the quotation of a joint rate agreed to by all the carriers participating in an international haul.

Another thing the shipper needs is an avenue of escape from the paperwork jungle which chokes our transportation systems and burdens unnecessarily our international trade. Last year, the export-import trade of the United States totaled more than 11 million shipments with a total value of some 58 billion dollars. And it is estimated that the paperwork associated with this trade -- the documentation required to support those shipments -- cost 5 billion dollars. That's too much. It is far too much.

The Trade Simplification Act of 1968 does not constitute an attack on the whole 5 billion dollars, but it is a good beginning. The bill would encourage carriers participating in a joint-rate international shipment to issue a single, through bill of lading for the entire journey -- from

door to door. A single bill of lading would suffice as a contract of carriage from Des Moines to Istanbul; from Birmingham, Alabama, to Birmingham, England; from Peoria, as someone has said, to Pretoria.

The legal environment in which international transportation services function includes another impediment which has been of concern to many people -- that is, the absence of a simple and uniform system of carrier liability. The environment needs to be changed so that a shipper can make his claim without worrying about where the loss or damage occurred. And the standard of recovery should be the same regardless of which carrier is responsible. After all, a container full of merchandise becomes no less valuable to its owner simply because it has been transferred from land to sea.

In an ideal transportation future, a container wouldn't have to be opened from the time it left the factory until the time it reached its destination, regardless of how many national boundaries or how many transportation transfer points might have been crossed. There would be no way to determine who was responsible for the damage, anyway.

The Trade Simplification Act of 1968 deals only indirectly with the liability question, but we think it would establish a framework which would provide impetus for a private solution to the problem. There are many domestic and foreign laws and international agreements relating to a carrier's liability. These laws and agreements are so complex, and vary so greatly, that it will take a long time to bring them in harmony. And a piecemeal attack might only cause even more uncertainty.

Private initiative can, however, surmount much of the problem. The initiating carrier in an international joint-rate movement could assume full responsibility for loss or damage throughout the entire journey. The joint rate would reflect the cost. Some freight forwarders already are offering this service. We will encourage its further development.

There is nothing new and nothing very controversial in what I've said so far. Most transportation people have agreed for a long time that joint rates and single bills of lading are needed. The question has been, how do we get there?

Our answer to that question is, as I've said, the Trade Simplification Act of 1968. I'd like now to tell you how the bill would work and how we decided upon this approach.

One of the best ways of telling you about the bill is to tell you what it would not do. Our goal has been the removal of obstacles to trade and transportation, and we have taken great care to avoid creating new regulations, or destroying the services of existing carriers, or abolishing the existing regulation of carriers. We do not propose any cumbersome new regulatory structures. We do not propose to withdraw any of the authority which the three regulatory agencies now possess.

In addition, the bill includes what we call a permissive approach to the problems it seeks to attack. No carrier would be forced to participate in joint rates, just as no carrier would be denied the right to continue offering the service it now offers. We assume that many carriers, large and small, will want to participate. This includes railways and trucking lines, steamship companies and air carriers.

Our bill would work this way: A group of carriers who might want to establish a joint international rate would meet together, and out of their conversations would come a proposal which would include the joint rate, the division of revenues among the various carriers, the apportionment of liability, procedures for the interchange of equipment, and so on.

Each of these carriers would then file the joint rate with its respective regulatory agency. Let's say that a joint rate was agreed to by a railroad company, an ocean carrier and a foreign surface carrier. Let's say further that the door-to-door joint rate was $100 per ton and that the American rail carrier would receive $30 and the American-flag steamship company, $50.

The railroad would file the total joint rate with the ICC. The commission might also require the railroad company to identify the $30 division for informational purposes. Or the commission could require that the $30 be set forth in a tariff. That would be up to the commission.

The same rules would apply to the Federal Maritime Commission and the steamship company -- or to the ICC and a trucking company; or to the CAB and an air carrier. Thus each regulatory agency would retain the authority it now has over carriers which operate under its jurisdiction.

A joint rate would depend upon the approval of all the regulatory agencies which might become involved; but at the same time, no agency would be given jurisdiction over the entire rate. In a word, what we have tried to do is make joint rates possible without extending the regulatory arm of the Federal Government unnecessarily and, at the same time, without depriving the transportation industry or the American public of any of the protection which the regulatory process now offers.

Our goal is to help those carriers who want to participate in intermodal joint rates, and to do so without disturbing the habits or the practices of those who do not want to participate. More importantly, though, our goal is -- as the bill's title implies -- to make international trading a less complex process.

If we as a nation can remove the artificial barriers to trade and transportation, then our products -- American products -- can move swiftly and cheaply between nations and between continents. This is the promise of the container revolution. This is the promise that the railroads and trucking companies and ocean carriers are making with their modern equipment and their new ways of doing things. This is the promise of the air freight carriers as they increase their cargo activity.

I'm sure that as railroad men, you have heard a great deal about the "land bridge" concept in transportation. In the United States, it is the idea of using the North American land mass as a bridge for cargoes moving from the Pacific to the Atlantic and bound for destinations in Europe and beyond. We believe that joint-rates legislation is important to the development of the land bridge.

The American land mass can become a bridge also for the movement of goods from the West Coast of the United States to Europe. Do you know that today, more than 20 foreign-flag steamship companies carry freight from the Pacific Coast to Northern Europe, but that not a single American carrier is regularly engaged in that trade? Think what can be done for American manufacturers and American carriers, including the railroads, if we can change the transportation environment in such a way as to make it possible for those goods to move overland across the United States, and then by water across the Atlantic to Europe.

The goods would reach Europe in half the time now required. The business for the railroads and the trucking industry would be completely new business. American-flag steamship carriers serving the East Coast would participate in the traffic for the first time. The whole operation would be less costly, making the American goods more competitive in foreign markets. And at the same time, more of the dollars spent for transportation would remain in American hands. It is estimated that American shippers now pay 250 million dollars a year to foreign carriers on these routes.

Ultimately, through extension of the use of the land bridge to the Pacific islands and the Far East, the balance-of-payments position of

the United States could be improved by billions of dollars. Goods would move less expensively, and more quickly. Perishable produce grown in Hawaii or California could be sold at reasonable prices in the markets of Paris.

The Trade Simplification Act of 1968 will not do all these things. But we do regard this bill as a good beginning -- a beginning toward a goal which we think is an important one for the Department of Transportation. That goal is to get the government out of the way of transportation -- to free transportation from some of the restrictions, some of the red tape, which has hampered the further development of what already is the greatest transportation system in the world.

There are many benefits to be gained from an increase in international trade. Not all of them are economic; not all of them are monetary. We look to a time when the friendship, the common interests and the mutual goals which we as a nation share with nations around the world can be reflected fully in our trade with those nations. Transportation -- the new transportation of efficiency and economy -- hastens our advance toward that time.

Containers know no national boundaries. They are undisturbed by the transfer from land to sea. It is convenient that they should have emerged at the same time that our partnerships with other nations have led us to new understandings and agreements concerning the movement of international trade.

Transportation was the cord which bound together the regions of the North American continent, and in this generation -- the ocean notwithstanding -- it can be the cord which ties us more closely to the nations of the world.

Recently I was reminded of a quotation which is attributed to the architect Daniel Burnham. "Make no little plans," he said; "they have no magic to stir men's blood."

The quotation was used by a major United States airline in an advertising campaign that was an apology, in effect -- an apology by the airline because it had been more successful than it had anticipated; because the astonishing number of air travelers has just about saturated the nation's airport facilities and the nation's airline industry.

Perhaps that has been the problem of too many of us who are associated with transportation. Perhaps we've made too-little plans and dreamed too-little dreams. We've devised one set of rules for the ocean and another for

the highway and still another for the rail lines. We've required 20 documents for a shipment of goods when half a dozen documents or maybe even one would have been adequate.

We confront the manufacturer with terms such as the long ton, the short ton, the metric ton, the hundred weight or so many dollars per cubic foot when all he really wants to know is how much it's going to cost him to send a certain number of his products from point A to point B.

We have tolerated a fragmented, uncoordinated, over-documented transportation system for much too long. And as a result, our trade has suffered and our horizons have been limited.

The proposed Trade Simplification Act of 1968 is, we feel, a beginning toward a solution to some of the problems of transportation. We hope the bill will have your support. I thank you for letting me come here to tell you about it today.

#####

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

REMARKS BY M. CECIL MACKEY, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION FOR POLICY DEVELOPMENT, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT THE 1968 NEW JERSEY WATER SAFETY CONFERENCE, ASBURY PARK, NEW JERSEY, MARCH 23, 1968 HOTEL BERKELEY CARTERET, 1:30 P.M.

In his recent consumer message to the Congress, President Johnson reaffirmed his belief that the "right to safety" is a basic right of the American people.

He pointed out that our complex system of commerce functions effectively because of the ingenuity of our technology and the integrity of our businessmen. However, the separation of the consumer from the producer, the loss of personal contact between them, as well as the growing complexity of products has made it increasingly difficult for most of us to make reliable judgments concerning product safety. This situation has created new problems for the individual and for government.

The consumer must have the assurance that his interests in safety are represented during the production process. The consumer must have confidence that the finished product he buys at least meets minimum standards of quality and safety.

When the products involved either travel or are used in inter-state commerce, this protective role properly falls on the Federal Government.

Under President Johnson's leadership and with the strong support of the Congress, substantial progress has been made in many areas of product reliability and consumer safety. Protection has been established guarding against unwholesome meats, against hazardous appliances, and even against dangerous toys. In our particular area of concern in the Department of Transportation, significant advances have been made in motor vehicle and highway safety. There is good reason to believe that the implementation of the pioneering auto safety legislation of 1966 will soon be saving thousands of lives each year. According to the National Safety Council, the first direct evidence of the benefits from new traffic safety regulations was the dramatic decrease in motorcycle fatalities during 1967. In the States which enacted crash helmet requirements--at the encouragement of the National Highway Safety Bureau--the fatality rate decreased as much as 59 percent.

But it is clear that much remains to be done if we are to meet our responsibility to the American consumer.

This year the President has proposed legislation to the Congress which would expand his consumer protection program in eight additional areas.

Measures are included which would provide better consumer protection against unsafe fish and poultry; hazardous radiation from television sets; and fraud and deception in sales.

He called for a comprehensive study of the automobile insurance system with a view to correcting inequities, reducing costs, and making sure that adequate coverage and compensation are available without discrimination.

And, of particular interest to us here today, he outlined a coordinated program to prevent death and accidents on the nation's waterways. And while the boating safety program has, in common with the others, the goal of protecting the consumer, it is unique in one respect. It is an effort to deal with a hazard before it reaches disaster proportions; to prevent a crisis rather than cope with one.

More than 8 million boats will be sailing on the waters of the United States this summer. This number will increase at an average rate of almost 4,000 a week.

Each year more than 40 million Americans use boats to fish, water ski or just get away from it all.

As you can see in the display across the street, there are boats and yachts to suit everyone's taste and pocketbook. From sailing dinghies to the sleek ocean cruisers. There are boats in the traditional designs and there are many with new styles--generally, I note with more horsepower and less boat.

But of much more significance, I think, is the new style that we find in the boating consumer.

The concept of yachting as the sport of a privileged few is long past. In our expanding economy, more and more people each year find the extra leisure time and money that they need to take up boating. Many have little or no experience in seamanship. And many who turn to the water as a source of recreation and pleasure will find it a source of tragedy as well.

According to the latest Coast Guard statistics, over 1,300 Americans throughout the nation lost their lives in boating accidents during 1967. An even larger number sustained serious injuries and property damage exceeded $6 million. The coroner's reports listed the cause of death in most cases as drowning, generally following some type of boating accident.

The real causes, of course, lie deeper. It may have been failure of the product--a boat lacking reasonable stability, with insufficient floatation or with a leaky fuel system. It may have been more simply that there wasn't anything to hang on to after an accident occurred. Other than product reliability, it may have been operator failure--reckless or careless operation, failure to keep life jackets handy, or just lack of seamanship.

In many cases the accident results from a combination of causes--a product that was not quite safe in the hands of someone who did not know quite enough about how to handle it. But we cannot dismiss 1,300 deaths by saying "he should have known better" or "anyone could tell it wasn't safe."

In the case of the average new boating enthusiast, the gap between consumer and producer is widening. He is not someone brought up in a nautical atmosphere--gradually moving from a row boat to a skiff--learning new skills at each stage. He is just a guy who finds he has a little spare time and some extra money and decides

a boat would be a great thing for himself and his family. He is not out to pit himself against nature. He is just looking for a way to relax. His definition of a boat may well be "a hole in the water, lined with wood or plastic into which you pour money."

And this man is entitled to protection from an unsafe boat; education on the potential dangers in his new environment; and some safeguard against the reckless acts of others.

There are, of course, many fine programs currently being conducted to promote boating safety. We in the Department of Transportation are justly proud of the men of the Coast Guard and their varied programs to protect the boatman. The Public Service groups--to name a few, the Coast Guard Auxiliary, the Power Squadron, the Red Cross, the YMCA and the National Safety Council--all provide valuable services in education and training.

The boating industry and related groups have demonstrated a concern for the problem of product reliability by developing construction standards and encouraging their use by their members.

Independent testing organizations such as the Yacht Safety Bureau give the consumer some basis for a safety-conscious choice.

Some of the States, particularly since enactment of the Federal Boating Act of 1958 have become increasingly effective in all phases of boating safety. New Jersey's leadership in this field is well recognized. I understand that the New Jersey Boating Commission has recently been awarded the Tenth Annual Kiekhafer-Mercury Gold Cup for the excellence of its State boating program. I offer you my heartiest congratulations.

All of the activities I have mentioned deserve a great deal of credit. Without them the boating accident rate and loss of life would certainly be higher than it is.

But the fact remains that 1,300 people died in boating accidents last year and many--probably most--could have been saved.

The time has come to intensify our efforts to insure that the boating consumer has nothing less than his "right to safety." The Recreation Boat Safety Act of 1968 now before the Congress will accomplish that objective.

The President has chosen to implement his program by following a principle of government which has come to be known as "creative federalism." Under this concept the capabilities of the Federal and State governments are joined in a commonly supported effort. Only those functions which require broad national guidance or control are reserved to the Federal Government. The bulk of the program effort--in a large part the actual contact with the public--is the responsibility of State or local authorities, with financial assistance from the Federal level.

"Creative federalism" has worked well in other areas--for example, Federal-aid in the highway program. More closely aligned to the problem area we are considering is the work in highway safety, with its joint program of standard setting and State and community grant programs.

The Recreational Boat Safety Act of 1968 is, I feel, a classic example of this principle.

It is a two-pronged attack on what we consider to be the key points of the boating safety problem. It proposes:

-- the establishment at the Federal level of minimum safety standards for boats and related equipment.

-- substantially expanded and strengthened State boating programs, education and enforcement with Federal financial assistance.

Safety standards, primarily enforced at the point of manufacture, are to be promulgated by the Secretary of Transportation. This will insure broad applicability and uniformity throughout the nation.

The safe boating programs, dealing as they do with the individual citizen, more effectively and properly belong to the States. They would receive financial assistance, but only minimal guidance from the Federal level.

This joint effort of Federal regulation and State enforcement can provide a coordinated nationwide safety program which will reduce the number of boating accidents. It can also avoid the possibilities of a sharply increasing accident rate resulting from the number and changing characteristics of the novice boatman.

We should not compare the problems of boating safety with those of highway safety too closely. The elements of each vary greatly in magnitude and context. But there is a lesson in highway safety which we cannot afford to ignore. The time for corrective action is before the problem gets out of hand. The time for planning is before emotional demands cause over-reaction.

We are now in a position to undertake reasonable planning and to commence corrective action which will provide adequate consumer protection without unnecessary restrictions. We may not always have this opportunity.

Let us look first at the standards section of the bill. The need for safety standards for boats and related equipment has long been recognized. Over the years marine insurance underwriters, boating industry groups and public service organizations have combined to develop a wide variety of safety related specifications and recommended practices. The American Boat and Yacht Council, the Boating Industry Association, the National Fire Protection Association, and the Yacht Safety Bureau to mention only a few, have expended a great deal of effort and money in developing standards and testing component equipment.

The limitation of this program is that there are numerous standards, but no uniform agreement to comply with them. Although there has been much research, there are still areas of potential hazard which are not adequately covered. Most significantly, the acceptance of the standards is left to the discretion of the manufacturer. Even under newly expanded safety certification programs, it is estimated that no more than 50 percent of the annual production will be in compliance with established standards.

The nature of the industry itself adds to the problem. Unlike the automobile industry where a few manufacturers account for nearly all the annual production, a significant percentage of boats are made by small builders who are not members of any of the standard setting groups. If there is a need for safety standards, they should apply to all--with an opportunity for specific exceptions where valid justification can be demonstrated.

In years past, it may have been possible for a knowledgeable yachtsman to take a copy of recommended standards in hand and make his own critical choices in a boat yard. But the average new boat buyer of today just does not have access to that kind of information.

The proper Federal role, as we view it, is to establish and enforce minimum performance standards in certain critical areas to assure the consumer that the product he buys has been designed and constructed with reasonable consideration for the safety of himself and his family. These critical areas could include buoyancy, stability, ventilation, fuel systems, capsized floatation and engine reliability. It is not our intention to specify how particular boats should be styled or built, but only to require that they meet minimum standards of safety performance. The voluntary standards which have been developed by industry and independent groups will no doubt be the basis for much of what the Secretary will require.

While it is not practical to presume that a boat can be made that is accident proof any more than a car or a plane can be crash proof, there are things that can be done to make a boating accident less likely to occur; or if one does, that it will reduce rather than add to the resulting danger to the occupants.

Another section of the Act recognizes that the operator as well as the manufacturer has a responsibility for safety. The Secretary will have authority to establish regulations listing the safety equipment which must be carried in a boat while underway. This is a natural extension of the standard setting authority and insures that the manufacturers' standards do not lose effect in actual practice. In many ways this procedure parallels State automobile laws which place the burden on the operator to insure that his vehicle has lights, windshield wipers, horn, etc., before he drives it.

In summation, minimum performance standards will be promulgated by the Secretary based on the recommendations of the Commandant of the Coast Guard. Although the actual standard setting procedures have not yet been developed, I can assure the volunatry groups and the boating industry that the research they have done will be given fullest consideration. The responsible portion of the boating industry should experience only minimal effect from the establishment of national boat safety standards--the consumer could benefit greatly.

The President's program also takes into consideration the fact that safer boats are only part of an effective water safety program. The other recognized parts include education and enforcement. We must have effective programs which will provide the novice boatman with at least the rudiments of navigation and related skills. We must

give him an opportunity to learn some of the potential dangers of his new sport before he has to cope with them. We should hopefully, develop in him, sufficient confidence so that he can deal with a difficult situation if one should arise.

As in the case of safety standards, much creative work has been done in boating safety education. State organizations, the Public service groups and the industry deserve a great deal of credit for the work they have done. But, again, we must look at the statistics and realize that there is more to do.

It is also the responsibility of government to protect the boatman from those who would endanger him through their own reckless or lawless operations.

Here we again look to the States to protect the consumer's "right to safety." Federal enforcement should be provided only where reasonable State capabilities cannot be made available. The necessity for full State involvement is further emphasized when we realize that nearly one-half of the annual boating fatalities occur in waters exclusively under State jurisdiction.

The Federal role in education and enforcement is to stimulate through guidance and financial help stepped-up State--and through the States--local boating safety programs.

The 1958 Federal Boating Act encouraged the States to establish meaningful programs but Federal assistance and incentive was lacking. Now through the use of matching funds, it is proposed to actively aid State governments either to initiate or expand their activities.

The Act authorizes the appropriation of $5 million for the first year of the program and calls for sufficient funds for succeeding years through 1971. The funds will be apportioned among the States by taking into consideration, whether the State has an approved boating safety program; the number of boats actually registered in the States; and an estimate of the number of boats using State waters. I am sure this latter will have particular significance to you here in New Jersey.

Under the Act, the Federal Government is authorized to provide up to 75 percent of the cost of carrying out the State's approved

program. This includes the cost of training personnel for State and local boating safety work and the cost of administering State programs as well. The approval of State programs will be based on regulations set by the Secretary. These may include, but are not limited to, requirements that a State program include boat operator education, safety and enforcement patrols, safety inspections, testing and examination of boats, boat operating zones, operator licensing programs, boating accident investigation, hazardous debris removal and emergency service. Let me emphasize that we are not attempting to direct State programs in detail. Our concern is to see that the available funds go to those who are willing to make an effort. The States in fact are encouraged to undertake innovative programs which might offer significant advancement in the effectiveness of boating safety.

In addition to the matching fund programs for the States, the Act encourages the Secretary to assist and cooperate with all interested parties to increase boating safety. The number of fatalities can be reduced only with the concerted effort of everyone involved.

The President's safe boating program is not limited to the legislative proposals I have outlined. The Secretary of Transportation has pledged to increase the effort within the Department, as well, specifically the Coast Guard.

He has called for a stepped-up research effort which will seek to develop safer boat designs and to improve life saving equipment. I feel that this is of great importance. Too many fatalities have occurred where life jackets were in the boat but either not worn or not available when they were needed. Perhaps here the solution is a floatation device that would be less cumbersome to wear.

The educational facilities of the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Auxiliary will be enlarged. They will give particular emphasis to informational programs for boat owners and operators.

The collection and analysis of accident statistics will be reviewed in an effort to help us better understand what causes accidents.

The existing waterway marker system will be reappraised to make it more responsive to the needs of the boatman. More attention will be given to weather and hazard warnings.

We feel that President Johnson has proposed a well balanced program which will be of significant benefit to the public at an acceptable cost. It seeks the cooperation of State and local governments, industry groups and the boating public in a common effort to save lives. But it seems that any program, no matter how well intentioned, stirs opposition if it appears to extend governmental control. The initial response to our proposed program in some of the boating press, was that "Big Brother" in the form of the Federal Government was moving in to destroy the enjoyment of recreational boating. But my associates in the Coast Guard tell me, and I am sure those of you in the Marine Patrol will agree, you don't feel like "Big Brother" when you tow in a capsized boat that carried an entire family to its death or when you have to tell a wife or mother that its just not worth searching any more.

I don't mean to be melodramatic, but no one seems to complain when the long arm of the government holds a tow line or a life jacket. It is time we moved a step further toward keeping the accident from happening in the first place.

We are moving in the right direction. The consumer, the boatman and the American citizen deserves this "right to safety." I earnestly urge you all to join in this endeavor--to give your full support to the President's program for recreational boating safety. The job is well worth doing--it must be done; it will be done better, faster and more efficiently with the full cooperation of the States, the industry and the boating public. We look forward to working with you.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, ALAN S. BOYD, BEFORE THE SECOND ANNUAL AUTO INSURANCE INDUSTRY TRAFFIC SAFETY RESEARCH SYMPOSIUM AT THE MARRIOTT MOTOR HOTEL, IN CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, AT 7:30 P.M., TUESDAY, MARCH 19, 1968

It's a pleasure to be here tonight - and a refreshing change to speak to a group and know that everyone in the room rode to the hotel with his seat belt fastened. Or to know that if it wasn't fastened, you were engaged in some sort of dangerous basic research. And that either way you were covered; and in good hands.

I am glad to be here for another reason - only marginally related to the business of the symposium. I am sure that at one time or another, some of you have found yourselves at a friendly little party and discovered that one of the guests was a psychiatrist. Most of us react the same way - watch out of the corner of an eye; wonder how much he can tell just by listening to us talk or by counting our drinks.

But until I came here tonight - as the man who has been asked to direct the first major analysis of the auto insurance industry - it never occurred to me to wonder how the psychiatrists feel at those parties. Now I know.

So, in the spirit of what I understand to be the first step in deep analysis, I would like to bring the subject of insurance out in the open briefly.

The Department of Transportation's concern with automobile accidents does not end when the wheels of the wrecked cars stop spinning. Our concern extends to the day when the wheels of justice have had their turn - when the car is repaired and the questions of compensation have been settled.

During the past six years, insurance rates in some areas have risen as much as 30 percent. Many drivers find they are unable to find insurance at any price - or at any price they can pay. As many as 80 insurance companies have gone into receivership or bankruptcy, which has placed yet another burden on people who have been injured in accidents. Our courts are jammed with automobile accident litigation.

These and other problems have become a matter of increasing national interest. You know, better than I, some of the ways this interest is being expressed. Some social critics, journalists, lawyers - and even some insurance executives - are calling for reevaluation of the traditional rules. Fault as a basis for shifting loss has been challenged.

So far, the discussion has been based on whatever set of facts was handy. And an effort to produce a solid foundation of fact as a basis for intelligent action to deal with the problem is long overdue.

To this end, President Johnson has called on the Department of Transportation to make a comprehensive study of automobile insurance. The success of the study will depend to a large degree upon the cooperation and assistance of the bar, the insurance industry, the state authorities and the consumer. We are, of course, pleased by the industry's response to the President's call for such a study. We look forward to your continued support, because it is essential to the success of our fact-finding mission. For our part, I can tell you we will make the study without pre-judgments; we intend to let the chips fall where they may.

(more)

In his message calling for the insurance study, President Johnson said automobile insurance is a "national problem." And he said it will become even more of a problem as we license more drivers, produce more automobiles and build more roads.

What brings us together here, then, is a common concern not just with insurance but with the many consequences of more drivers, more automobiles and more roads. It is a concern implicit in many of the President's messages in the past two years; messages which, in turn, reflect a changing national attitude toward transportation and its affect on human beings and their environment.

When he asked Congress to create our Department, President Johnson said that - as good as it was - America's transportation network "is not good enough when it builds super-highways for super-charged automobiles - and yet cannot find a way to prevent 50,000 deaths this year." In the months since he delivered that message, we have begun to get results from our efforts to prevent deaths on the highways - as you have heard and will hear during this conference.

In his message on the cities last month, the President said: "Never before have residents of urban areas faced a clearer choice concerning urban transportation - shall it dominate and restrict enjoyment of all the values of urban living, or shall it be shaped to bring convenience and efficiency to our citizens in urban areas?" And that is a question which not only our Department but the mayors and managers of every city in the nation are working hard to answer.

And the answer must start with the automobile.

The automobile dominates every balance sheet of American transportation. Nearly half of the total expenditure for transportation goes to buy and operate automobiles. When you add private trucks, you account for three-quarters of all the money Americans spend for transportation of any kind. Representing as it does about ten percent of the Gross National Product, the automobile is not only the backbone of American transportation, it is in some ways the backbone of the American economy.

(more)

The automobile not only dominates transportation financially, it dominates the landscape. It is at work, at school, at the market, on the open road in the summertime - giving Americans a mobility and range; a comfort and independence unmatched in the world. You can even find new models perched hundreds of feet in the air on slivers of rock if you follow the television commercials closely. It is truly this country's magic carpet.

Yet, with all of this, there are people who still doubt the automobile is here to stay. Some of its critics, to be sure, complain daily about what it is doing to the cities and then drive home in something with enough flair and power to win the Daytona 500. Some of them have it in mind that if they can just get enough other people out of their cars and into buses or streetcars it will be easier for them to drive to work in the morning. And some people just don't like anything that's happened in the country since the Hupmobile.

Much of the criticism of the automobile as we know it today is warranted. About half of the waste matter that pollutes American air comes from the car. It causes about half the nation's accidental deaths. And some of the highways we have built for it have been built at the expense of community values more basic than transportation.

But to base any judgment of the future role of the car on the car as it exists today assumes there will be no change. And changes already are coming.

Under the authority of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act, new safety equipment is being built into American automobiles - new types of windshields, head rests, seat belts and shoulder harnesses, collapsible steering wheels and others. If our preliminary statistics are accurate, the collapsible steering wheel, alone, will reduce deaths in auto accidents by one-fourth when every car is equipped with one.

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare is working toward material reduction of air pollution.

(more)

And the Federal Highway Administration is experimenting with new approaches to highway design in metropolitan areas - approaches like the Baltimore design concept team. In that city, highway engineers are working with architects, city planners, economists, sociologists and other professionals to design a highway that will not only carry traffic but will create new parks and new housing as it moves through the city.

Perhaps the biggest question mark in the future for the automobile is cost. Until now, we have managed to avoid looking the transportation bill collector squarely in the eye. We have not included the cost of polluted air, of courts, or dispersed neighborhoods in our transportation budget. Nor have we been strict in our accounting of the cost of parking space and other facilities in downtown areas.

The Federal Highway Administration recently inventoried highway needs in the 50 states for the years 1965 to 1985. They estimate that it will take nearly $31-billion a year to build and maintain America's highways during the next 17 years.

They found that the minimum possible growth in highway travel by 1985 is 60 percent - and that 71 percent will be more like it if the present trend continues.

In terms of vehicle-miles, they found that urban travel is doubling every 20 to 25 years - growing at a rate twice that of the population.

None of the estimates includes money for parking in or near the cities. Yet, it makes no more sense to continue to build new urban highways without new parking spaces than it does to turn on another spigot over a bucket that's already full.

When you add these factors together, you find the future role of the automobile looks something like this: It will continue to dominate American transportation as long as people can afford it. It may well change substantially. It may be powered by steam and run on a cushion of air. It may be equipped to turn itself over to remote-control operation once it reaches a freeway. It may one day look like nothing whatever on the streets in 1968. But if it has the advantages of convenience and dependability that motorists get from their cars today, they will use it.

(more)

This is not to say that the automobile will continue to dominate the central business district. Forty percent of all Americans now live in the 30 largest metropolitan areas. And it is apparent that mass transit - rail or bus or both - will be needed in those and other areas.

Mass transit will be needed to take the pressure not only from commuter highways but from the downtown area itself. It will be needed to provide transportation for the poor, the elderly, the handicapped and others who cannot afford a car or who cannot handle one.

And if the Congress approves the transfer of mass transit to our Department, we will give the highest priority to research that will bring the same technological advances to transit as we expect will be brought to the automobile.

The Department of Transportation looks at mass transit as the best means in medium and large cities immediately at hand for solving the problem of peak hour commuting and downtown congestion.

It could help us relieve congestion at airports.

It is essential to more efficient use of our present highway network and for any future achievement of a balanced mix of transportation.

We do not believe mass transit has reached a point of no return.

Above all, we in the Department of Transportation have tried to work closely with transportation industry and unions, with our states and localities. For we are convinced that while the solution to our transportation problems will require some hard choices, that is not the same thing as choosing sides.

We can't solve out transportation problems by embracing one mode and eliminating or ignoring all others.

Nor can we solve them simply by letting everybody go his own way.

These approaches have been tried, and they don't work.

So now we're trying to do the job together, and this is beginning to show results.

With your help, I know it will work.

# # # #

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, ALAN S. BOYD, BEFORE THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON URBAN TRANSPORTATION AT THE PITTSBURGH HILTON HOTEL, PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA, ON TUESDAY, MARCH 12, 1968, AT 4:20 P.M.

Sic Transit Gloria Mundi - "So Go the Glories of the World" - that's the way the old saying went. Until last week, when it took off in a different direction.

The last page of last week's Life Magazine features a pictorial essay entitled "Awaiting the Sic Transit." The scene is a bus stop. A Londoner, carrying a large sign, bends over to peer at a bus schedule attached to a lamp post. "Times of Last Busses" is the heading on the schedule. The Londoner's sign reads: "The End of the World is at Hand."

But that was only the beginning

(more)

Last week the Wall Street Journal treated its readers to a front-page account of a rare and wonderful experience that few modern Americans have ever enjoyed: an intercity train ride that didn't make you feel like you'd gone through a wringer.

The reporter was talking about the Tokaido Line in Japan. And he didn't resist the obvious invidious comparisons.

Indeed, his description of the delights of his Tokaido ride reminded me of another account I came across recently - an account that goes like this:

"I can conceive of nothing so completely fulfilling in every respect the requirements of our population as such a road. . . There would be no dust. There would be no mud. . . /People/ have simply to enter the station from the sidewalk and pass down a spacious and well-lighted staircase to a dry and roomy platform. The temperature would be cool in summer and warm in winter. . . The passenger would be sure of a luxurious seat in a well-lighted car. . . ."

This was the inviting vision advanced more than a hundred years ago by an engineer named A. P. Robinson of a subway he was proposing under Broadway in New York City.

I cite these more as instructive examples than unpleasant reminders - more as random signposts of how far we have to go than as telltale symptoms of how far gone we are toward developing in this country a transportation system really worthy of the name.

We haven't gotten there yet. But we are, I think, beginning for the first time to take the right track.

For the first time, we are seeing the so-called transportation crisis for what it really is - part and parcel of the complex and chronic problems that affect all of our cities.

Americans have worked very hard for the past two centuries building the most advanced industrial society known to man. But about 30 years ago, we began to look around at the cities we had created in the process and said, this is not exactly what we had in mind. It needs more parks and trees. Too many of the people live in squalor. The schools teach, but

(more)

too many do not educate. What's more, they said, the bus service is terrible. The streets are too crowded. The air is not safe to breathe. And all in all, it's a place we'd rather leave than live in.

So we decided some time ago that we had to do something to make our cities places where men could live and work and thrive.

And we started arguing about it. We haven't stopped arguing - but we no longer let our arguing stop us from doing something about it.

Under President Johnson's leadership we have made great beginnings over the past several years.

We have entered into massive efforts to improve our schools and train more and better teachers.

We have expanded training for the unskilled and encouraged industry to return to the city where the jobs are so urgently needed.

We have stepped up slum clearance and revitalization of decaying neighborhoods and the creation of more parks.

The President's program represents the most far-reaching attempt in modern history to save, not just the cities, but the people who live and work there.

The establishment last year of the Department of Transportation was a crucial part of that effort.

Over the last few weeks, the President has moved to expand and advance that effort even more.

In his recent message to the Congress on housing and the cities, the President called the nation to an even broader and bolder effort to "change the face of our cities and to end the fear of those - rich and poor alike - who call them home."

As part of that effort, he asked the Congress to approve a reorganization plan.

"-transferring to the Department of Transportation the major urban transit grant, loan, and related research functions now in the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

(more)

"-maintaining in the Department of Housing and Urban Development the leadership in comprehensive planning at the local level, that includes transportation planning and relates to broader urban development objectives."

With Congressional approval of this plan, the Federal government will be far more effectively organized to help our cities develop transportation systems that serve their total needs.

This does not mean we will now be able to come up with some all-purpose plan for the solution of our urban ills - in transportation or in any other field.

We cannot tell the cities where to go, or how to grow or what to build. That they must decide for themselves. But we can help them choose among the best ways of doing it.

Before a city can decide what kind of transportation system it needs, it must decide what kind of city it wants to be. It must decide what kind of life and work and recreation it wants to offer its people.

And the key word here is people.

We have any number of highways that move many vehicles, but not very many people.

We have built cities with space for highways, and skyscrapers and cars - but not enough space for people.

It is, I grant you, an oversimplification to suggest - as some have - that we may well reach a point in some cities, one of these days, when we must choose between people and pavement.

But perhaps - in times as complex as these - it is necessary to talk in terms of simple, basic facts now and then.

The simplest - and most surpassing - fact is that cities are for people. Or at least they're supposed to be. And transportation is for people. Or at least it ought to be.

In today's world - even more in tomorrow's - any urban transportation system designed to do no more than move people and products from place to place is a failure, no matter how magnificently it performs that function. Because if

(more)

that is all it is designed to do, there is always the danger that it will do as much harm as good.

In the first - and final - analysis transportation must be designed to serve the total needs of people.

We have in the past given a great deal of lip service to this notion. We have even granted it some secondary consideration now and then in the building of our transportation plant.

But we have never acted as if we really believed it.

It is time we did.

This means, of course, that our urban areas are going to have to make some decisions - they are going to have to decide how large they want to grow, in what directions and ways they want to grow, and so on.

It means that we are going to have to stop making transportation decisions by default. Transportation is one of the great choice mechanisms of our society. In the past we have, in effect, exercised our choice without knowing it - buying automobiles and building highways without really being aware of many of the implications of these decisions.

We can no longer leave these decisions merely to the marketplace - or to technicians. We build highways that are the technical superiors to any in the world. Our highway people also have the ability to build roads that serve the broader needs of the community - as they are beginning to demonstrate. But they cannot do that on their own, we must tell them what the broader goals are and support them as they work to achieve those goals.

It is also time we stopped measuring the success or failure of our urban transportation systems in absolute terms - in terms of a life-and-death struggle between one mode and another in which the winner takes all and everybody else loses.

(more)

It is time we started remembering that autos and highways are not inherently evil and inhuman any more than mass transit is inevitably the most uncomfortable and inconvenient way to go since the days of the prairie schooner and the overland stage.

It is time we stopped leaving social and human costs out of our calculations in considering the costs of our transportation systems. Those things that our calculations cannot comprehend are most often the most important - precisely because they are incalculable and cannot be reduced to a formula or a diget.

I take it as axiomatic that those things least liable to precise measurement are often those that must place highest in any adequate set of human priorities.

It is also time we recognized that - in developing urban transportation systems as in rebuilding our urban areas - we have to start where we are with what we have.

We have far too great a tendency to look at the cities - and transportation systems - we have now and those we will have tomorrow as totally different. We tend to view the cities and transportation systems of tomorrow in utterly visionary terms, as the creation of some totally new technology whose magic machinery, once set in motion, will totally transform our urban scene.

We tend to forget that not suddenly, but slowly - only after gradual, grueling effort - will tomorrow's cities emerge. And they will be no more and no less than all we have done, or failed to do to improve the cities of today. We will, of course, also build new cities and communities - and in doing so avoid the mistakes we made in building the old. But whatever it is that we're going, we've got to get there from here.

The scientists tell us that if you ask the right questions in the right way they answer themselves. They also tell us that the way things look to us depends entirely on the way we look at them - on our focus and our perspective.

(more)

We are beginning to really look at our cities for the first time - and for the first time to see them for what they really are or ought to be: systems for supporting and sustaining man in his pursuit of a full and free life.

And the job of an urban transportation system is to help the city serve that purpose.

I think we have a long way to go before we can really say we have in this country urban transportation systems that do their job.

But I think we are on the way.

# # #

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY ALAN S. BOYD
SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, OPENING A CONFERENCE
ON "LONG-RANGE POLAR OBJECTIVES," AT THE FAA
AUDITORIUM, AT 2:30 P.M., MONDAY, MARCH 4, 1968

Admiral Henderson; Distinguished Guests.

It is a pleasure to welcome you to this conference on the Polar Region.

I apologize for one bad piece of scheduling. The snow we had last Friday was originally ordered for today to help set the mood for you. Fortunately, it is still good and cold and I hope that will help.

A great deal has been written about the Polar Region -- not all of it kind. Something under 100 years ago, an English novelist, W. Winwood Reade, said of the Arctic that it was "the Gloomy Region, where the year is divided into one day and one night, lying entirely outside the mainstream of history.

And if Thomas Jefferson were President today, it is possible he would have forbidden a conference like this, let along encouraged it. Mr. Jefferson dealt as harshly with the subject of cold as the cold apparently dealt with Mr. Jefferson. And he once wrote: "Cold is the source of more suffering to all animal nature than hunger, thirst, sickness and all the other pains of life and of death itself put together."

I am sure many people wo uld agree with Mr. Jefferson.

I doubt that many would agree anymore with Mr. Reade. If the Polar Regions have, indeed, been outside the mainstream of history, they are not outside any longer.

Their influence on weather; their potential as a source of raw material; their importance to defense -- all combine to make the Polar Regions very important to us.

Transportation is a crucial element of any plan for developing the resource of the Arctic or the Antarctic -- crucial and challenging.

It is one thing to clear snow from the streets of Washington. It is another to work out a transportation plan for the cover of the Arctic basin.

But before we can develop a scheme for logistics, we need to know just what the Nation's goals and objectives are. Take the Arctic area of Alaska for example; if our goal is to rescue the Eskimo from poverty, that calls for one kind of transportation system. If we want to remove copper, then we are looking for a different system altogether. If we want to settle the territory, then we have still another transportation problem on our hands.

So we have asked you to come together to tell us where to start.

Among our many interests in the Department are the Marine Sciences -- the deep frontier. Another area in which we are deeply involved is Alaska. And the man who has had primary responsibility for both of these areas is Under Secretary Everett Hutchinson.

He is chairing the steering committee for this conference. He is vitally interested in the subjects. He will start our people working on the basis of the information you are able to provide today.

So it is, again, a pleasure to welcome you and to thank you for the effort you will be putting in during the next two days.

And it is a pleasure to present to you Under Secretary Everett Hutchinson.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

REMARKS BY EVERETT HUTCHINSON, UNDER SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION
PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT THE OPENING OF THE POLAR CONFERENCE,
MARCH 4, 1968, 2:30 P.M. AT 800 INDEPENDENCE AVENUE, S.W.
WASHINGTON, D. C., THIRD FLOOR AUDITORIUM

Thank you, Secretary Boyd. It is a great pleasure for me to be able to take part in opening the polar conference.

When plans for holding this symposium on the government's role in the polar regions were first discussed, I became intensely interested because it meant drawing together two subjects with which I have been very much concerned in the Department of Transportation -- the marine sciences and transportation in Alaska.

I have, at Secretary Boyd's request, provided the general oversight of the Department's marine science program. This has given me the opportunity to learn at firsthand about the many exciting things that are going on in this area, not only in the polar regions, but throughout the oceans of the world.

And somehow or other, my office seems to have become the focal point of the Department's involvement in the transportation problems of Alaska. It was never really planned that the Under Secretary should occupy this position -- it just sort of happened that way, and I couldn't be more pleased. Among the most rewarding experiences that I have had in the past year have been my associations with the people of Alaska -- and I am glad to see some of my friends from the big State here today. A lot has been said about the pioneer spirit that helped to make America great, and I guess I'm not saying anything new if I make the point that we can still find that spirit in Alaska.

Maybe the harsh climate brings out the best in people. Whatever the reason, the qualities of resourcefulness, dedication, and willingness to work are developed to the highest degree in the citizens of Alaska. And, of course, these same qualities -- the ability to make the most out of a little, the determination to get the job done, and the

(more)

willingness to work at it, are bound to be found in anyone prepared to deal with problems as hard as those that face us in the Arctic and Antarctic. I am confident, for this reason, that you will have a most successful conference.

We have asked you here to help us determine the proper role of the Department of Transportation in the polar regions. Because transportation plays basically a supporting function, this means that we must go further and ask what will be the role of the United States itself in these regions. This conference, then, must be concerned with the kinds of transportation that will be needed to meet this country's scientific, military, and commercial requirements in the polar areas over the next 50 years.

The Department of Transportation is not yet a year old, but we are pursuing programs in many areas. We are concerned with urban congestion and the needs for improved urban transportation as well as inter-urban travel and commerce. We are in the final testing phase of a project to connect New England and Washington with trains capable of speeds over 160 miles an hour. We are beginning to see results in our highway and automobile safety programs. We have many other solid programs that are well justified and should be productive.

In addition, we have a commitment to provide high latitude transportation. The United States is a party to a 30 year treaty to remain in the Antarctic with our bases and our research programs. We will continue to provide transportation for scientists into the ice-covered seas.

Likewise, we will continue to assist scientific ventures in the north polar regions. We will continue to assist with the supplying of our Arctic bases.

A great deal has been said recently about the need for a vast expansion of transportation services and facilities in northern and western Alaska. As we are concerned at this conference with the Arctic, let us consider that portion of Alaska lying north of the Yukon River drainage basin. Many exciting things are happening in this vast northland. Numerous copper, gas, coal, and oil deposits are being actively explored. As these potential sources of needed resources are developed, transportation will be needed to the commercial markets of Alaska, the west coast, and the entire Pacific rim.

(more)

Large jet airliners are already flying scheduled daily scheduled trips north of the Arctic circle. The State of Alaska has committed substantial funds for studies of the feasibility of building a rail link from the line of the Alaska Railroad to the Kobuk River Valley and the Gubik oil and gas fields on the Arctic Ocean. Studies are being made of the best way to build highways across permanently frozen ground. The Army Corps of Engineers is surveying several sites for deep-water ports on the northwest coast of Alaska.

While there are developments taking place in Arctic transportation, by far the greatest part of the task remains to be done. Within the last month the first commercially significant oil discovery was made at Prudhoe Bay on the Arctic Ocean. I am told that all the equipment for this drilling operation had to be brought in by air. At Bornite, about 400 miles northwest of Fairbanks, a major copper deposit is being explored. Equipment and even living quarters again had to be moved in by air, or by a tortuous journey up the shallow Kobuk River. If the resources of this area are to be developed, it must be obvious to all that more efficient and cost-effective means of transportation will have to be provided.

The Department of Transportation is prepared to take the lead in promoting and encouraging the building of a better transportation system to meet the urgent needs of this vast region. But we look to others, to many of you here today, to help us decide just what will be required. Should we be devoting our highest priority effort to developing an all-season bulk transportation capability, either by developing harbors and more powerful ice breakers or by looking to an extension of the present railroad? Or should we perhaps be concentrating on transportation to meet the demands of the expanding population by building roads and air fields? Where are the most urgently needed new transportation facilities to be located, and what purposes should they serve? These are questions that we at the Department of Transportation are asking ourselves, and now we are asking you to help us find the answers.

We ask you to consider not only transportation needs, but also transportation technology. For example, we are all aware of the heavy ice that covers the heart of the Arctic basin and locks in the polar regions during the long winter. We need to think in terms of using the cold to our benefit.

(more)

Frozen ground can be an aid, not a hinderance, to transportation. Some work has already been done on using ice as a building material, and it is not impossible, perhaps, that all-season harbors could be built largely of ice on the shores of the Arctic Ocean.

Some scientists think the ice cover of the Arctic basin is unstable and that it could be removed in a few years, and that it would not reform. We hope you gentlemen will be able to tell us what transportation requirements will be in order to keep an eye on this ice. We hope you can show us how knowledge about it will be vital to this nation's interests, and will therefore justify spending transportation dollars to provide access to this area and the platforms you need to study it.

Tomorrow in your working sessions think hard about our role in providing facilities, research and manpower that will enable us to satisfy your transportation requirements in the polar regions. Consider the future wealth that must be developed. Consider the human resources that can be tapped by bringing the Eskimo, the Indian and the Aleut into the mainstream of our society.

So gentlemen, you see that we are concerned with your needs and your country's needs, and with the benefits that are associated with all of your programs in the high latitudes.

Good luck in this conference. The Department of Transportation is vitally interested in the results.

(End)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, ALAN S. BOYD, BEFORE THE AMERICAN ROADBUILDERS'ASSOCIATION 1968, ANNUAL MEETING IN LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, FLAMINGO HOTEL, ON FEBRUARY 12, 1968, 10 A.M.

I don't know what the prophet Isaiah might say if he were standing here today in Las Vegas.

I do know that as I stand here I can't help recalling his ancient exhortation to "make straight in the desert a highway. . . ."

Rumor has it that there are some present-day saints who think we ought to have left it at that.

Actually, I don't think they're saints at all - judging by the language they use when they storm into work every morning after fighting the rush-hour traffic.

And there are those who think we've interpreted the rest of Isaiah's exhortation a little too literally, especially in some of our urban areas - I mean the verses that read: "Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low; and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain. . . ."

While we're on Isaiah, I think an even more appropriate text of his for this occasion is the one that goes: "Come, let us reason together."

That is, as you know, one of President Johnson's favorite Biblical passages - and after some ten months at the helm of the Transportation Department I have come to fully share his fondness for it.

More than that, I am convinced that our success in developing the transportation system that the nation needs in the years immediately ahead must come - not from the sudden appearance of some new technology, or from a massive outpouring of money that simply gives us more of the same - but from the willingness of everyone involved in using and improving that system to reason and work together.

I am also convinced that any effort by any segment of that system to seek its own advancement at the expense of other segments, or of the system as a whole, will be ultimately and utterly self-defeating.

Take, for example, our highway system. I don't think there is any question but that the Federal Highway Program as it has developed over the years since 1916, and particularly over the last ten years, must rank as <u>the</u> great public works project of this nation.

Without the highways that Program helped build the unparalled prosperity we enjoy today would surely be beyond our reach. And millions of Americans would not yet know the immeasurable opportunities those highways have opened up - in all spheres of human experience and endeavor, personal, social, economic, cultural, recreational.

Who could harbor anything but the utmost affection for highways?

Well, some are less affectionate than others. And these are, by and large, the people who have been entrusted with the management of major cities.

Some two-thirds of the Federal Interstate System is completed. About one-half of the scheduled 6,000 miles of that system in our urban areas remains unbuilt. And in city after city, progress toward building the remaining miles has either slowed to a rush hour crawl, or come to a complete stall.

The last miles are indeed proving to be the longest.

(more)

Let's examine the reasons.

Senator Jennings Randolph, Chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, put it this way in a speech last October to the American Association of State Highway Officials:

"The highway is a catalyst, changing all it touches. This is true in rural America as well as in urban America, but the urban highway, by reason of the density of the population and the concentration of economic and social values, has a far greater effect on the environment of the city."

A freeway rolling through vast rural countrysides - where the per acre population of cows or corn often far exceeds that of people - that is one thing. But a freeway roaring through thickly populated urban neighborhoods and communities, straining their physical, social and economic fabric - that is another.

San Francisco, Seattle, San Antonio, New Orleans, Atlanta, St. Paul, Milwaukee, Chicago, Indianapolis, Cleveland, the District of Columbia, Philadelphia, New York City, Boston - this is but a selective roll call of major cities across the country in which bruises and bitterness from fierce freeway fights still show.

San Francisco, I fear, has shown us how deep resentment can run when a city and its citizens believe a freeway has been forced on them without taking into account the views and values and needs of the city itself. In the words of former Mayor John Shelley, "San Francisco's famous, or as it has often been called, infamous, Embarcadero Freeway. . .without doubt served as the trigger mechanism for our 'Freeway Revolt.'" "We have," the Mayor continued, "the visible evidence of the Embarcadero Freeway and the people are saying, 'Cut it out; no more.'"

Last year San Francisco turned down two major freeways - and a quarter of a billion dollars or more of Federal matching money that would have come along with them.

A month or two ago I ran across this view of urban highways: "Take the Federal highway program. No one seriously questions the nation's need for good roads, but a lot of people are beginning to wonder whether that need always has to override everything else.

(more)

"The doubters have become more numerous as freeways multiply in metropolitan areas, displacing families, schools and businesses, destroying scenic areas and drawing an ever-increasing flow of cars into already over-crowded city centers. Yet the planners by and large push full-speed ahead, insisting on the route that's best - for the road, if not for the community."

These are not the comments of the American Institute of Architects, or of the National League of Cities, or of some mass transit lobby - or even of an official of the Department of Transportation.

These are the concerns of the Wall Street Journal.

I think the moral to all this is clear. If we don't include the total needs and desires of our cities in our urban highway planning - and not just the needs of the auto user in the narrow sense of the word - then let there be no mistake: major cities will continue to drag their feet on highway construction.

I am convinced that, in the long run, the highway industry and the highway program, will flourish to the extent to which it meets the total needs of our society - not as narrowly conceived by any particular special interest, whether it be public or private, but as broadly conceived by our citizenry as a whole.

In our urban areas - where most Americans live, and where our transportation problems most demand and defy solution - that means several things:

First, that each urban area itself must decide what kind of transportation system best serves and suits its particular needs. Obviously, the system that works best in Las Vegas or Los Angeles is not likely to be the system that works best in Philadelphia or San Francisco.

Second, any assessment of the role of any segment of our urban systems must be made in the context of the system as a whole. We can't build airports without adequate access roads or rails - or undertake extensive road building to accommodate private automobiles without taking into account the feasibility of rail or other mass transit.

Third, because the transportation system itself has so powerful and pervasive an impact upon the total environment in which it operates, that impact must be of prior and prime concern in any decision to alter or expand that system.

(more)

What I'm saying is really very simple: cities are for people, and so are transportation systems.

The problems that freeways are running into in our cities are not entirely of their own making.

They do not, for example, arise from any deep-seated American resentment of the highway or the automobile. That combination has given the people of this country unparalled freedom, comfort and convenience of travel and, with proper planning, will continue to do so.

They arise, in part, from a changing set of values. When President Johnson called for legislation to make administration of Federal highway activities a part of the Department of Transportation, he emphasized that future highway planning should reach beyond the economics of road building to encompass not only all transportation needs but the very environment in which those needs exist.

We are now an urban society. Seventy percent of our people live in or around cities. And there is a growing realization that these are the only cities we have and we should be handling them with care. So we are becoming more protective of them - of the air around them, of the water supply, of the parks and of the neighborhoods, because they are the heart of American life.

What this means, in short, is that we can no longer afford to build transportation systems or segments of systems if they serve only a transportation need and do it at the expense of other considerations.

The answer, then, to the problems of highways in urban areas - and the problems of urban areas with highways - is not to continue on a collision course, but to make common cause - the kind of common cause that may well be underway in the city of Baltimore, to cite one example.

Many of you, I imagine, are aware of how for years Baltimore has been embroiled in a bitter struggle over the city's 21-mile share of the Federal Interstate Highway System. The issues were the usual ones: some of the city's most historic sections were threatened as well as at least one viable, stable neighborhood.

(more)

Last year, the State of Maryland and the City of Baltimore came to the Department of Transportation and asked us to finance a new approach to breaking the impasse. It was a so-called design concept team that would bring together the social as well as the highway engineers, the urban as well as the highway designers, the urban as well as the highway interests.

It is far too early to speculate about what the final results of this effort will be. But thus far I think the indications are extremely encouraging.

When the team was first formed, for example, one planned section of the freeway - that would have run right through a neighborhood, cutting it in two and eliminating a substanital number of homes and jobs - was regarded as unchangeable.

But as the team looked more closely at the situation, as the architects began to talk to the engineers, and the sociologists to the leaders of the community - as everybody began to talk to everybody else - they began to be aware that there were indeed alternative routes and alternative designs. They began to be aware that by talking with each other and with the leaders of the community they could discover possibilities - and problems - they had not seen before. And in the process they could see the freeway becoming, more and more, not simply a means of moving automobiles and trucks and buses, but as an occasion and an instrument of improving and enhancing the life of the entire neighborhood.

I do not - as I have said - know what the results of this effort will be. But I am convinced that it is only from efforts such as this, in cities across the country, that we can arrive at acceptable solutions to our urban transportation problems.

Let me be absolutely clear on one point. The approach I suggest will cost more money. The planning and analysis being done by the concept team in Baltimore will add between one and one-and-a-half percent to the total cost of the segment of freeway that is under review.

Let me also suggest that, in the long run, the roadblocks which major American cities seem increasingly determined to place in the path of freeways they do not want will be far more costly.

I do not know how the trade-off between the brief pause for more intensive planning and the long delay caused by bitter argument over route and design would work out in every case.

(more)

I do know that the cost of freeway construction has been going up under the pressure of rising prices of materials at a steady rate of 3 percent a year. It requires no more than grade school arithmetic to see that a brief delay for planning review would cost less than a long delay for quarreling over route and design - in our out of court.

I do know that nobody is going to gain by thinking in terms of pro-highway or anti-highway - of either rail or road. It is not a question of either-or - it is a question of both-and as well as a question of what proportion.

Let me repeat here what I have said many times before: It is quite clear that Americans will continue to add at least 2.5 million automobiles to our supply every year and it is quite clear that we are going to build highways to accommodate them. Yet it is also clear that we are dangerously close to the point of diminishing returns in our use of the automobile - that now that almost ever body has his own auto, and many of us more than one, none of us can use it with the unlimited pleasure and freedom we bought it for.

The sheer growth of numbers of the automobile will eventually begin to limit the very freedom of movement, which led us to buy so many in the first place. For another, we are going to have to provide efficient, effective and attractive mass transit facilities as a serious transportation alternative. I am not - let me emphasize - talking about mass transit instead of autos and highways: I am talking about mass transit as well as autos and highways, mass transit of a kind and quality that will offer people what they do not now have - a real choice.

In general, I think it is time for all of us - in the public and private sectors of the Nation's transportation system, and particularly of our highway system - to re-examine our role in terms of the Nation's total needs in the years ahead.

As you know, Senator Jennings Randolph is holding intensive and exhaustive hearings on our whole Federal approach to urban highways. I am informed that Chairman Fallon intends to discuss the same subject when his House Committee opens hearings on this year's highway legislation.

Within the terms of existing legislation, the Department of Transportation is reviewing and revising our highway and other standards to make them far more responsive to the total needs of the society.

You - the builders - have given us the greatest system of roads in the world. It is now time for us to take the next step - to build the greatest transportation system in the world.

It will not be an easy job. The blueprint is still in the developing tank and the lines are still too faint to read.

(more)

But we do know this: It can be done. You do have an enormous opportunity, never before granted to builders. You have a chance to build a system that will give us a better way of life than man has ever known. That's a job worth bidding on. That's a dream worth doing something about.

Thank you.

# # # #

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

REMARKS BY ALAN S. BOYD, SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BEFORE THE TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA'S NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION INSTITUTE AT THE WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 31, 1968, AT 9:30 A. M.

In going over some of your policy positions the other day, I found one that advocates making it a Federal offense to assault an Interstate Commerce Commission employee while he is on duty.

So I am here today with fresh and rather vivid impressions of the controversial nature of this job to ask whether you would consider extending that policy to some of us in the Department.

It is always a pleasure to take part in the working sessions of the Transportation Association of America. I have no doubt that the two decades you spent making a case for a coordinated system of transportation had much to do with the decision to create a Department of Transportation. I only hope you have no illusions that your mission has been accomplished. Your work has really just begun.

The Congress has agreed with President Johnson that the general welfare of the nation requires better coordination of transportation services. It is now a matter of policy. But the initiative for translating the idea into tangible improvements in the way we move people and goods should come from private industry. We intend to do our fair share of the work. But I believe, as I know you do, that the changes in our system will come faster and more smoothly if they are the result of private enterprise rather than Federal pressure. So there is more than enough work to go around.

I have today what amounts to the first annual report of the Department. It is two months short of a year since we became an official part of the government, but it seems like a year -- at least a year.

In some ways, these first months remind me of what Dr. Charles Elliot said when someone asked him how Harvard came by its magnificent store of knowledge. He said it was very simple -- the freshmen brought a great deal with them and the seniors took away very little.

That story means more after you have spent some time trying to sort out the pieces of the incredibly complex transportation network of the United States. It has particular meaning if you start the job thinking you have a fair understanding of American transportation.

We went to work on April 1 of last year searching for the right answers and we are just now beginning to find the right questions.

And I am afraid that if a citizen came into our building thinking the Department was formed to manage a well-coordinated system rather than help create one, the dialogue would sound something like this:

He would ask: "What time does the 9 o'clock come in?"

And we would reply: "We are working toward a balanced and integrated system of transportation in which people and goods can move from one mode to another with a minimum of delay, damage or discomfort."

If that didn't stop him, he might ask: "I came in on the 10 o'clock plane; what plane would my baggage come in on?"

And we would say: "A transportation system can no longer be designed with profit and efficiency as the only criteria. We must take into account environmental factors."

When he stalked out of the building, we probably would shout at him: "And don't forget, there are sweeping social implications in every transportation decision."

There is no telling what he would think if we were to tell him that we believe we had a productive first year and that we made progress.

For one thing, we are now nearly at full staff strength. It has been a slow process. We have chosen our people with care and I believe that whatever time we have lost we will make up for in the quality of future work.

We have made real progress in safety on the highways, in the air, on the railroad system.

An expanding program is underway to improve the capacity of urban streets at moderate costs by re-building intersections, improving signals, creating so-called reversible lanes and making other relatively minor adjustments.

We have started another program to eliminate high-accident locations on existing highways.

Work is moving ahead on the prototype of the supersonic transport.

Both types of high-speed trains that will go into service this spring between Washington and Boston have been tested -- one at more than 150 miles an hour, the other at over 170 miles an hour.

In Baltimore and Chicago, we are trying a totally new approach to one of the most critical transportation problems -- the conflict between the expressway and the city that it serves. I will have more to say about this project later.

None of these programs will solve our transportation problems. But they will all contribute to a better system. The only thing about this country that is more complicated than its transportation network is the people who live in it. And we will show results, not with sweeping changes, but with what seem at first glance to be insignificant adjustments all through the system -- from better synchronization of traffic lights in one town to elimination of a grade crossing in another.

We have also, I believe, made clear our general policies in the briefs we have filed with the regulatory agencies. We supported the rent-a-train proposal and the application for helicopter service in the Washington-Baltimore area because we want to encourage innovation. We oppose an attempt to bring air taxis under economic regulation and we argued for greater freedom for trucks to use the Interstate Highway system because we want to encourage competition and more efficient use of the system.

We have a task force rewriting all safety regulations -- air, rail and highway -- to eliminate contradictions and to try to make them clear and consistent. In this, as in other projects that affect industry's ability to function, we are doing the work in consultation with industry.

We have tried to demonstrate that we do not intend to withdraw into a fortress Washington, bolt the door, draw the blinds and issue Draconian instructions for building a better transportation network. In the last analysis, private industry must finance the faster, safer, more efficient transportation which the public interest requires. We will help with research, analysis, recommendations for sensible regulatory policies and with a portion of the total investment. We are also required to advise the government on which of its investments will bring the greatest benefits in transportation. But neither government nor industry can produce the final product by itself. And we intend to continue working closely with industry.

Perhaps the most encouraging sign of progress this past year came not from inside the department but from outside.

We find an increasing awareness among American business that transportation is a total system. It shows up in the creation of new systems-oriented divisions of companies that once were preoccupied with their own products as the ultimate transportation weapon. It shows up in a scramble for men with experience in broad transportation planning. This new feeling that -- to paraphrase Calvin Coolidge -- the business of business is America -- is not confined to transportation.

This month, Fortune magazine devoted most of its issue to efforts of business to help cope with social problems which have, in the past, been considered the private preserve of local, state and Federal governments. The use of systems analysis and engineering which were developed by the aerospace industry is an important ingredient in many of these efforts. As Fortune put it, the notion that social problems might be solved with systems engineering was regarded as an "eccentric boondoggle" when it was pioneered in California three years ago. That is no longer the case.

We are building a strong office of systems analysis in the Department. It is, in many ways, still an infant art, but it has a great potential if for no other reason than that it makes you face facts. It is common sense plugged into a computer. And its guiding principle is the same as that on which any good detective operates -- assume nothing, challenge everything. It is a great destroyer of myth and folklore. And it gets you into the habit of measuring all of the consequences of an action instead of just the good consequences. And it forces you to explain in detail why you are in business not just what your business is.

Systems analysis has also turned up some broad gaps in what we know about the transportation network we are trying to improve. For example, we have a report that tells us that if we build a highway through a corner of a primitive area in the west it will cut the population of bighorn sheep from 10 to 2. We have no such precise information about where the nation's millions of railroad cars are and how productively they are used. I think one of the most important missions of the Department must help industry fill in this and other information gaps so that we have a clear idea of what impedes a more orderly flow of goods in the system.

It is significant that in a year of tight budgeting for the Federal government, we are prepared to increase expenditures during fiscal 1969, including the highway trust fund, by a net of $500 million.

There are off-setting cuts in some programs. The highway construction program is essential to shippers and truckers. But the delay of release of funds is just that -- a delay. And the cut works out to about five percent, as compared with an average cut in other public works of closer to seven percent.

We are asking the Congress to keep the supersonic transport program going forward as fast as technology will permit. This is a project that will maintain America's leadership in aviation. It is a program that we hope will set a pattern for sharing the risk of developing new technology in transportation where the public interest is involved.

We have asked for an increase in the Federal Aviation Administration budget that will permit us to hire 1,200 more controllers and install radar and instrument landing facilities at more hub airports.

We are asking for a 50 percent increase in research funds for automobile and highway safety. And we will make available $140 million to the states for improving the quality of their safety programs.

We are, in fact, asking for more money for research all down the line -- in high-speed ground transportation, in the Coast Guard, in all departments.

There is some urgency about this. If the demand for transportation continues to expand at its present rate, we must double the capacity of the system in the next 13 years. It is a job of such dimensions that, to my knowledge, nobody has even added up the cost, let alone worked out a plan for achieving it.

And while the increased demand puts pressure on all of us to produce better methods for moving people and cargo, it may well be a blessing for everyone involved in transportation.

For one thing, it provides an immediate opportunity to improve the system. As we expand what is already in place, we will pay closer attention to access roads for airports; to consolidating terminals so that you are not deposited by a train several miles from the bus you must board for the next stage of the trip.

The expansion should bring a new spirit of cooperation among the modes. With any luck at all, each mode will have its hands full just trying to keep up with new demand. There will be no time for scheming to impede the growth of other modes or trying to coax away work that can be done more efficiently by other carriers.

Finally, it gives us an opportunity to apply the lessons we have learned from the past about the hidden costs of inadequate planning in the system.

We have the best transportation network in the world. But we pay two prices for its service -- one in cash and the other in noise, polluted air, accidents and delays. We have learned that transportation can change the environment. We did not even have to plan for it -- it just happened. I am persuaded that we can change the environment just as easily by planning for it -- only this time we can produce more desirable changes.

We are a country that does not know its own strength. We have the knowledge and the material resources to achieve more than most of us really understand.

President Johnson raised the question in his State of the Union message. "We ask now," he said, "not how can we achieve abundance, but how shall we use our abundance."

I think the answer is in improving the quality of life for our people -- in better health, better housing, better job opportunity, better education, better transportation. It lies in clearing the air, cleaning the water and making the country as pleasant as it is prosperous.

The President also raised the obvious next question.

The issue, he said, is not whether we can do these things but whether we will.

I believe, as he does, that we will.

#####

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

REMARKS BY EVERETT HUTCHINSON, UNDER SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BEFORE THE PIPE LINE CONTRACTORS ASSOCIATION'S 20TH ANNIVERSARY CONVENTION, FAIRMONT HOTEL, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA JANUARY 22, 1968, AT 9:30 A.M.

I am more than delighted to have a part in your Twentieth Anniversary Convention. And it is indeed a privilege to share a spot on this program with your distinguished President and also with one of the gas industry's most articulate spokesmen, Dick Rosan.

In this age of mass mobility, when transport modes are humming over our heads and clamoring all around us, we sometimes overlook one of the fastest and most efficient forms of transportation that is moving quietly beneath our feet -- the pipe line.

But I assure you that the Department of Transportation has taken notice of the pipe line industry. Especially when the pipe carries natural gas.

And, of course, we cannot overlook the thousands of miles of pipe line that carry oil and other liquid products to the American consumer.

(more)

As a matter of fact, pipe line contractors, or at least the techniques they developed, may be involved in the most advanced form of transportation now being studied -- tubular travel.

So the scope of our mutual interest has widened considerably since 1963, when I spoke at your Convention in Boca Raton, Florida.

At that time, I was a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I expressed optimism then for the continued growth of the pipe line industry and I hold that same view today.

You may be familiar with these figures published by Pipe Line Industry Magazine, but I think they are worth repeating.

By 1980, it is estimated that one-half of all the energy materials transported in the United States will travel through pipe lines. This compares dramatically with 1940, when pipe lines carried only 14 percent of the energy supply.

Total pipe line mileage in the United States is now approximately one million miles with expected growth to 1.4 million miles by 1980. And maintenance costs in 1967 are estimated at about $338 million a year.

These figures clearly indicate the size and growth of the pipe line industry. And, if you also consider the 38 million American consumers who rely on just one segment of that pipe line -- that which carries natural gas -- the public interest aspects of the industry are obvious.

About this time last year, a handful of Department of Transportation officials met to consider legislation in the public interest to further insure the safety of natural gas pipe lines.

Similar legislative attempts had been made in the past. And similar legislative attempts were in the mill even then. But they all lacked two ingredients of paramount importance -- industrial input and cooperation.

So we soon realized that any significant legislation must involve both government and industry.

(more)

Shortly after that I heard the story of the old trapper who, armed only with a knife, came upon a grizzly bear. Not knowing just what to do, the old hunter started to pray.

"Lord," he said, "If you're on my side, let this knife find its mark. If you're on his side, let me die quick. But, if you're neutral, you're gonna see the darndest bear fight you ever heard tell of."

So the Lord must have been on both of our sides. Certainly I think that the Senate-passed natural gas bill reflects a good deal of the thinking of both government and industry.

Senate Bill 1166, authorizing the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe safety standards for the transportation of natural and other gas by pipe line, was passed on November 9, 1967.

I believe it is basically a good bill. And one which, if enacted into law, will lead to an unrivaled safety record and increased public confidence.

I would like to briefly comment on some misunderstandings that have developed concerning the need for pipe line safety standards.

It is important to realize that this bill was introduced not because, as some have charged, the Nation is sitting on a million-mile fuse of dangerous and dilapidated gas pipe lines.

Rather, it was introduced because such safety standards as do exist are not uniform in coverage, enforcement and application, and are not mandatory.

The legislation was not premised on the safety record of the gas industry -- which is good, but on the coverage and enforcement gaps in existing regulations.

The Department, in cooperation with the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, conducted a survey of all the State utility commissions.

I would like to summarize several parts of that survey, which was answered by 40 states.

(more)

First, while all of the reporting states said they have statewide authority for privately-owned gas systems, only 25 percent of them have any type of enforcement.

In the important area of testing and inspecting, only 23 percent of the states have a program for the inspection of existing pipe lines.

As for the accidents and pipe line failures which do occur, 35 percent of the states do not collect accident statistics; 15 percent do not require gas companies to report accidents; and 45 percent do not determine the probable cause of accidents.

As Buell Duncan, President of the American Gas Association, said in announcing a grant to the National Safety Council to study the feasibility of establishing a system for collecting public accident statistics:

"...record keeping procedures (by industry and government) are confusing, inconsistent, and irregular."

Duncan even reported that during AGA's inquiries into the industry's safety record, they found among the fatalities two deaths which turned out to be tropical fish.

These facts indicate a far from uniform emphasis on the safe transportation of a commodity upon which more than 120 million Americans depend -- with millions more to be affected if that commodity is not transported with absolute safety.

But these facts do not indicate, at least to us, that the states still aren't well equipped to regulate the gas pipe line industry.

They simply need some standards which will give them uniformity of purpose and action.

We see the role of the Department of Transportation as one of imposing minimum adequate standards and of cooperating fully with the states.

We are doing this in the Highway Safety Program. And there is every reason to believe that similar cooperation with the states and local interests can be achieved in improving natural gas safety.

(more)

Without going into detail, I would like to briefly outline three provisions of S. 1166 which are intended to insure that cooperation.

I think these are particularly important -- to you who must ultimately implement the standards -- and to those of us who must write them.

First, the standards must be promulgated according to the Administrative Procedure Act. And an opportunity must be given for interested parties to be heard and to present arguments. The proper flow of necessary information must be encouraged.

The Department has reiterated both privately and publicly its determination to utilize the expertise and experience presently available in the gas industry.

We intend to keep in close contact with the industry throughout the standard-setting procedure. And I would like to stress at this point the importance of the provision for a technical advisory committee.

This committee, composed of 15 persons, would evaluate the proposed standards. Five would be from State and Federal agencies, five from industry, and five would represent the public.

We expect the industry membership on the advisory committee to play a significant role in providing the expertise I just mentioned -- especially as it relates to standards on design, installation, welding, and other technical aspects of the construction process.

Much has been said about the B31.8 Code for Pressure Piping, that is now the industry's standard. We feel there are many inadequacies in that Code.

But we also recognize that it has many strong points. We fully intend to use the Code as a basis for the new standards. And we expect the Code committee to be well represented on the advisory committee.

Another provision of special significance relates to the states' ability to assume compliance and enforcement responsibilities. We are very hopeful that the states will be able to tackle this problem.

(more)

The Secretary is authorized to pay, on a matching basis, up to 50 percent of the states' standard-setting and compliance costs.

And even if a state cannot assume this responsibility, it can enter into an agreement to undertake monitoring, reporting and record-keeping functions and inspections.

The third area of statutory cooperation is with other Federal and State agencies. The Secretary is authorized to cooperate and consult with the Federal Power Commission and other Federal and State agencies whenever a standard or waiver would affect continuity of service.

These procedures are designed for one purpose: To insure that the standards will be reasonable and practicable, and in the public interest.

Senate Bill 1166 is now being considered by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Just what its final form will look like, I cannot say. And I'm not positive of the effects this bill might have on the pipe line construction industry.

But I would be less than candid if I did not say that it will require a high level of construction performance. I hasten to add, however, that your overall performance in the past has been most praiseworthy. The industry's safety record is testament to that fact.

As far as replacement construction is concerned, the very last thing we want to do is to require gas companies to dig up all of their old pipe line and replace it.

But again, I would be less than honest if I did not admit that some existing pipe line will probably have to be replaced.

The natural gas industry and the pipe line construction industry is clearly entering a period of significant growth. And I'm sure all of you are aware of the awesome population forecasts for the next few decades.

Our public responsibilities are great now. They are going to become even greater. I believe gas pipe line safety standards will be an important step for both the industry and the government in meeting those responsibilities.

And I ask your continued cooperation in helping to achieve pipe line safety goals.

Thank you.

(end)

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C., 20590

REMARKS BY DONALD G. AGGER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BEFORE THE TRAFFIC CLUB OF PHILADELPHIA, AT THE BENJAMIN FRANKLIN HOTEL, PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA, TUESDAY, JANUARY 9, 1968, 7:00 P.M.

Two months ago, Alan Boyd, the Secretary of Transportation, was in Philadelphia for an annual conference of the Delaware Valley Council, and he said he was glad to be here because it is always a pleasure to visit one of the few areas in the United States that produces nearly as many transportation solutions as it does transportation problems.

Secretary Boyd was referring to Philadelphia institutions such as the Budd Company and the Pennsylvania Railroad, both of which are co-operating with the Department of Transportation in the effort to create, in the Northeast Corridor, high-speed passenger rail service truly worthy of the name.

That tradition of solving transportation problems is an old and honored one in Pennsylvania. In the mid-1700's you gave us the Durham boat, which I suppose was the first great bulk carrier for inland waterways in the United States, and also the Conestoga Wagon. The Conestoga Wagon was a remarkable device, because it was amphibious -- I guess we would now call it intermodal.

You had the first improved turnpike in the nation -- the Lancaster Pike, which was remarkable also because it was a financial success. The first great highway bridge -- a span across the Schuylkill at Philadelphia, built in 1798. And the first long canal -- the Schuylkill Canal, completed in 1825.

Sometimes we tend to think that the only really impressive transportation breakthroughs have come in our lifetime, but it doesn't take much reading of Pennsylvania history to learn that that just isn't true. I'll give you an example. In 1794, when the turnpikes were just beginning to be built and the freight lines were just beginning to be formed, it cost five dollars a pound to ship goods the 80 miles from Philadelphia to Lancaster. But just 16 years later, by 1812, the price had been reduced

to two cents a pound. That's a cost reduction of the sort that would stun a shipper today.

I propose to talk tonight primarily about freight movements -- the transportation of things. But I want to say something also about the transportation of people. Like a lot of other Washingtonians, I'm anxious to get on one of those high-speed, Budd-built passenger cars that the Pennsylvania is going to be operating. They're going to run faster than passenger trains now run. But of equal importance, I think, they're going to be more pleasant to ride in.

Not long ago I read a policy statement by Joseph Alioto, the new mayor of San Francisco, on the subject of "Transporting People." Something he said caught my eye.

"We must think in terms of moving hurried, sensitive people ...." the Mayor said. "We must refrain from thinking that we are moving automobiles and the other hardware of transportation."

We in the Department of Transportation are pleased when we hear mayors or city councilmen or legislators or other local officials talking that way. For we, too, are more interested in moving people than in moving hardware. In this nation, we have the world's greatest transportation system -- the best vehicles, the best roadways, and so on. But the danger has been one of thinking too much in terms of hardware and asphalt and concrete and too little in terms of people. Too often, on our tangled expressways and in our crowded airports and on our outdated rail lines, we have de-humanized transportation. We need to reverse that trend. It won't be an easy job because the problems of finance and the problem of having so many people to transport show no real signs that they will diminish.

I want to tell you about a broad and far-reaching effort which we call "facilitation." It's not a very good word, and I usually make it a point to apologize for it before trying to define it. Facilitation -- transportation facilitation -- is the effort to facilitate the flow of cargo or people by removing barriers such as outdated regulations, by cutting through unnecessary red tape.

Facilitation is concerned particularly with the problems which arise when passengers or cargo switch from one form of transportation to another -- from the train to the ship, for example. We're accustomed to speaking of transportation terminals -- air terminals, bus terminals,

and so on. But our terminals are not really terminals -- especially not in 1968. They're connecting points -- the place where the air traveler fights for his luggage while worrying about whether he'll be able to get a taxi; the place where the container is shifted from a truck to a ship, or back again from a ship to a rail car.

If "facilitation" seems to be a dreary sort of word, we in the Department of Transportation have learned not to mind too much. For the fact is that our Office of Facilitation has been coming up with some of the most exciting ideas in the Department. We think our facilitation dreams have real promise of fulfillment. Let me describe some of those dreams.

I have a dream of a transportation system which will allow passengers to move speedily and easily from one inner city to another. It will be "wait-less" transportation -- that is, a transportation system which will not require people to wait in line.

The passenger will be able to commit his baggage to the journey at the terminal -- perhaps back at his hotel -- with some certainty that the baggage will reach the same destination that he does, and before he does.

There will be no lines at the ticket counters -- indeed, no ticket counters. The individual will insert his travel card into a machine, and receive immediately printed information on his trip. And in the same swift and simple transaction, his bank account could be debited automatically.

For the international traveler, there will be no delays at immigration or customs. There need be no visas for international travel, and a passport will be the size of a credit card and good for life.

In short, the international businessman will be able to fly to Europe with just as much ease as the businessman today who takes the air shuttle from Washington to New York.

We have dreams, too, about freight movements in a transportation system of the future. In the world today, perhaps the biggest and most exciting transportation development is not the supersonic transport and not the jumbo jet and not the high-speed train, but a seemingly simple box which you and I know as the container.

We have dreams of taking advantage of the container revolution. The container's great asset is its capability for efficient interchange from truck to rail to ship. Our dream is to clear away the artificial impediments so that shippers and the transportation industry can take advantage of the container's capabilities to reduce transportation time and transportation costs and transportation frustrations.

We see the day when materials of lighter weight will be used in the construction of containers, but yet will offer the same strength and durability as today's containers. When that time comes, the container might move as easily by air as by water or rail or highway.

We see the day coming -- and relatively soon, we believe -- when one rate filed with one government agency will govern the movement of a shipment of freight from an inland point in the United States to an inland point abroad.

And that shipment -- paid for by a joint through rate -- will be accompanied by a single bill of lading which covers the entire movement, regardless of national boundaries and regardless of whether the goods are moving at any given moment by land, by water or in the air.

This bill of lading, then, will be a standard contract issued and used by ocean and air carriers, by railroads and by truckers.

I see also uniform liability for all segments of the transportation industry, so that the shipper can make his claim without worrying about where the loss or damage occurred. And the standard of recovery will be the same regardless of which carrier was responsible. After all, a container full of merchandise becomes no less valuable to its owner simply because it has been transferred from land to sea. And in this ideal transportation future we are dreaming of, there will be no reason to open the container -- no way to discover the damage -- until the container has reached its final destination.

Ultimately, international movements of containerized freight will undergo only one inspection, if any. The requirements of customs, agricultural and public health authorities will have to be satisfied, but that single inspection process can take place not at a dockside hundreds of miles from where the goods were loaded, but at the original point of origin. And this will apply to movements to the United States as well as from the United States.

I look forward to the day when air, sea, truck and rail tariffs will be based on common descriptions of the products you ship. Today, a pair of shoes may be described as slippers, or footwear, or boots; or perhaps as leather, with the word "shoes" in parenthesis; or as rubber, with the word "boots" in parenthesis.

Why is that? Why have we allowed so much of the paperwork of transportation to become so complicated? Why can't we all agree that a pair of shoes is a pair of shoes, so that we can avoid the costly re-drafting at transfer points and so that we can have common coding systems and take advantage of the wonders of automation? Common commodity descriptions would permit us, for the first time, to gather usable statistical data for the legitimate use of the government, of manufacturers, and of the transportation industry.

I mentioned bills of lading, but my dream includes the possibility that one day, they will be a thing of the past. The day is approaching when we can eliminate bills of lading -- when computers will automatically pre-bill freight charges, when computers and the banking community can assume the administrative tasks that fall so heavily today on shippers and carriers alike.

Indeed, even checks in payment for transportation services can be eliminated, with banks establishing an automated system for the accounts of shippers and carriers. At the end of the month, the transporter or the user of transportation would simply receive a statement noting the additions to or subtractions from his account.

We have heard a lot during the last several months about standardizing the size of containers. I have felt that the competitive forces in the marketplace can, and most likely will, provide us satisfactory answers to the question of container sizes.

But there are other kinds of container standardization which I believe we in government and you in business should work toward in unity and with diligence. Together, let's standardize the safety requirements for containers so that a container that goes aboard a ship will be perfectly suitable to go along a highway -- so that a container can pass from state to state, or from nation to nation, without regulatory difficulty.

Let's also standardize the markings on containers so that ownership

and characteristics can be determined quickly, regardless of what country the container happens to be in, or what kind of vehicle it happens to be on, at any particular moment. We need to be able to pool containers on a world-wide basis in the same way that the railroads of the United States pool boxcars. If we can do this, we won't need to ship empty containers from place to place and we won't need to leave containers sitting idle at terminals.

What we're looking toward -- and this is one of the most exciting parts of our transportation dream -- is a world bound together by the fast and efficient transportation of goods and people. In that world, the United States can become a land bridge between the Pacific and Europe.

Land bridge. Those words have become familiar lately to many of us in the transportation business. They mean simply this: that a shipment of goods originating in the Pacific, even in the Far East, and headed for Europe could go by ship to the West Coast of the United States; and then across this great continent by fast-moving train; and then to Europe by ship again.

The prospects are exciting. Money now spent to pay foreign-flag ship owners for carrying goods from the West Coast to Europe would go instead to United States rail and truck lines, and to United States-flag vessels which operate from the East Coast.

Foreign shippers also would use the land bridge to move goods from, say, Australia to Europe -- or in the opposite direction. And they would thus pay American carriers for their services.

Ultimately, the land bridge could improve by billions of dollars the balance-of-payments position of the United States. Goods would move less expensively, and more quickly. Perishable produce grown in Hawaii or California could be sold at reasonable prices in the markets of Paris. The technological advances that would result from the use of the land bridge would undoubtedly be made available to all shippers in this country.

Recently I was reminded of a quotation which is attributed to the famous architect, Daniel Burnham. "Make no little plans," he said; "they have no magic to stir men's blood."

The quotation was used by a major United States airline in an advertising campaign that was an apology, in effect -- an apology by the airline

because it had been more successful than it had anticipated; because the astonishing number of air travelers has just about saturated the nation's airport facilities and the nation's airline industry.

Perhaps that has been the problem of too many of us who are associated with transportation. Perhaps we've made too-little plans and dreamed too-little dreams. We've devised one set of rules for the ocean and another for the highway. We've required 20 documents for a shipment of goods when half a dozen documents or maybe even one would have been adequate.

We confront the manufacturer with terms such as the long ton, the short ton, the metric ton, the hundred weight or so many dollars per cubic foot when all he really wants to know is how much it's going to cost him to send a certain number of his products from point A to point B.

And worst of all, I think, we have too often made travel not the exhilarating adventure -- or at least the comfortable necessity -- that it should be, but a demeaning thing. Oh, sure, they serve good food and drink aboard the airplane. But the place the traveler really needs a stiff martini is in the waiting line at Kennedy Airport. And certainly our highways are smooth and wide. But the trip during the rush hour isn't smooth, and too many of those highways have plowed through parks and damaged landscapes that can never be repaired.

Look at our cities. In order to meet the transportation demands of some people, we've sliced highways through the cities at a phenomenal rate; and far too frequently the result has been that large segments of those cities have been left isolated and ripe for decay. We leave schools and parks in disrepair, and we bulldoze trees. The freeway spoils the view. The planes taking off from the airport are noisy. And we did not leave any place for people to walk in the sun.

I've been describing tonight some pretty large transportation dreams. I don't say the Department of Transportation is going to accomplish all of them. Indeed I will say that the Department of Transportation will accomplish none of them unless you of the transportation industry and you of American business join the effort. To a large extent, our job in government is to get government out of your way.

I challenge you tonight to let us know when you think we're wrong, to prod us when you think we're sluggish, and to help us make the big plans which can stir men's blood.

In the final analysis, the dreams we are dreaming in the Department of Transportation are in your interest. For it is your hope, I'm sure, to move your goods as swiftly and as cheaply as possible. It is in your interest to accept the new business which a land bridge across the United States would provide. And regardless of where you live, it is in your interest to see that our cities -- the heart of our commerce -- do not die from strangulation or from decay within.

For dreaming big dreams, we make no apologies. I thank you.

###

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

REMARKS BY ALAN S. BOYD, SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT THE DEDICATION OF THE RESTORED CABLE CAR BARN, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, NOVEMBER 10, 1967, 10:30 A. M.

I come here to lead the cheers for the Cable Car -- surely one of the most engaging examples of the irrepressible inventiveness of man.

Still, it shouldn't have endured these 94 years. Except for one thing -- it continues to do its job better than anything we've devised since Andrew Hallidie decided horses deserved a better deal than hauling high-hatted millionaires up to their mansions on this city's hilltops.

Let's face it: In an age of superjets and sonic booms, it ought not to be still clattering and clanging its way up and down the hills of this city as if it owned them -- and expected to outlive them all.

In an age of planned obsolescence, it ought not to have outlasted other forms of transportation that, at first glance, looked more durable -- and, at second glance, had disappeared.

In an age when so many transit systems come and go -- because so many transit riders don't -- it ought not be carrying more and more people every year.

More -

But here it is -- fresh and frisky as ever. Not just surviving, but thriving -- a noisy, bumpy, awkward and anachronistic contraption that, after nearly a century, serves as both showhorse and workhorse of the oldest ongoing transit system in the country, and one of the most effective as well.

Two members of my staff have lived in this city -- two men who regularly rode the Cable Car to work in the morning and home in the evening.

They tell me it's the only way to ride.

Obviously, there are lots of others who feel the same way.

Last fiscal year the Cable Cars carried close to ten million, nine hundred passengers -- over 700,000 more than during the previous year.

The Cars have more business than they can handle. You have 39 cars now -- and I understand a fortieth is almost finished and will soon be ready for service.

The simple and, I suppose, startling fact is that the Cable Car is a superb success, and not merely as a tourist attraction. For millions upon millions of envious Americans it is the symbol of this city but it is also an effective everyday transit vehicle, carrying stockbrokers and secretaries, accountants and ad men, back and forth between home and office.

It really has a way with people.

The question is, why?

Why, with so much going against it, is the Cable Car -- after 94 years -- not just a going, but a growing, concern?

Well, I suppose any one of us could come up with a hundred and one reasons.

There is the sensation of riding it: a cross, I imagine, between a roller-coaster and a rumble-seat.

More -

To get a little more psychological, it doesn't isolate us or overwhelm us, or dwarf us or demean us, or close us in or cut us off -- and so on, and on.

But I think the main reason for its success is the obvious one, the one we're most likely to overlook -- and that is simply that it is so superbly suited to the people and the place that it serves.

That, in a nutshell, describes what any successful transportation system must be -- and what the Department of Transportation is trying to help our cities and states throughout the nation devise for themselves: a system that meets their needs as well as the Cable Car does yours.

We have a way of overlooking the obvious, in transportation as in other fields. And I think in the future we're going to have to be a lot more like that undoubtedly legendary little boy who had never been to the Fleishhacker Zoo and kept pestering his mother to take him. So finally one day she did, and she showed him the seals, and the elephants -- and took him around from one animal to another. But nothing seemed to satisfy him, he kept fidgeting and fussing. Finally, after they'd seen everything, and his mother in despair started to lead him out of the zoo, he said "But, Ma, when can I see the Fleishhackers."

We may laugh at the boy's naivete, but not at his logic. For, if his assumptions were equally as unwarranted and unquestioned as ours often are, at least he asked -- as we so often do not -- the obvious and essential question.

Undoubtedly, the absurdity of our predicament might occur to us as we crawl to work in the morning along a spanking new superhighway in our superpowered V-8's.

Yet our answer to the problem in many cases has been -- not to ask why, or what are the alternatives, or what does this do to our cities, our suburbs, ourselves -- but to sanction, by silence or support, a multiplication of freeways and highways that often multiplies the problem even more.

In transportation, as in other fields, we are in danger -- because we don't ask the obvious and essential questions -- of obliterating many of the distinctions that matter, and emphasizing those that don't. So often, for example, we lose sight of the distinction between ends and means, between human values and economic values, between personal convenience and public need. As a result, we spend untold amounts of

More -

energy and ingenuity in trying to shape people to fit jobs, instead of trying to shape jobs to fit people -- and we allow our highways and freeways to determine the shape and character, the size and scale, of our cities, instead of the other way around.

In everything we are undertaking in the new Department of Transportation, we are trying to do one basic thing: To look and to try to get the country to look, at our transportation system in an entirely new light. For the first time in our history, we are trying to see transportation for what it really is -- an integral and important part of the total life of society, capable of immeasurably enhancing that life or of rendering it all but intolerable.

One doesn't, for example, have to be a world traveler to understand that where one form of transportation ends, another begins -- or if it doesn't you're in trouble. And one of the big jobs of the new Department is to help make sure the right ends meet -- to see to it that trucks and railcars, for example, can get in and out of docks swiftly and smoothly and without interfering either with each other or with other traffic.

And we all observe and experience, every day, the countless ways in which transportation affects and influences -- for good or evil -- our health, our attitude, our pattern of life, our physical and social environment. Its impact is as deep and direct upon the air we breathe as it is upon the way we live.

For this reason, our concern in the new Department must center principally upon our urban areas -- in which three out of four Americans now live. And the proportion grows every year.

There is no single answer to our urban transportation problem, because there is no single problem. The transportation problems of San Francisco and Detroit and Chicago are as different as the cities themselves.

For that reason, the "answer" to the so-called "urban transportation problem" will not come out of Washington's mimeograph machines any more than it has come out of Detroit's assembly lines -- it will not come from the sudden appearance of some radical new technology -- it will not come from an effort to exalt one form of transportation at the expense of any other.

The answer must come, instead, from within each urban area itself -- and it must come in the form of a balanced, total system suited to the unique needs of each area.

More -

And we've got to start where we are with what we have. Your Municipal Railway craftsmen, when they began to build the new Cable Car that will soon see service, started with a piece of an old Cable Car roof, a piece of a seat, and an old windshield wiper. And that is precisely how we must go about improving the transportation network of America.

There are some fancy technological feats we may be able to pull off in the far future. But for the foreseeable future, over the next few decades, most of the transportation progress in this country must come from improving what we have and using it better.

There's no question, for example, that there is a lot more capacity on most city streets than the congestion that occurs every rush hour might lead us to believe. And we are looking at all sorts of ways of making better use of the streets and highways we have -- ways that include off-street parking, special lanes for buses, off-street loading for trucks, so-called convertible streets (which run all one way in the morning and all the other way at night), radar-controlled signals on freeway entry and exit ramps, overpasses in city streets to eliminate intersection tie-ups.

Not all of these ideas are new -- it's surprising how old some of them really are. One possibility, for example, is the banning of large commercial vehicles from main streets during the daylight hours. Tokyo took this step in 1962. But that was not the first time in history. Freight carts once clogged the streets of ancient Rome so much during daylight hours that Julius Caesar ordered them to enter the city only at night. Which they did -- keeping everybody awake all night with their noise.

We are also, as you know, supporting demonstration projects to test the feasibility of new high-speed ground transportation -- and seeking, in every way we know how, to explore and uncover new ways of improving the public transportation alternatives now available in our cities. We are looking, for example, at the possibilities of free public transportation -- trying to find out just what the various costs and benefits are, and where it might be feasible and where not.

Long ago, a Mexican General in the struggle for California said of us: "These Americans are so contriving that some day they will build ladders to touch the sky, and once in the heavens they will change the whole face of the universe and even the color of the stars."

More -

So today our astronauts circle the globe in less time than it takes some Americans to commute to work.

But we have not been entirely successful in our earthbound contriving -- and some of our successes have been a lot closer to home than our General imagined.

San Francisco still ranks among the great cities in the history of the world in all fields and forms of transportation. You are embarked upon the most advanced and extensive new rapid transit system in the country in BARTD. I know the going has been bumpy. But I urge you to get together, to smooth out the rough spots -- and, above all, not to get off before the ride has even started.

And in the Cable Car you own the only transit system I can think of that people are not only willing, but genuinely want to ride.

Recently, I understand Jim Carr has insisted that women be allowed to ride on the outside steps of the Cable Car -- and that makes it the only public conveyance I have ever heard of to do the pedestrian a favor.

The Cable Car, as I have said, has a lot to teach us about meeting our transportation needs throughout the country.

I am, therefore, delighted to dedicate this Cable Car Barn -- restored, renovated and refurbished, just the kind of place every Cable Car deserves to come home to after a hard day's work.

# # #

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION ALAN S. BOYD MADE AVAILABLE IN CONNECTION WITH THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES REQUEST THAT GEN. WILLIAM F. McKEE, FEDERAL AVAITION ADMINISTRATOR, BE FIRED.

I have full confidence in the ability and dedication of General McKee and the FAA top management to continue to provide our nation with the superior air traffic control system that has long been the standard of excellence throughtout the world. General McKee has devoted nearly four decades of his life to outstanding public service. Any demand that he be removed from office is completely irresponsible .

Rec'd 7-27-67