

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.

#