I am not your keynote speaker this morning. Nor am I an expert in air pollution -- except when it comes to smoke-filled rooms, and I'm not really all that expert there.

I am the man who is supposed to get things underway so that the experts can take over.

Old Samuel Johnson was right: "Nothing concentrates a man's mind like the immensity of his hanging (or in this case, choking)."

It seems to be our American habit -- in both our domestic and foreign affairs -- to wait until things get really bad before we rouse ourselves to action.

I cannot help but feel that we are just about 6 to 10 years behind time in seriously getting down to work on the problem of air pollution.

I do not want to overlook the current state of the problem. But one prominent meteorologist, Morris Neuberger of UCLA, has predicted that -- if things continue as they are now -- "the world's atmosphere will grow more and more polluted until, a century from now, it will be too poisonous to allow human life to survive."

Air pollution seems already to be taking a serious toll of human life. Emphysema -- a disease associated with air pollution -- is the fastest growing cause of death in this country today. Among American men, the death rate from emphysema is almost 10 times what it was in 1950.

Each month, one thousand more workers are forced prematurely onto the Social Security rolls because of the crippling efforts of this disease. Significantly, deaths from emphysema are twice as high in the cities as in rural areas.

Like emphysema, other major respiratory diseases -- bronchitis, asthma, and lung cancer, not to mention the common cold -- are clearly linked with air pollution, even though the link is incompletely documented as yet.

It is on this basis that, in the four years since the last Conference on Air Pollution was held, the American Medical Association, the American Thoracic Society, and a number of other organizations interested in public health have called for national action to control air pollution.

I agree with them. Unless we tackle air pollution in real and deadly earnest, we shall be taking an intolerable risk with the lives and health of innocent people.

Now, however, we have begun to move. The Clean Air Act was an important step forward. Many communities and states have already taken advantage of the financial incentives, the technical assistance and the research back-up that the federal government can now provide. But we have far to go before we can say we have the problem in hand.

All of us contribute to air pollution; therefore all of us must do our part in its control.
Not very long ago, air pollution was regarded as strictly a local problem. Neither the states nor the federal government played a significant role in dealing with it.

Some people believe that the problem can be solved locally.

Others suggest that we have come full circle, and that the federal government must assume the full responsibility.

I submit that neither approach is adequate by itself. What we need here is a working partnership among all levels of government -- federal, state, and national -- and with private industry as well.

Therefore, in your discussions here, I urge you not to feel bound by any outworn notions about who should do what to control air pollution, based upon who used to do what in the past.

I hope you will think instead about who can do what most effectively, from this time forward. I assure you that there will be plenty of work to go around. Air pollution will not yield to anything less than a determined and a coordinated effort by all sectors of our society.

Everyone seems to agree that the most efficient and effective way to control air pollution would be on a regional basis. In the words of Scripture, "the wind bloweth where it listeth."

It has no regard for the lines we mortals draw upon our maps, separating one state from another or cities from the surrounding suburbs.

Just as we need a non-proliferation treaty among nations, so we need non-diffusion treaties between states that share the same airshed.

Yet, if there is a single, effective inter-state regional air pollution control program anywhere in this nation, I have not heard of it. I think we ought to give serious and sober consideration to this hard fact. We should ask ourselves how we can bring into being these regional programs that we all agree are much needed.

Air pollution is a challenge to the vision and responsibility of private industry as well. Industry is the source of a great deal of air pollution. It has -- or should have -- a very real interest in upgrading the quality of the communities in which it functions. Moreover, if present trends continue, the costs of polluted air to industry itself are likely to mount.

I must admit to disappointment that proper control of air pollution has thus far too often been seen as a nuisance to be endured -- or to be postponed -- by some industrial firms, and even by units of local government, when any number of reasonable accounting have already revealed that the long-run costs of pollution are far greater than those of its control.

There is another problem. Standards of control vary greatly from city to city and from state to state.

Is it realistic to expect industries in one city to give serious support to the enactment of stringent regulations locally if they have no assurance that their competitors elsewhere will have to make commensurate expenditures? And how can that assurance be given?

These are very real problems which industries -- and the communities in which they function -- confront in any coordinated and effective effort to clear the air. Your government is currently and actively concerned with them, in the hope that it can achieve a solution.
I realize there are still problems remaining to be solved in air pollution control technology. Some of the most ubiquitous and damaging gaseous pollutants, the sulphur oxides, remain uncontrolled, because we have not developed the technology to deal with them.

The same is true of fumes from diesel trucks and buses. But I cannot believe that this nation, which is preparing to land a man on the moon, is not capable of devising ways to control sulphurous gases and diesel fumes here on earth.

As you know, I am Chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council. This nation has achieved, through a working partnership of industry, science, and government, remarkable successes in space. I am confident that, with the same kind of teamwork, we can do equally well with innermost space -- this thin but infinitely precious envelope of atmosphere in which we live and breathe and work.

When we launch astronauts into space, we equip them with special suits, put them in costly capsules, and take every precaution to ensure that they will survive their strange and hostile environment. It seems to me that, here on earth, we have a right to breathe free and easy in the open air -- and enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness without resorting to smog masks.

Above all, we have the right to be free of the haunting fear that disaster may any day strike any one of a large number of our cities.

This is our task -- this is our challenge. The American people want to know what we must do to "Control Now - for Clean Air." They look to us for answers -- it is our responsibility to have them.
I am not your keynote speaker this morning.

Nor am I an expert in air pollution -- except when it comes to smoke-filled rooms, and I'm not really all that expert there.

I am the man who is supposed to get things underway so that the experts can take over.

Old Samuel Johnson was right: Nothing concentrates a man's mind like the imminence of his hanging. For in this case, choking, coughing, crying, dying.

It seems to be our American habit -- in both our domestic and foreign affairs -- to wait until things get really bad before we rouse ourselves to action.
I cannot help but feel that we are just about 6 to 10 years behind time in seriously getting down to work on the problem of air pollution.

I do not want to overdraw the current state of the problem. But one prominent meteorologist, Morris Neiburger of UCLA, has predicted that -- if things continue as they are now -- "the world's atmosphere will grow more and more polluted until, a century from now, it will be too poisonous to allow human life to survive."

Air pollution seems already to be taking a serious toll of human life. Emphysema -- a disease associated with air pollution -- is the fastest growing cause of death in this country today. Among American men, the death rate from emphysema is almost 10 times what it was in 1950.

Each month, one thousand more workers are forced prematurely onto the Social Security rolls because of the crippling efforts of this disease. Significantly, deaths from emphysema are twice as high in the cities as in rural areas.
Like emphysema, other major respiratory diseases -- bronchitis, asthma, and lung cancer, not to mention the common cold -- are clearly linked with air pollution, even though the link is incompletely documented as yet.

It is on this basis that, in the four years since the last Conference on Air Pollution was held, the American Medical Association, the American Thoracic Society, and a number of other organizations interested in public health have called for national action to control air pollution.

I agree with them. Unless we tackle air pollution in real and deadly earnest, we shall be taking an intolerable risk with the lives and health of innocent people.

Now, however, we have begun to move. The Clean Air Act was an important step forward. Many communities and states have already taken advantage of the financial incentives, the technical assistance and the research back-up that the federal government can now provide.
But we have far to go before we can say we have the problem in hand.

All of us contribute to air pollution; therefore all of us must do our part in its control.

Not very long ago, air pollution was regarded as strictly a local problem. Neither the states nor the federal government played a significant role in dealing with it.

Some people believe that the problem can be solved locally.

Others suggest that we have come full circle, and that the federal government must assume the full responsibility.

I submit that neither approach is adequate by itself.

What we need here is a working partnership among all levels of government -- federal, state, and national -- and with private industry as well.

Therefore, in your discussions here, I urge you not to feel bound by any outworn notions about who should do what to control air pollution, based upon who used to do what in the past.
I hope you will think instead about who can do what most effectively, from this time forward. I assure you that there will be plenty of work to go around. Air pollution will not yield to anything less than a determined and a coordinated effort by all sectors of our society.

Everyone seems to agree that the most efficient and effective way to control air pollution would be on a regional basis. In the words of Scripture, "the wind bloweth where it listeth." It has no regard for the lines we mortals draw upon our maps, separating one state from another or cities from the surrounding suburbs.

Just as we need a non-proliferation treaty among nations, so we need non-diffusion treaties between states that share the same airshed. Regional Compact!

Yet, if there is a single, effective inter-state regional air pollution control program anywhere in this nation, I have not heard of it.
I think we ought to give serious and sober consideration to this hard fact. We should ask ourselves how we can bring into being these regional programs that we all agree are much needed.

Air pollution is a challenge to the vision and responsibility of private industry as well. Industry is the source of a great deal of air pollution. It has -- or should have -- a very real interest in upgrading the quality of the communities in which it functions. Moreover, if present trends continue, the costs of polluted air to industry itself are likely to mount.

I must admit to disappointment that proper control of air pollution has thus far too often been seen as a nuisance to be endured -- or to be postponed -- by some industrial firms, and even by units of local government, when any number of reasonable accountings have already revealed that the long-run costs of pollution are far greater than those of its control.

Local, State, Responsibility, Enforcement!
There is another problem: Standards of control vary greatly from city to city and from state to state.

Is it realistic to expect industries in one city to give zealous support to the enactment of stringent regulations locally if they have no assurance that their competitors elsewhere will have to make commensurate expenditures? And how can that assurance be given?

These are very real problems which industries -- and the communities in which they function -- must face. These are coordinated and effective effort to clear the air. Your government is currently and actively concerned with them, in the hope that it can achieve a solution -- and a solution must be found.

I realize there are still problems remaining to be solved in air pollution control technology. Some of the most ubiquitous and damaging gaseous pollutants, the sulphur oxides, remain uncontrolled, because we have not developed the technology to deal with them.
The same is true of fumes from diesel trucks and buses. But I cannot believe that this nation, which is preparing to land a man on the moon, is not capable of devising ways to control sulphurous gases and diesel fumes here on earth.

As you know, I am Chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council. This nation has achieved, through a working partnership of industry, science, and government, remarkable successes in space. I am confident that, with the same kind of teamwork, we can do equally well with innermost space -- this thin but infinitely precious envelope of atmosphere in which we live and breathe and work.

When we launch astronauts into space, we equip them with special suits, put them in costly capsules, and take every precaution to ensure that they will survive their strange and hostile environment. It seems to me that, here on earth, we have a right to breathe free and easy in the open air --
and to enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness
without resorting to smog masks.

Above all, we have the right to be free of the haunting
fear that disaster may any day strike any one of a large
number of our cities.

This is our task -- this is our challenge. The
American people want to know what we must do to "Control
Now - for Clean Air." They look to us for answers - it is
our responsibility to have them. We better gear
up for action on a whole
series of fronts -
Cites, Poverty, Pollution,
Education etc.
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VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Stern, Secretary Gardner, and Dr. Stewart, and all the guests and delegates to this, the National Conference on Air Pollution.

I can't think of a place you could come to where the environment is better to discuss air pollution than in Washington, D.C. Congress is out of session, but there is still a little hangover. And those of us in the Executive Branch, or those of us that are hybrids between the executive and legislative -- like a Vice President -- we contribute our fair share to air pollution.

I am very pleased to say that Dr. Stewart is here this morning to take care of any casualties that may come along during this conference, in light of what I have been reading in the press about the many dangers here.

And I am delighted to know my friend, Ed Muskie, is going to be your speaker at your banquet tomorrow night, and that you are going to have John Carles Daly as the master of ceremonies. And if any of you have any doubt what Ed Muskie's line is, let me tell you, it is air pollution, before you start along with his Chamber of Commerce descriptions of lobsters from Maine and all of the other many wonders of that part of America.

Well, I am here this morning, I suppose, in the role of a sort of keynote speaker, even though I do not
want to claim that dubious honor. I am not here as an expert on air pollution except when it comes -- according to some people -- to smoke-filled rooms and, in light of the results of the recent elections, I am really not an expert on that, either.

(Laughter.)

So maybe I should just take my stand once again as a general practitioner, and that is about what I consider myself to be in the organizational structure of our Government. With some sixteen years in the United States Senate, and now these two years as Vice President, you become not a specialist, or not an expert, but hopefully, a man that has a wide range of interests, and possibly one who without considering himself a technician, can at least you'll want to listen when arouse your curiosity, so that you put the technicians to work.

[Now] I am supposed to be the fellow that gets things started or under way so that the experts can take over. Somebody once said that experts should be on tap and not on top. And I think that is still a good axiom in politics and in all matters of public policy. Old Samuel Johnson [Adams] had some advice for us this morning or I should say, Samuel Johnson. You remember that great philosopher and writer, and at times almost a cynic, but in a delightful manner. He said, "Nothing concentrates a man's mind like
the imminence of hanging."

(Laughter.)

And I suppose that no matter how you reword it, that is just about as precise as you can get it.

I might add that this morning we should concentrate our minds on the problems that we face in terms of the atmosphere that surrounds us, the air that we breath, and the fact that more people have their eyes filled with tears today due to smog than at any other time in our national history -- there is more coughing -- that is right -- hacking, and more crying, and more dying, due to air pollution than at any other time. So let's concentrate our attention before we have no attention left to concentrate.

It seems to be our American habit in both domestic and foreign affairs to wait until things get really bad before we arouse ourselves to action. I hear every day in Washington: "Well, before things get better, they will have to get worse." And the real test around here is whether or not you have enough judgment to know when they are worse enough before they start to get better. Or whether they will get so bad that there is no way to redeem the situation.

[Now,] I cannot help but feel that we are just about six to ten, maybe even fifteen years, behind time in seriously getting down to work on this problem of air pollution. What an amazing situation this is. Waters in
our lakes and streams polluted, a nation that is blessed with more fresh water than any other nation on the face of the earth. And the air that is the atmosphere, the most vital feature of the environment in which we live, even more polluted, in a nation that prides itself on having more scientific advances and technological achievements than any other nation on the face of the earth.

I have been delivering a series of lectures on what we call the scientific and technological gap. This ever-widening gap that separates the United States, with its advanced technology, with its tremendous developments in science and discovery, the gap that separates us not only from the underdeveloped or the developing areas of the world, of Asia, Africa, Latin America, but even from Western Europe. And yet, with all of this achievement, with all of these institutions of higher learning, with all of our high-paid corporate executives, with all of our Government officials, there is no nation on the face of the earth that lives in a polluted environment as much as we do.

We have the number one air pollution problem. It's nice to be first. Except when it comes to misery. And I suggest that we ought to be willing to put up with the seriousness of this.

I don't want to overdraw the current state of
the problem. And possibly I am just like many of you --
the victim of what I read and what I hear. But one
prominent meteorologist, Morris Nieberger, of the University
of California, Los Angeles, has predicted that if things
continue as they are now, the world's atmosphere will grow
more and more polluted until, a century from now, it will
be too poisonous to allow human life to survive.

I can only say we don't intend to let that
happen. But that is sort of the shock treatment that you
get and need, and it tells us what could happen unless man
puts his mind to the problem.

Air pollution seems already to be taking a serious
toll of human life. I think we can point out this morning --
and you will during this conference -- that air pollution,
first of all, is unnecessary; science and technology can do
something about it; number two, that it is physically, from
a health point of view, very dangerous; industrially and
from an economic point of view, very costly; and from the
point of view of human relations and democratic government,
it is intolerable.

People are entitled to live in a wholesome
environment; hopefully, to have a job, hopefully at least,
to have a decent home in which to live; hopefully to have
a decent community with good streets and parks and play-
grounds. But above all, they are entitled to have what God
Almighty gave them, and you have no right to rob them of fresh air to breathe.

It is bad enough for man to destroy the earth, but to destroy the atmosphere, I think, is reaching beyond his jurisdiction. And it is about time that we called a halt to it.

Now, I said that there is a serious toll of human life involved. And there is. And the nation that suffers the most is ours. From emphysema, a disease associated directly with air pollution. It is the fastest-growing cause of death in this country today. Among American men the death rate from emphysema is almost ten times what it was in 1950. Each month 1,000 more workers are forced prematurely on to the Social Security roles because of the crippling effects of this disease. Significantly, deaths from emphysema are twice as high in our cities as in our rural areas.

Now, if there happens to be a coincidental relationship between the filthy air of the urban area, and the relatively clean air of the rural countryside, then the coincidence only underscores what anybody with an eighth-grade education already knows. What a pity it is to think that we can build glistening towers, magnificent buildings, incredible designs of machines and devices, and yet we don't know how to control the smoke that comes out of a smokestack.
Like emphysema, other major respiratory diseases -- bronchitis, asthma, lung cancer, not to mention the common cold -- are clearly linked with air pollution, even though the link is incompletely documented as yet. However, there seems to be a growing body of evidence that all of these diseases, or all of these disturbances of the lung and the throat, are related at least indirectly to the atmosphere that surrounds us, and the air that we breathe.

It is on this basis that in the four years national since the last conference on air pollution was held, the American Medical Association, the American Thoracic Society, and a number of other organizations interested in public health, have called for national action to control air pollution.

Now, if we will get as excited about air pollution as we [do] about cigarettes, and do twice as much about it, I think we will make some progress at this conference. I happen to agree with these great associations -- the Medical Association and the Thoracic Society -- unless we tackle air pollution in real deadly earnest, we shall be taking an intolerable risk with the lives and the health of innocent people. And you know most of us are well aware of the mandates of the Constitution. Every officer on this platform has taken an oath to uphold the Constitution, to defend it...
two mandates in the Constitution; the rest of it is optional; just two things required of the Federal Government: to provide for the common defense, and to promote the general welfare. Everything else in the Constitution is optional.

I think we are providing for the common defense in terms of the external threat of a military force. But to promote the general welfare, I think that is what this conference is for. And we settle down to the task in these days ahead now, to try to find some answers. We can say that we have begun to move. And as I said earlier, moving and beginning in America is generally tied to some moment of crisis. I don't know what we would have done if the Russians hadn't come up with Sputnik. I think our educational system would still have been in the doldrums. They scared the living daylights out of us, and today we have a better educational structure. Not because of men of good will alone, not because only of men like Secretary Gardner, who believes in the doctrine and the application of standards of excellence, but because the American people became frightened.

We do something finally about our cities when there are riots, regrettably. We do something about most problems because we are afraid. It has been said, jokingly, but all too often with a degree of evidence that proves the point, that if a nation can come up with a few Communists,
they can get foreign aid. Fear of the Communist threat precipitates action, even though you and I know that there ought to be a world in which people are well fed, clothed, educated, if there had never been a Communist.

I don't happen to think that we ought to be motivated all through our lives by the fear of evil consequences. It would seem much better that we do what is right because it is the right thing to do, and because it generally adds up to being the most profitable and constructive thing to do.

But we have begun. The Clean Air Act was an important step forward. But, my, how long it took to get it! And all of the struggle that went on for air pollution control and water pollution control. You would think that some people thought they owned the air and that it was an invasion of private property or private rights, or that some other people owned the waters of the rivers or of the lakes.

Many communities and states, fortunately, have already taken advantage of the limited financial incentives, the technical assistance, and the research backup the Federal Government can now provide.

I believe that this conference underscores one fact above all others -- that the Federal Government is now involved in air pollution control, and it will have to be involved. But it needs to have more than involvement on its
part -- it needs the working cooperation of every element, every segment, of the American society.

We have to go a long way before the problem that confronts us is in hand. We are late in getting started; our resources that we have to apply are limited, and the problem is immense.

Certainly, \[ \text{Now,} \] all of us contribute to air pollution. Therefore, all of us must do our part in its control. And in your panels in this conference you will undoubtedly outline for us how each and every one of us can do his or her part.

Not very long ago, air pollution was regarded as strictly a local problem. I remember when I was Mayor of Minneapolis in 1945 -- I had a big struggle trying to get an air pollution control officer appointed in the city government. We finally got someone that was given the title. He had ability, but he had no authority. We Americans always feel a little better, when we see a problem after [and] the reformers come along and call it to our attention, if we can just pass a law. At times, we are not so much worried \[ \text{at times} \] about the enforcement of the law or even \[ \text{the} \] observance, if we just pass the law.

Well, we passed laws, passed ordinances at the local levels, and in some states, good state laws. But
neither the states nor the Federal Government have played a significant role up until now in dealing with this problem. Most of the approach to the problem of air pollution thus far has been on a city-by-city, local basis. And most of the time, ineffective.

Some people believe that the problem can be solved locally. And they believe it very strongly. Others suggest that we come full circle, and that the Federal Government must assume the full responsibility.

Well, I am not like that old fellow who was asked to take a stand on an issue in the local election: and he said: "Well, I have friends on both sides, and I stand squarely with my friends."

(Laughter.)

But I think there is a rather realistic and meaningful approach to our problem. It is my view that you can't do this locally, and it is my view that the Federal Government on every single problem that confronts this nation today, while it must assume a sense of direction, or coordination, and do its part that it can't do it all. And even if it can, it shouldn't.

I happen to believe in what we call creative Federalism. I happen to believe in our system of government. I happen to believe that social responsibility is also not only the duty of government -- it is the duty of citizens.
I happen to believe that one of the ways in which you can strengthen local and state government is to bring about a partnership of the three levels of government, Federal, state, and local.

So what I say is that neither approach of local control or Federal alone is adequate by itself, and what we need is a working partnership among all levels of government, a partnership that must also include Federal, state, and local, along with private industry as well.

Let me repeat, as I shall once again when I conclude my address, that every problem that confronts the American society today requires the mobilization of our resources, all of them -- Federal, state, local, and private. You can't rebuild your cities by the Federal Government, or by the local government, or by the state government, or by private industry alone. You can do it working together. And if we can't perfect a formula to do that, then our democracy is a failure.

But I think that we in our democracy know how to put together a working plan, and I think I can show you how to put together a working plan here. Therefore, in your discussions here, I urge you not to feel bound by those outworn notions about who should do what to control air pollution. If you have expressed such a point of view before, quit reading your own propaganda. If you have a point of view, I think we ought to cast aside that which we found
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didn't work in the past, and do some fresh thinking. I hope you will think instead about who can do what most effectively from this time forward.

How do we divide up this responsibility? How do we share the burden? How do we do it, knowing that each partner carries his full share of the load?

Air pollution will not yield to anything less than a determined and coordinated effort by all sectors of our society. We have to declare total war on air pollution. And that means that we have to ask every part of our society to engage in the struggle.

Everyone seems to agree that the most efficient and effective way to control air pollution would be on a regional basis. In the words of the Scripture: "The wind bloweth where it listeth."

The wind or the air has no regard for the lines that we mortals draw upon our maps, separating one state from another, or cities from the surrounding suburbs.

In the month of October, I flew over a great metropolitan area in the United States, in the Upper Midwest, in the Great Lakes area, and I saw smokestacks belching forth sulfurous gases that filled the air with poison. And I asked the local officials: "Don't you have an ordinance about this?" "Oh, yes." "What are you doing about it?"

We didn't get an answer. But I want to tell you, if the
local law enforcement officials would be as active in enforcing their air pollution ordinances as they are the traffic ordinances on those traffic tickets, we would get something done.

(Appause.)

And I don't know why it is any more illegal to overpark a car and clog the streets than it is to violate an air pollution ordinance and clog the air.

As a matter of fact, I think that -- well, I won't make any judgment on that, I will be a little careful. But I recognize the problems that are involved in local jurisdictions in this matter. But just as we need a nonproliferation treaty relating to nuclear weapons among nations, no further nonproliferation, so we need a nondiffusion, or so we need nondiffusion treaties between states that share the same airshed, regional compacts, conforming to within Federal standards, backed up by Federal law, and strengthened by cooperation cooperating with the Federal agencies.

But I must say, in all candor, if there is a single effective interstate regional air pollution control program anywhere in this nation that works, I have not heard of it. But that doesn't mean it can't work, because it can.

We have made regional compacts work in other areas, and they can work in this, providing that they are within
the framework of uniform standards. I think we ought to
give serious and sober consideration to this hard fact of
regionalism in cooperation with Federalism. We should ask
ourselves how we can bring into being these regional
programs that we all agree are much needed.

Air pollution is a challenge to the vision and
the responsibility of private industry as well as government. In fact, it is the private sector which makes a
major contribution to the pollution of the air. Industry
is the source of a great deal of air and water pollution.
It has, or it should have, a very real interest in upgrading
the quality of the communities in which it functions. No
industry has the right to dirty the curtains of the
housewife. You didn't get that privilege when you set
your plant up.

I am putting it in the least of the little
problems of air pollution. But no industry has a right to
shorten your life, none whatsoever.

[Applause.]

The purpose of industry is to extend your life.
And I think industry wants to.
believes that American business is highly socially
conscious, that it recognizes itself as a working partner
in community life. Sometimes doesn't quite know what
to do, because the pattern hasn't been designed that
its operations to fit into a pattern. That is where the public official comes in, working with his private brother to find a formula and a pattern, to find a workable formula.

Not only does industry have a real interest in upgrading the quality of the communities in which it functions, moreover, if present trends continue, the costs of polluted air to industry itself are likely to mount.

Now, I must admit to disappointment that proper control of air pollution has thus far too often been seen by some industrial firms as a nuisance to be endured, or to be postponed by some industrial firms, and even by units of local government, although

when any number of reasonable accountings have already revealed that the long-run costs of pollution are far greater than the cost of its control.

So I appeal this morning, as a fellow citizen, for local and state responsibility. I ask the law enforcement officers -- who are perfectly willing to go around and arrest a drunk, or someone who is molesting someone else, or someone who threatens someone else, or someone who overparks his car -- I ask them to be even more vigilant on other transgressions against the public welfare.

Of course, one of my weaknesses is that I always digress in these speeches. But when I think of the slum areas of our cities, there are ordinances in every city that say, "You are not permitted to put the garbage all
over the lawn." There are ordinances that require you to have safe wiring and good plumbing. And I want to say that if the law enforcement officers of state and local government were as interested in the slum tenements, as to their safety and their occupancy, as they are in a night club, where you have a sign saying that "Only 400 people can occupy this room," and where they run in a public health officer about three times a week to see that the dishes are being cleaned right, and where they are checking the sewer and checking the men's room, and checking the wiring; if they would do a little of that in the slums, we wouldn't have so many slums.

I know. I tried it. It works. You would be surprised what you can do by a timely call upon some people, particularly if you have authority. One of the advantages of having served in local government -- and I did serve for two terms as the Mayor of Minneapolis -- is where you know where the bodies are buried. You even buried a few yourself.

(Laughter.)

There are very few tricks that some people have tried that you haven't at least observed.

[Now,] there is another problem relating to our local government, however, that needs to be faced in standards of control vary greatly from city to city and from state to state. And I think we can ask the question, and I know
industry does, "Is it realistic to expect industries in one city to give zealous support to the enactment of local stringent regulations if they have no assurance that their competitors elsewhere will have to make commensurate expenditures?" And how can that assurance be given? That is a question that you need to face here.

If the city of Denver, Colorado, is to insist that every industrial plant abide by the law and has strict enforcement, what about the city of Minneapolis, my city, or the city of Detroit, or Chicago, or St. Louis? Because most of American industry today is highly competitive, and it has its competitive plants in many cities.

These are the very real problems which industries and the communities in which they function must face in any coordinated and effective effort to clean the air or to clear the air. Your Government is currently and actively concerned with these problems, in the hope that it can find a solution, and the purpose of consultation in a conference like this is not for the Federal agents to tell you what to do, but for you to advise and counsel the Federal representatives as to what you think will be best to do so that the individual citizens, the representatives of local and state governments, of private industry, working together with the Federal representatives, may come to an agreement, a consensus, yes, a feeling of what can be done.
I realize there are still problems remaining to be solved in air pollution technology. I am not unaware of that. I spent ten years of my life as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Scientific Research of the United States Senate, and I am a pharmacist; I have studied in chemistry; I think I know a little bit about some of the problems that face industry.

Some of the most ubiquitous and damaging gaseous products, the sulphur oxides, remain uncontrolled because we have not as yet developed a technology to deal with them efficiently.

The same is true of fumes from diesel trucks and buses.

Having said that, I cannot believe that this nation, which is preparing within the next two years to put a man on the Moon, and finally to colonize, if you please, to put them there so they can live there and return from there -- I cannot believe that a nation that is capable of putting a man on the Moon, and even contemplating interplanetary travel, is not capable of devising ways to control sulfurous gases and diesel fumes here on earth.

Because, my dear friends, if we can't control the bus and what it spews out on our streets and in our air here on earth, what makes you think you can do anything on the Moon once you get there? I think we ought to call off the whole project.
[Applause.]

But I might say, I think we will do better on the moon, because we are not going to have any vested interests there. There will be no one carrying placards or petitioning us, or standing in the way, according to what we hear, at least.

Now, I happen to be Chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council. It is a very interesting work. The Congress has seen to it that the Vice President has new duties from time to time. You might be interested in knowing that two of the more recent duties within the past six years have been to assign the Vice President as Chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, commonly known as the Space Council, dealing with the infinity of outer space; and only this last summer, to assign the Vice President to be Chairman of the Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Technology, known as oceanography. Any assignment I get is out of this world, or in the bottom of the ocean.

[Applause; laughter.]

But I can stand before you and tell you my domain is less polluted than yours. From what I hear of the seas, they are in some danger, but not as yet as bad in pollution as certain areas on earth; and space, they tell me when I talk to my friends, the astronauts, that it is beautiful.
magnificent. If fact, if you get up high enough, 100 miles or so, you can take a better picture of the earth than you can if you are up 40,000 feet.

This nation has achieved through a working partnership -- and this is where we get down to the practicalities. I talked about creative Federalism, working partnership, and I looked at the audience and saw some people say, "I've heard that stuff before." So have I. But then the question comes -- does it work? Are there any examples? I am here to tell you there are.

There is a working example of what I am talking about, a working partnership the National Aeronautics and Space Agency (NASA), the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, just to mention three great Federal agencies, working together with private industry with a host of contractors that employ today over 400,000 skilled professional workers, with better than fifty great universities spread across our land, with great banking institutions, the university scientific community, government, all working together in what we call the space program.

Government couldn't do it alone, or if it did, it would not be within our system. Industry obviously couldn't do it alone. The university couldn't do it alone.

So we put them all together, and we have asked our
great universities, their schools of technology and science and engineering, and the life sciences, and we have had interdisciplinary work; we have asked them to find answers to problems that only ten years ago seemed impossible to solve. And we have found out how to solve them.

Well, I am confident, with that same kind of team-work, that we can do equally well with innermost space, this thin but infinitely precious envelope of atmosphere in which we live and breathe and work.

When we launch astronauts into space, we equip them with special suits, put them into costly capsules, take every precaution known to modern man, to insure that they will survive in a strange and hostile environment.

And I want to tell you one thing about a space capsule, there is no air pollution. We have found out what to do about that. It seems to me that here on earth we have a right to breathe free and easy in open air, and to enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, without resorting to smog masks.

I would put it another way, that any nation that is willing to make the investment that we are to put a man on the moon ought to be able to find ways and means, and be willing to make an adequate investment to help keep a man on his feet right here on earth. And to make him live a good life. That is really what we are
talking about.

As your Vice President, I am here to tell you that we can do anything that this nation wills to do. We have proven it. We are going to build a supersonic transport -- we are going to solve every problem involved in it -- the engineers say we can. We are going to be able to desalinate the water of seas. We are already working to a point where we are able to control genetics. We are going to be able to transplant an organ from the body of one person to another on a regular basis. We are studying the secret of life itself, the cellular structure, and even coming to the point of artificial creation of life.

We are doing fantastic things whenever we will to do it. We are going to be able to put into orbit a man-orbiting laboratory; we will construct that laboratory in orbit; we will put it together; we will nail it together, so to speak. We will have men going in and out of that laboratory just as they go in and out of an underground plant or factory, or a factory on earth, and it will all be within the next five to ten years. We know that.

We are able to do anything that we want to do, if we want to do it. And if we are willing to dedicate the resources to it.

We are talking now about building huge buildings under the sea. I am Chairman of oceanography; I have been
involved deeply in this. We can now mine the seas; we
can build a building bigger than this hotel on the bottom
of the ocean; live in it; mine the magnanese, copper, the
down there all
gold; we can do these things.

We can discover more from a satellite orbiting
300 miles above the earth about what is in the earth than
we can by going around and digging in it. The largest
gold deposit in the world was discovered only recently by an
space satellite.

We will be communicating all over the world with
communication satellites. We will be able to have the
university of the world in ten years, an instantaneous trans-
lation so that students at our great universities will
be able to hear the greatest philosophers and teachers
in the world in ten different countries on the same day,
and have the language brought to them in their native tongue.
We can do all this. Don't tell me you don't know how to
control some fumes coming out of a bus.

(Applause.)

Don't tell me that we are incapable of doing
something about sulphur, gas sulphur oxides. Don't tell
me this. I don't believe it. I tell you what we ought
to make up our minds to do is, we have to do it, or do we
have to just list the casualties every day, as they
do in Vietnam?
As a matter of fact, my dear friends, there are more people dying from emphysema than there are on the field of battle. And I have a feeling that there are some guerilla warriors going around that we are letting loose in this country without doing anything about it, known as air pollution.

We have the right, I think, to be free of the haunting fear that disaster may any day strike in any one of a large number of our cities. To free ourselves from this fear is our task, and this is our challenge. The American people want to know what we must do to control now for clean air, not twenty years from now.

Somebody once asked an old scientist, "What is the difference between the long run and the short run?" He said, "In the long run, you are all dead." I am a short-run man.

[(Applause; laughter.)]

I enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. So I say, let's gear up for action. And I know there are going to be people here that say, "Well, we have got to wait for more information." I have been engaged in academic pursuits myself. And you can sit around waiting for more information all of your life -- there is always more information to wait for.

I boarded yesterday the replica of the Santa Maria.
Christopher Columbus could have been waiting right now, right on up to the Queen Mary, if he waited for more information.

(Appause.)

One thing about Christopher Columbus, he didn't have much of a ship, but what he had, he got in and he set sail and he got across the ocean. Of course, he didn't get to where he was planning, but at least he made the trip.

So what the Vice President is saying to you this morning, in my characteristic style, is "Let's get with it."

This is where the action is. Here is where we need the job to be done. And we need to take action on a whole series of fronts. I know there will be those who will tell you, "Well, we just need to plan the whole thing out. We can't move until we have a massive plan for everything."

Well, I have said earlier, our problems are massive; it is going to take a massive effort; it is going to take the coordination we have never known before; it is going to take pooling of the resources of America, and maybe of the world. But at least of America, without the loss of identity of any of these resources. The cooperation of public and private, without ever in any way diminishing the importance of either, without anyone becoming a monolith.

But let's not keep waiting for the day somebody
comes in with a master plan. Because I have news for you--
your master plan
every master plan has already been altered, and [your master plan]
too, will be
altered before [they] get the ink dry on the first page of
the master plan.]

What this country needs right now from you is a
plan of action to meet the problem that is here in this
year -- 1966 -- and the year 1967, and the immediate years
ahead. And I charge this great conference -- and it is
a fine one, and my goodness, how grateful we are you are
here -- I charge this great conference with the responsi-
bility of helping our country, not just our Government, but
our country, our fellow Americans, to have an environment
that is healthy and decent, in which they can live.

And you can make your contribution by seeing to
it that one of God's great gifts to mankind, the air [that]
he breathes, is as pure as God Almighty intended it to be
for his children.

Thank you.

[(Applause.)]

(Whereupon, at 11:30 a.m., the address
was concluded.)]