

C.2 38)

REMARKS BY ALAN S. BOYD, SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BEFORE THE FLORIDA COUNCIL OF 100, SHERATON MOTOR INN, CYPRESS GARDENS, FLORIDA, 10:00 A.M., NOVEMBER 17, 1967

It is always a pleasure to come home to Florida. It is nothing short of a deliverance to come home in November. Living here, you would not believe some of the things the weathermen say in Washington this time of year.

I am particularly honored to be with the people of Florida who represent so well the other climate of this state - the climate that has made it one of the faster-growing and most prosperous states in the nation. Florida is well aware of its stake in an efficient transportation system to serve its tourist industry and its growing foreign trade.

It is said that a good scare is worth more to a man than good advice.

The history of the Department of Transportation bears that out. In 1805, when Albert Gallatin recommended creation of a department of transportation, it was good advice. But keeping a horse on the trail and a train going 15 miles an hour on the track required little Federal intervention. So the advice was largely ignored. It wasn't until we reached the 1960's and our present level of smog, noise, highway deaths, airport congestion and traffic jams that we got the good scare that Albert Gallatin could not provide.

(more)

On the other hand, the long wait to deal with transportation as a national problem has tempted many people to assume that the creation of the Department has solved the problem.

That is dangerously far from the truth.

One of the Department's young system analysts recently found himself trapped in an elementary school trying to explain to some children what the Department plans to do.

System analysts tend to think more in terms of parameters and infrastructures and sub-systems than most fourth-graders and he ran into some language difficulties.

At one point - I gather in some desperation - he told the youngsters that we are looking for a "magic matrix" within which to develop a balanced transportation system.

When the teacher told the youngsters to get out their crayons and illustrate the lecture, they all drew pictures of what they thought the "magic matrix" would look like.

The pictures, of course, are charming.

But the unhappy fact is that too many of the parents of those and other children still hope there really is a magic matrix.

Too many people - particularly in our cities at rush-hour - are looking for a quick and easy way out.

And there isn't one.

What we do have is an incredibly complex series of problems of land-use and air-use created by about 100-million cars, trucks and buses and 100-thousand commercial and private airplanes.

What we do have is a population of 200-million people most of whom seem to want to go to the same place at the same time.

We also have projections that show that all of these problems will increase each year as far as we can see into the future.

Accommodating the growth of our population and its needs for transportation will no longer be as simple as doubling our highway mileage or tripling our runways.

The transportation jobs of the past were relatively simple because they dealt with relatively open space and easy rights-of-way.

Blasting through a mountain for a 19th century railroad was rugged work but it was child's play compared to blasting through a city for a 20th century freeway.

(more)

In addition, we can no longer afford to ignore the fourth dimension of transportation - its effect on the environment.

Transportation today determines not only how well we can move in our cities but how well we can live in them.

It can be noisy or silent, cause discord or create harmony, serve us or entrap us.

In his message to Congress asking for a Department of Transportation, President Johnson said: "Our transportation system has not emerged from a single drawing board, on which the needs and capacities were all charted.

It could not have done so, for it grew along with the country itself - now restlessly expanding, now consolidating, as opportunity grew bright or dim."

The result, he said, is that America "lacks a coordinated transportation system that permits travelers and goods to move conveniently and efficiently from one means of transportation, using the best characteristics of each."

Said the President: "Both people and goods are compelled to conform to the system as it is. . ."

Our job - in the broadest sense - is to reverse that order, to compel the system to conform to the needs of travelers and the shippers of goods as well as to the needs of the people who live by the side of the road and off the end of the runway.

We do not intend to change everything about American transportation in the next several years, but we do intend to challenge everything about it.

We will ask of every thing we now do: Is there a better way?

When they involve the most difficult transportation problems - the ones of the cities and their suburbs - the answers become increasingly complicated.

They make the problems of long distance travel look very simple, indeed.

For example, we are working with the Pennsylvania Railroad on the first high-speed train service in the nation, a service that will carry passengers between New York and Washington at speeds up to 120 miles an hour.

We are solving all of the problems connected with that project.

It is when the passenger leaves the train and tries to get to his hotel that the real troubles will begin.

(more)

We are financing construction of a prototype supersonic transport that will cut trans-Atlantic flying time to less than three hours.

The program is on schedule and the technical problems are all well within the capabilities of our engineers.

It is on the ride to the airport that the passenger will have difficulty; and at the ticket counter and in getting from the counter to the plane.

And we cannot count on advanced technology, alone, to clear a path for us in the city, because the solution involves more a change in mental attitude than in mechanical ability.

No architect lasts long in his profession designing office buildings without integral elevator systems that move both passengers and freight with dispatch and in separate locations.

We take that sort of planning for granted these days and we regard any building that mixes freight and passengers and can't keep its elevator cars running smoothly as a nuisance.

But for a variety of reasons, we have never extended this integration of transportation and building to the entire city.

James Rouse, one of the nation's foremost real estate developers, recently said: "There is absolutely no dialogue in the United States today between the people who have developed knowledge about people - the teachers, the ministers, the psychiatrists, sociologists - and the people who are designing and building cities."

It is too late to start over and build our cities the right way.

But it is not too late to draw better guidelines for the future.

Those guidelines can be drawn only in the urban areas themselves.

The Department of Transportation cannot and will not try to remake the transportation system of this nation by Federal fiat.

Instead, we will work with cities, and States, and industries to support their efforts to meet the imperative public need for the best transportation system American ingenuity can devise.

(more)

Because they affect the quality of life in a community, a region and only incidentally in a nation, transportation decisions are local political decisions.

The Department of Transportation can and will show the decision-makers how to build better, faster and less expensive systems.

But it cannot - and should not - decide whether the better systems should be adopted.

And on that point, let me say that in transportation as in all other aspects of urban planning, businessmen and other laymen must be involved in the politics of planning.

We must have experts, of course.

But urban planning, like other things, is too important to leave entirely to the experts.

There is another area of activity in which the Department cannot hope to succeed without the help of businessmen - eliminating some of the paperwork that hampers both trade and transportation at home and abroad.

When it takes a sheet of paper 12 feet long and 11 inches wide to describe the processing steps involved in documenting international shipments, it is easy to see why some transactions produce so little profit.

It is easy to see why more than \$5 billion of this country's annual \$56 billion import-export business goes into paperwork.

But it will not be easy to correct.

We conduct our international trade in an accumulation of decades and in some cases centuries of custom and tradition.

Ship's articles still guarantee seamen a half-pint of vinegar a week to ward off scabies.

Even the preamble to the jet-oriented Federal Aviation Administration's annual appropriation makes specific allowances for spending money for the repair of skis and snowshoes for reasons that nobody I have talked to any longer remembers.

We have already begun experiments with new approaches to bills of landing and clearance papers for ships.

We recently transmitted by Telstar the health, customs and immigration papers of passengers on a trans-Atlantic flight so the papers were already on hand and checked when the plane arrived.

We are beginning negotiations with Japan this week on programs for cutting the red tape of travel during Japan's 1970 international exposition.

(more)

Again, there is no easy answer to these problems. The specialists in my office and businessmen who are familiar with foreign trade tell me it may be ten years before we see daylight. But it is a project well worth the time and effort we intend to put into it.

Finally, gentlemen, let me say that just as transportation is an integral part of the society it serves, so does the society affect transportation.

As a state deeply involved in foreign trade, you are well aware that as an industrial and commercial nation, we cannot survive without peace in the world.

In our democratic society, we deal with problems as they become clearly visible and visibly crucial to the majority of our citizens. Because we insist that there are two sides to every question in a democracy, the majority view often is a long time in coming.

There are two sides to the war in Viet Nam.

We could withdraw.
It would cost this generation nothing.
It could cost the next generation everything.

We are at war in Viet Nam because, as long as totalitarian aggression is permitted, democratic government will not be.

We are at war in Viet Nam because our national interest lies in a peaceful and prosperous Asia, just as it lay a decade ago in a stable Europe.

And, if we do not make it clear in Viet Nam that aggression is a futile course, then we shall have to make it clear at another time and another place.

And the next time it may very well be closer to home.

We are at war in Viet Nam because we must have a world in which talk and not terror is the accepted way to settle international disputes.

Make no mistake.
The war in Viet Nam is a major struggle with major consequences for us and for Americans for decades to come.

Thank you.