

Kansas

CHANGING NEEDS IN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVATION

I welcome this opportunity to join you. I am concerned about your problems. I want to be associated with your progress and the future of the 105 soil conservation districts in Kansas and the 3,000 in our land. There is the deep personal pleasure of meeting old friends again. Too, there is the professional pleasure of discussing soil and water conservation with those in the field. I always carry away from these meetings new ideas, fresh viewpoints--perhaps more than I bring.

Words are the legitimate weapons of civilized man facing the issues of his time. Your conference, as I see it, provides for a timely discussion of vital issues. The accelerating demands of our time place a premium on effort, which is basic to soil conservation, and to resource development, and to the basic welfare of our Great Nation.

It is less than profound to observe that a good community can be produced only by good men--or that we get out of life about what we put into it. Yet men of good will and their efforts are, indeed, essential ingredients of a useful, civilized community.

There are more such ingredients, of course: faith, skills, and determination--sacrifice, vision, and planning--encouragement, investment, and opportunity for self-expression and accomplishment. Therefore, I increasingly sense that this is the time to speak for the unity of the countryside in all its values and uses. It is the time to advocate the protection and development of our resources as a whole, in accordance with their capabilities and the goals of the community. It is a time to speak for action that will meet

Address by Norman A. Berg, Deputy Administrator for Field Services, Soil Conservation Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.,

the oncoming demands of a growing Nation. Above all, it is a time to assist conservation district governing boards to assume fully their responsibilities of local leadership in soil, in water, and in related conservation and resource development work.

In a steel mill a great bar of steel was suspended vertically by a delicate chain. Nearby a bottle cork was suspended by a silk thread. Could the small cork held only by a fragile thread set the steel bar into motion? The cork was swung gently against the steel bar. The bar remained motionless. But this was repeated again and again. In ten minutes the bar gave some evidence of feeling uncomfortable, and a "nervous chill" ran over it. Then ten minutes later the chill was followed by a tremor of vibration. At the end of an hour the great bar was swinging like a pendulum in concert with the tiny cork.

How many "potential" leaders "give up the ghost" and desert their goal because they stopped just before a "nervous chill" ran over their bar of steel? How many Conservation Districts are now on the very verge of greatness.

There is an old Greek proverb that says, "Before you score, you must have a goal." Our collective goal is that the Nation's future still lies in rural America. The vast countryside can offer relief from the teeming cities and their congested suburbs can provide ample land and water to serve the expanding needs of commerce and industry, and broad acres on which to build garden communities for tomorrow's generations.

If we act in time with wisdom!

On the Eastern Seaboard, airline pilots flying north at dusk from Washington to Boston look down on a coruscating corridor of light, an unbroken, 450-mile-long conglomeration of 37 million Americans that is referred to by demographers as "the Eastern Megalopolis." Another area is growing even faster; will ultimately pose bigger problems; this is the potential "Great Lakes Megalopolis," soon to stretch without interruption from Pittsburgh to Chicago, by the year 2,000 containing a population of 45 million.

Extraordinary population growth at home and abroad provides substance for mounting demands on the land--and on the resources associated with land. The forecasts of human increase project figures of such magnitude that they are hard to comprehend.

During the next 35 years, the population of North America is expected to increase by 64 percent, to 350 million; Latin America by 157 percent, to 630 million; Europe by 15 percent, to 780 million; Africa by 151 percent, to 775 million; and Asia by 89 percent to 3,400,000,000. The total number of people on our planet is expected to rise to six billion by the year 2000--an increase of 2,900,000,000 in just 35 years.

Last week, if you will excuse a personal reference, the calendar began marking off the days that will lead in less than a year to the 50th year--a half-century of experience for me.

We have become, in that lifetime, a Nation of city-dwellers. Each day and each year, more and still more Americans concentrate in the towns, cities, and suburbs. To them life naturally centers where they work, make their homes--raise their families. And from these centers of population emerge a

pattern of mutual interests, problems, and understanding. A kinship is growing up among these people of Albuquerque and Atlanta, of San Francisco and Salt Lake City, of Wichita and Washington.

This kinship derives from such typically metropolitan concerns as taxes, transportation, housing, crime, ^{pollution} schools, and recreation.

What then happens to the countryside? Increasingly, it becomes an obstacle in time and space--merely landscape separating cities. It is to many--far too many--a "land in between" to be crossed as quickly as possible via superhighways, fast trains, or faster planes. Among this young and urban oriented generation, there is danger that the land in between will be regarded increasingly as just "undeveloped" space, the "hinterland", only there for the nourishment of the urban center.

The American countryside--that expanse of nature separating our cities and towns and rural hamlets--represents the land we have left to grow in, play in, and build on the American dream.

That is all we have; and when divided and divided again for the multiple needs of a Nation growing rapidly in population, in urban development, in highway mileage, in an array of man-oriented uses alien to nature, this natural landscape that once seemed so limitless shrinks before us at every turn--and we are made aware of the challenging crisis in the countryside.

The crisis we face in the countryside is a crisis of quality in a Nation whose people demand quality in the marketplace but have failed to provide for it in the natural environment.

It is a crisis of quantity in a land whose rich natural endowment has been vandalized to a degree of grave proportions.

Three decades ago a method was devised by which we could say to farmers and ranchers and others, in keeping with our Constitution that declares that most public responsibilities over private lands is a function of the States, "You must take the initiative. You must decide. You must want to do something about erosion. You must do the planning and the operating, the policy thinking, and the acting."

We in the Service--as Federal workers--were asked to show great faith in the intelligence and resourcefulness of the farm folk of America. We were asked to delegate this vast responsibility to rural people at the grass roots.

We could, and would, of course, guide and help them, but only they could do so big a job!

More than a quarter century of experience is proof that America has delegated to the common man, the local landowner, the local organization, this power of self-government in conservation of soil and water on the private lands of the Nation.

Has it been successful? Has this faith been justified?

Conservation districts have made remarkable progress in Kansas achieving physical conservation objectives as they have nationwide. But they have made an even greater contribution. They have brought into being a throng of informed and concerned people who have given freely of their time and efforts to learn about their resource problems and to help make the decisions needed to solve them. Districts have by their actions exemplified the principles of democracy and Federal-State-local cooperation. They have achieved great things in the American tradition. They have proven again that democratic

government controlled by the people themselves liberates the powers of the people into creative growth and plenty.

But success and fame are fleeting. What would have been sufficient for yesterday is apt to be too little and too late for tomorrow.

The trends for conservationists are fairly easy to discern. Our Nation is facing the prospect of unlimited demands on its limited resources. All the evidence of our times supports a forecast of ever increasing needs for intensive management of its limited resources--including their planning, development, multiple use, and conservation.

There can be no turning back--change and its effects press heavily upon us. New problems roll over the horizon in increasingly complex numbers. Districts see the need for better and more representative governing boards. Planning for "conservation" by farms, ranches, and communities must be accelerated--putting the plans into operation must be speeded up. A proper role must be carved out for conservation districts in watershed and river basin work in rural and non-rural areas, in community development, in recreation areas, in cropland conservation, in the Great Plains program, and in wise land use adjustments critical to worldwide food demands.

On many of these matters I feel that we and our allies in conservation may no longer have a black-and-white kind of decision. The kind of complexity that we face in the future suggests we're going to have to begin choosing from several colors of gray.

How do we as a Nation go about making such decisions?

What we do too often is make the decisions by answering much less demanding questions. Many of these decisions are made by default. My wife and I were allowed to purchase a plot of ground with a home on it in the three States where I have worked. The only question asked was, "Do you have the money?" At that moment, a decision was made about population level, because as long as my house and trees are on that plot, it cannot be used efficiently for producing food. The same is true every time a superhighway is built; a decision is made about future population level. At the moment, somewhere between three and five percent of the arable land in this country is covered by asphalt and concrete. That's an area the size of Georgia. And so decisions are being made, but they're being made without full knowledge of the consequences. It is important for us to realize that we must answer some immediate and critical questions. For instance:

Should a proposed highway location be contested?--or land cleared of trees to produce row crops? Will the benefits of a proposed reservoir outweigh the forced abandonment of a dozen valley farms?

Should the right of eminent domain be exercised to obtain easements for a watershed project?--or for the development of a community playground? What are the risks to the water supply, and to wildlife, in my use of pesticides? Should my district fight to prevent drainage of a waterfowl marsh that would provide a factory site?

Decisions on questions like these are not easy, for right is not always evident, nor are the alternatives necessarily wrong. Issues are interwoven with shades of good and bad. They provoke doubt, and ready-made standards of judgment do not always apply.

No one believes that the problems of conservation districts are exactly the same today as they were in 1937--or that the solutions to them are the same, or that farming and ranching have not changed, or that the social pattern of our population is the same as it was.

A rural and limited soil conservation concept simply is no longer sufficient in a society that has become increasingly urban, a society in which the interests of the users of resources have become equal to those of the owners of resources.

As cities enlarge, serious problems of land-use erosion, sedimentation, pollution, recreation and the like spring up around urban areas. This is a whole new series of major conservation problems affecting large numbers of people that simply did not exist a few years ago.

These are problems demanding solution, and the demands come from the urban society that is now in the majority, that now decides increasingly what programs we shall have, including conservation, and how much financial help they shall receive. And these people, as I have said, are looking at the picture from the standpoint of resource users. The late, great Adlai Stevenson capsuled the changing scene when he said:

"There is a new America every morning when we wake up. It is upon us whether we will it or not. This new America is the sum of many small changes--a new subdivision here--a new school there--a new industry where yesterday there had been vacant swampland--changes that add up to a broad transformation in our lives. Our task is to guide these changes, for though change is inevitable, change for the better is a full-time job."

The recognition of this crisis in the countryside has given birth to a new concept of conservation.

This concept of new conservation says that as populations grow and people live in greater and greater concentrations, we must consider the total environment and not just those values that can be measured in dollars and cents.

When we consider the total environment, we must take account what conservationists call the "vulnerable" values. These values--including wildlife, the beauty of nature, space for growing and living, pollution control, and recreation--are especially vulnerable because it is hard to measure them in dollars and cents.

We are seeing a definite blossoming of concern for such benefits--benefits that are essential if we are to enjoy an environment of real quality. Throughout the Nation there is a growing feeling that our generation has a special responsibility, in a world of change, to protect the qualities of environment that have enduring value in our civilization.

Along with the new concept has come an awakening--a greater awareness--in conservation today.

Conservation has moved from the province of the few to the embrace of millions. This is as it should be. Yet we cannot help asking, with considerable anxiety, is the awakening sufficient? Is the awareness adequate?

This is the new America that we face. This is the new resource climate in which we exist. What are the central issues?

First, there are steeply increasing demands on resources.

Second, the kinds of demands on resources are changing. The quality of resources is becoming more important, and the location of resource problems is shifting.

Third, it is apparent that resource matters are growing more complex. We face new problems of conflict and competition. A given resource may have to do double--or triple--duty. Concurrently, the interests of resource "users"--as well as resource "owners"--are assuming greater importance. Somebody is going to have to make decisions--unpopular decisions in many cases--about the allocation of resources to any given uses.

This raises another significant problem--the effect of resource demands on local self-government and our democratic system. As the Nation grows, will the requirements of larger economic units and higher levels of government take precedence over smaller units and lower levels of government? Is this the basic economic and social trend reflected in the replacement of

These are the challenges that conservation poses in our age as we confront the new America. A question that concerns us today is the role of conservation districts in this more complicated resource picture. What would districts attempt to contribute, what responsibilities would district boards seek to fulfill? How can districts strengthen their capacity to meet the challenge of the times?

The history of districts has been one of steady and progressive evolution. As new problems have appeared, districts have moved to help solve these problems. At first they worked mostly with individual farmers. Next came work with groups of farmers. Later, programs expanded to include whole communities--in watershed projects, resource conservation and development projects, and planning and zoning programs.

In other words, as the times have changed, districts have changed.

Now the question really becomes one of the next step. Are districts ready to move ahead? Are they ready to make further adjustments in their programs and legislative authorities to enable them to do an even better job?

The NACD believes that this is a question which must be faced by every district in the Nation. To help explore its ramifications, Past President Marion Monk appointed a Special Committee on District Outlook three years ago to look beyond the events and programs now current to the probable needs and developments of the years ahead, not only in terms of the resources involved, but in terms of districts as serviceable units of

associated with meeting the needs, and chart a course most likely to bring about the desired results.

John Wilder, of Somerville, Tennessee, now National Vice President of NACD, is the Co-Chairman of that committee. It includes supervisors, representatives of State Soil and Water Conservation Committees, and others closely associated with the district program. The Committee worked hard and long, and its report to the NACD Board of Directors and Council at their meeting in New Orleans, Louisiana, was fully adopted. One State Association President after careful study said, "Not District Outlook, but District Look-Out!"

The Committee discovered that many districts across the country had already geared up to make a useful contribution to the solution of modern resource problems. By analyzing the experience of these districts, as well as examining the problems faced by other districts, the Committee studied a number of questions that appeared significant in the development of broader and more effective district programs. Let me list these briefly:

1. Do districts effectively use all the technical, financial, and educational help now available to them from Federal, State, and local agencies?
2. Do districts have sufficient funds and administrative assistance to carry on expanded programs?
3. Can districts perform work in non-rural, transition, and

4. Are districts sufficiently representative of all community interests involved in resource programs? Increasingly, these are the people who will vote the taxes to pay for conservation programs.
 5. Do districts have available to them techniques that allow them to band together to solve problems that are multi-district or regional in nature?
 6. Are the powers that districts possess adequate for the performance of their new and increased responsibilities? Are they able to, for example, conduct watershed and other project programs without recourse to complicated administrative and legal arrangements?
 7. Are district responsibilities defined sufficiently broadly in State enabling laws? Today's conservation programs must be truly comprehensive in order to be effective. Land and water considerations cannot be divorced from forest and recreation considerations; and recreation and fish and wildlife resources can only be treated in relationship to all the other resources.
 8. Do the State Soil and Water Conservation Commissions themselves across the country need strengthening?
 9. And, finally, does the general public have sufficient opportunity to participate in the total district effort? Do the people have a chance to approve and modify district programs? Is conservation work presented to the public in such a way that it becomes as vital and significant to them as new highway plans, school, and education policy, and health and welfare issues?
-

Now, with these questions in mind, let us consider a few examples of ways districts are working at present to find creative techniques to help solve the new and more complex resource problems that they face:

1. In Nebraska, Kentucky, and Virginia they have changed election laws so that district supervisors are elected at general elections, thus affording all citizens an opportunity to participate directly in the program.
2. In New Mexico, in Massachusetts, and the Virgin Islands, district responsibilities have been redefined by legislation in broad terms.
3. In Pennsylvania and New York a new law makes it possible for districts to have some non-agricultural supervisors, rather than solely farmers.
4. In Montgomery County, Maryland, and Fairfax County, Virginia, the districts have helped to establish a sediment control program whereby builders and developers will be required to install erosion control devices in accordance with an approved conservation plan.
5. In districts in Arkansas, the supervisors have hired full-time executive secretaries to provide administrative assistance. State associations, also are beginning to employ staff help because their programs are growing so rapidly. North Dakota, Colorado, Texas, and California have already taken this step.

6. In Virginia, districts played a key role in conservation activities during the construction of the internationally known Dulles Airport.
7. In West Virginia, a new memorandum of understanding has been signed between the State Department of Health and the soil conservation districts. It will enable districts to cooperate in public health aspects of recreational development, community planning, and watershed improvement. This is believed to be the first such memorandum in the country.
8. Louisiana has amended its conservation district law to include all cities, villages, and towns in existing districts as a part of soil and water conservation districts. It also makes it possible to elect a landowner, whether or not he is a farmer or rancher, on the board of supervisors.
9. In Kansas the Board of Directors for the Agricultural Hall of Fame and National Center requested technical assistance of the SCS in preparing a complete conservation plan for the lands surrounding the buildings. The Hall of Fame property consists of 275 acres of land located 8 miles west of Kansas City, Kansas.

In the spring of 1966, a soil survey of the property was completed. Soil Conservation Service specialists in the fields of agronomy, engineering, wildlife, recreation and plant materials have provided on-site technical services and assistance to the

Wyandotte County Soil Conservation District in the development of a basic conservation plan.

The plan is now complete and has been approved by the Board of Directors. The Board of Directors desire to develop the soil, water and plant resources so that they will provide a demonstration and a "show case" of sound land use and treatment that is so essential to the future of agriculture.

Therefore, regardless of how we answer the questions the Outlook Committee raised, the needs are more than evident. There is need, for example, to re-identify the resource assets of each community, county, and conservation district to project the probable demands that will be made on these resources and to guide the development and use of these same resources along wise and orderly by-lines.

There is need to develop a countryside purpose--to identify the principles and goals of the countryside and to make them known.

There is need for leadership in conservation districts, in farm organizations and chambers of commerce--among conservationists, tradesmen, bankers, and newsmen--to identify the array of new issues now facing the countryside and the soil, and devise constructive programs for dealing with them.

The key to the new approach in a nutshell seems to be that of:

- (1) involving more people in resource work,
- (2) extending district services to additional people, and
- (3) placing more emphasis on broad-based resource planning.

At the same time continuing the original purpose of the district as an effective local action organization to get as much total conservation on the land as fast as possible!

This is a fortunate development, for there is evidence that if districts do not assume these responsibilities and carry out truly active and comprehensive natural resource programs that meet today's needs, somebody else

In many cases, conservation districts could perform some of the work being taken on by the new groups, the result being less duplication, better coordination, and a more efficient and useful program. But if this is to be so, districts must take the initiative. It is not a case of taking on responsibilities already being performed effectively by others; but rather digging into the work that remains undone, and which needs to be done.

The challenge that lies ahead is an exciting one. Whether it will be met depends on local district leadership--it does not depend on the NACD, the State Associations, the State Soil and Water Conservation Committees, the Soil Conservation Service, or any of the other agencies with whom they work. Local leadership is the key to moving ahead; and the opportunities are restricted only by the state of people's minds. Our role is the traditional one--that of guidance and counsel. What is your District's Outlook?

> What will this mean now--and in the future--to the Soil Conservation Service? Frankly, we don't fully know yet. But we have some ideas. In the past we have considered soil, water, and related resources basically in terms of agriculture and farming. These remain of the utmost importance. But today people look to resource development to fulfill more basic needs--to create more jobs and increase their economic opportunities and improve their environment so beauty can be a daily experience.

We, in the Soil Conservation Service, believe that we have kept abreast of new methods and alert to new ways of doing old jobs. At the same time, we have not forgotten the hard-learned fundamentals that determine the success or failure of soil and water conservation. But there are challenging days ahead

The term "soil conservation" has come to signify those combinations of skills and practices needed to develop and sustain the productivity of each kind of soil for whatever purpose it is used--whether that use is for crops, for forest, for recreation, or for housing.

Soil conservation means choosing the appropriate use for each piece of land as well as protecting and improving the land after the use has been chosen.

Soil conservation means the careful planning and treatment of entire operating units be they farms or ranches or entire watersheds.

Soil conservation then means working out land use and treatment in full recognition of the essential relationships between soil, water, plants, animals, and--yes--man himself.

The greatest danger, as conservation technology advances, is that we may fail to involve the human element. Conservation must be people-centered. It must not only be carried out for people. It must be carried out by people.

To be fully effective, conservation decisions must always be made by the people who will be responsible for carrying them out. Conservation in three-fourths of America will never be accomplished by edict. Government can, and must, be an active partner, but should do for people only what they cannot do for themselves.

Conservation will move forward if it is viewed and accepted by land-owners and operators as a means of making more efficient use of their soils,

It will go forward if city people are made partners, if they are helped to see their stake in soil and water resources, and if they are invited to work with rural people in soil and water conservation endeavors.

> Conservation of America's natural resources must have new and challenging meaning for all of our citizens.

Today we must be concerned with building and renewing and developing as well as preserving and protecting the irreplaceable lands and waters upon which a great Nation depends for its sustenance and its growth.

The task of the new conservation is to assure future Americans of a bountiful country, not only in the produce of the fields, but also in the majesty of great forests, the broad sweep of well-managed landscapes, the reservations of parks and playgrounds to renourish the spirit of a dynamic people.

The new conservation must assure the flow of clean waters to quench the thirst of a growing population. But it must also satisfy the human longing for a quiet stream, allow the humbling experience of standing on the banks of a great unspoiled river, give the satisfaction of knowing that the lakes and waterways are a safe and proper habitat for the fish and the wildlife that are a benefit and a pleasure to man.

Resource conservation once meant preservation against heedless exploitation. It was a slowing-down process in order to keep more of our natural resources for a longer time. This remains a basic aim today, but we know

We in SCS are now in our fourth decade of carrying out the mandate of the 74th Congress--that passed P. L. 74-46--naming the Soil Conservation Service and giving it statutory authority. National policy was thereby enacted which stated, "It is hereby recognized that the wastage of soil and water resources on the farms, grazing and forest lands of the Nation, resulting from soil erosion, is a menace to the national welfare."

The future of our resources resides in the continued wise application of such proven Federal legislation. Now we also have the small watershed act which provides for dams and land treatment measures to prevent floods and impound water for recreational, municipal, industrial, agricultural, and wildlife needs, and the Great Plains Conservation Program which is responsible for restoring to original use the vast rangelands in the Great Plains States.

The potential of our lands and waters is bound to such legislation as the Resource Conservation and Development program, the Water Pollution Control Act, Public Works and Economic Development Act, and Rural Water and Sanitation Facilities Act, among many other recent Acts of an interested Congress.

Over thirty years ago the dust blew out of the Plains that once had grown lush grasses. This irreplaceable topsoil was carried to the eastern States and out to sea. Today, most of the great land again is rich grazing and wheat country.

The hard years of the Dust Bowl era led us to understand how to use our priceless land and water resources wisely, just as today the mounting pressures for clean water and useable land emphasize the need to make our basic natural resources serve their highest possible purpose for the greater benefit of all the people now and in future years.

Nature must often be guarded against itself.

Our conservationists have learned to tame the wild streams, save the irreplaceable topsoil from washing off the land, improve the woodlands for better growth and greater beauty, and build the most efficient agricultural economy ever known to man.

> Now we must come of age in America as resource conservationists.

In the broad area of resource conservation, we have discovered the key to an abundant and purposeful and satisfying life. Indeed, we have yet to perfect our advance so that it reaches out to every American and into every corner of the land, but we are moving resolutely in that direction.

We may look with confidence and enthusiasm on the task that lies ahead. We see across the Nation the product of a tradition that can only be strengthened with time.

The accomplishments of our conservationists attest to the imagination and determination of conservation leaders in their home districts; to the understanding and cooperation of thousands of landowners and operators in every part of the country; to far-sighted State and national government

Conservation still begins on the land, on each individual acre. As a Nation, we have developed our resource conservation policies on the firm basis of essential involvement at the local level, for we are a people wedded to the concept of individual initiative and grass-roots participation in the public affairs that concern us.

But we must understand, too, that our State and Federal governments also represent the interests of the individual and the local community. And we have wisely and properly drawn upon State and Federal resources to support the local effort. We have done this in the National interest because the summation of local interest is national interest. That is how we have advanced for more than a quarter of a century in the conservation and development of the Nation's lands and waters.

We can do those things in the new conservation that have been born of local initiative and cooperation, and advanced by the dedication and wise efforts of an enlightened State and national government.

Let us not, however, erroneously assume that all is well with the land.

There remains a serious backlog of conservation projects to be initiated and accomplished. There are dams to be built and land measures to be applied. There are studies of soil types to be made so that we may be assured of building our country on a sound footing. There are rivers and streams to be protected against siltation and cleansed of pollution. There are lakes to be established and others to be restored. There are ranges and forests to be protected against heedless destruction and wildlife benefits

There remains a need for more professional conservationists to guide the Nation's conservation work. And there is need of greater financial support at all levels to extend the benefits of this effort throughout all of the land. There is greater need than ever for a strong State association of conservation districts.

Secretary Freeman said,

"No longer can there be separate compartments in the conservation world--no compartment for soil conservation apart from beauty preservation, no longer a wall between wildlife protection and agricultural conservation, no longer a forestry objective separate from the interests of the grasslands, no longer a policy question as to multiple use of water resources and, finally, no more a disunity between city and open country. . .

"The true conservationist of today sees the union of resources and values on which humanity depends, and he would preserve that union! He sees the world of conservation as one world. . ."

"Cooperation at the local, State, and Federal levels has brought us a good piece along the road to sound conservation. Now we must build on that cooperative effort, and multiply it by heaping success on success as we have been privileged to do in the past.

"To success in this mission we will have to carry the word far and

We are committed as conservators of the great American estate to provide for the future as we draw upon the resources that are available for our use and that are committed to our care. We, as a Nation, have perhaps reached that stage of the "nervous chill" experienced by the steel bar.

With continued dedication to the task of conserving our vital land and water resources we will insure the future prosperity of this great Nation. The full swing of the pendulum. To this challenging and rewarding task your national government is dedicated. Working together with districts we can achieve our loftiest goals.

We enjoy a period of grace--even now--before the remaining vestiges of nature unspoiled by man are erased. We still have time to protect, restore, and develop the lands and waters of rural America--if we act with resolve and dispatch.

We can--and must--return to an alliance with nature. It is simply a matter of desire, of discipline, and of dedication.