

**Address by Rep. John E. Fogarty
Rhode Island Wildlife Federation Meeting**

February 15, 1958

It is a distinct pleasure and an honor to address a meeting of the Rhode Island Wildlife Federation. The strength of the conservation movement is something of a mystery to some of my colleagues in the Congress. They can't understand why so many people will work so hard, and write so many letters, in behalf of a cause that means no material gain for them and no financial profit. They can't understand what makes you tick.

You probably never think a great deal about it yourselves. But I think I've got you figured out. You belong in the same category with many other groups that appear from time to time before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Labor and Health, Education and Welfare. This is the subcommittee that I have the honor to serve as chairman.

I get to know conservationists because they come before my subcommittee to support funds for water pollution control, which is one of the functions of the Public Health Service.

Some of these other groups are a mystery also to those of my colleagues who seem to think the greatness of America is to be found only in the stock market reports, or by adding up bank accounts and cash register receipts. These other groups I am talking about come before my subcommittee to ask for funds for education. Sometimes for funds to help educate and train the handicapped. They come in support of appropriations to build hospitals and for research to fight heart disease and cancer. They come in behalf of funds to administer the pure food and drug laws.

My friends who think in terms of dollar marks ask, why do they do it? The answer, I reply, is easy. These people believe in the Golden Rule. They come not because they have anything to gain themselves. They come to lend a helping hand to others.

Why do I put you conservationists in the same general category with the people who fight for public health and social welfare programs? You too are motivated by a cause that is bigger than yourselves. You also have nothing to gain financially or materially when you work for better management of our natural resources. Indeed, conservation involves and requires restraint in the use of natural resources, just as the farmer reinvests some of his money and labor to restore soil fertility. Just as the conservation-minded logger does not cut all the trees, but saves some to make seed and produce future crops of timber. Just as the true sportsman limits his take, so there will be breeding stock left to make future wildlife crops.

Conservation has been aptly called a kind of religion. And therein lies the secret of its strength.

The thing that distinguishes a conservationist is his ability to see beyond the end of his nose—his ability to look into the future. You too are motivated by the Golden Rule, but you are able to project it into the future. You are concerned not only with the health and welfare of your neighbor of the day—the fellow who lives next door, or in the next block, or in the other county. You are concerned for the fellow who is going to be living there 100 years from now. You are concerned about the future of America!

I call it the Golden Rule projected into time. The Golden Rule applied in the fourth dimension.

You see it clearly. You know that America is great because of the hearts and minds of her free citizens. You also know that America has become great and powerful and rich because of the natural resources that have built her cities, sustained her industries, fed her people. I am talking about the farm lands, the fertile soil, the minerals beneath that soil, the great forests, the grasslands, the abundance of clean water!

You also know that one of the things that help keep our people mentally well and physically strong is the opportunity to find recreation in the out-of-doors. To go hunting and fishing. To play on clean beaches and swim in unpolluted waters. To breathe the fresh air of the mountain parks. To camp and hike in the public forests.

You know that America will not remain great and strong unless her natural resources are conserved and restored and wisely used. So you are conservationists!

Well, you have your work cut out for you. You have your work cut out not only in the long haul, but right now, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and fifty-eight. Let me tell you why:

When the Russians flung their Sputnik into space last October, they not only put a little piece of metal into orbit around this planet. They also set into motion a chain of events the outcome of which is difficult to predict.

Who at the time could have foreseen that one of the results might be a cutting back of conservation programs in the United States? Who could have foretold that this country, bastion of the free world and main bulwark against communist imperialism, might in panic permit the waste and destruction of soils, waters, forests and wildlife—coincident with spending more money in the necessary effort of catching up in missile development?

If these things come to pass, my friends, then the master strategists in the Kremlin can congratulate themselves on another windfall from their emphasis on science and technology. They can congratulate themselves because they could not have devised a better weapon for undermining the basic strength of America—that basic strength of natural resources without which this nation cannot fight a long cold war—or a hot war—against communist domination.

This is no short-range emergency that confronts us. It is long-range peril. Some of our best thinkers say we must gird ourselves for a cold-war struggle that may last a hundred years—unless some unfortunate event sets off hot war and ends it all, including civilization, in a holocaust of nuclear retaliation.

Yes, the experts are agreed this is long-range peril. And in such long-range peril, even thinking in terms as brief as ten years, the wise use and husbandry of natural resources is vital!

Yet this waste of resources, this undermining of America's strength, is likely to happen, my conservationist friends, unless you bestir yourselves. They are likely to happen because the short-sighted among the budget planners have tried to find the extra money needed to overtake the Russians in missile technology by cutting back on conservation and public welfare programs.

Let me give you some examples. These figures are taken from the President's budget as proposed to Congress for fiscal year 1959:

The Bureau of Land Management, an agency in the Department of the Interior that tries to protect the natural resources on 468 million acres of public lands in the United States and Alaska, would be cut back from \$28 million to \$26 million—including a million dollar slash in funds for fighting forest fires.

The U. S. Forest Service, in the Department of Agriculture, the agency that manages the National Forests, would take a \$3 million cut in direct appropriations.

One Forest Service program, assistance to the states in reforestation, would be cut from \$1,308,000 to \$258,000. This kind of cut would practically eliminate the program.

The Fish and Wildlife Service, in the Department of Interior, would suffer a \$5 million slash—from \$27,497,074 to \$22,711,000—in direct appropriations. This cut not only would hurt the national wildlife refuges and waterfowl program, but the research and promotion programs designed to help commercial fisheries would suffer. In Rhode Island this hits an important industry.

The National Park Service would be cut back by \$13 million. The watershed protection program of the Soil Conservation Service would take an \$11 million shellacking, and no extra funds are proposed by the Administration to provide technical services for new Soil Conservation Districts recently organized, and other Soil Conservation Districts that need to be organized in many parts of the nation.

These are a few examples. I could give you others, but these serve to illustrate the danger. They show you, my conservationist friends, why your work is cut out for you!

I submit that trees not planted now will not provide timber for building, chemicals, paper, and other vital industries twenty and forty years from now.

Top soil permitted to erode away now will not produce the food and fiber needed by America in future years. And that same top soil, allowed to clog our streams and fill our reservoirs, means less water in future years.

Raw sewage and industrial wastes allowed to flow untreated into our public waters also is a sure way to poison and undermine the basic strength of America. And this brings up a subject very close to home.

As you know there are certain groups and interests that look upon our streams and beaches as cheap and convenient places to dump their sewage and

industrial wastes. They have a vested interest in dirty water, and short-sightedly they fight every attempt to clean up the pollution menace. We had to lick them on the floor of the House last year to save the pollution-control funds of the Public Health Service. I shall never forget the good work done in that fight by the sportsmen, the garden clubs, and other organized conservationists of America.

These same groups, spearheaded by industrial trade associations that ought to know better, are at it again. Having been beaten in Congress, they went to work on the White House. Working through a so-called "Joint Federal-State Action Committee," they persuaded the President to recommend that the entire program of grants to stimulate the building of sewage-treatment plants be dropped after next year. They advance the theory that if the federal program stops, all the states will appropriate enough money to carry it on. But their real objective is to stop the program, because these same industrial groups will be found opposing pollution control bills, and fighting the appropriations, in every state legislature.

I should like to emphasize that these groups are not representative of industry as a whole. A great many enlightened industrial leaders realize full well their own stake, and the national stake, in clean waters. We see them investing their own money, willingly and voluntarily, in research and installations to abate pollution.

We don't know yet how soon we shall have another fight in committee or on the floor to save the water-pollution control program, but it is a lead-pipe cinch another fight is coming up, this year or next.

So get your affairs in order, conservationists of Rhode Island, and prepare to do battle. And when you go to St. Louis in a couple of weeks to attend the National Wildlife Federation convention--Sam Cudworth, I am talking to you--tell

them John Fogarty says thanks for the good work they did last year in saving the program.

Tell them they have their work cut out to save America's natural resources, to keep her soils rich, her waters clean, her wildlife abundant and her forests green. Tell them they may not get rich or win any medals—but future generations will thank them for keeping America strong and beautiful and free!

An interesting thing about this so-called "Joint Federal-State Action Committee" is that it is controlled by high Administration officials, including Percival Brundage, director of the Budget Bureau, three other Cabinet members and three White House assistants, plus enough state governors who take the same point of view.

Another curious fact is that while the President was persuaded to advance its recommendations to Congress in his budget message, the Committee's report hasn't even been approved by the National Conference of Governors. It isn't scheduled to be acted on by the governors until next May.

When the Committee's recommendations for stopping sewage-treatment grants and eliminating vocational education were brought up for immediate approval by the Board of Managers of the Council of State Governments at Hot Springs, Arkansas, last Dec. 6, the motion was defeated 35 to 7.