

James K. Carr Oral History Interview—JFK#2, 5/25/1971
Administrative Information

Creator: James K. Carr
Interviewer: William W. Moss
Date of Interview: May 25, 1971
Place of Interview: San Francisco, California
Length: 14 pages

Biographical Note

Carr, Under Secretary of the Interior (1961-1964), discusses the relationship between the Interior Department and other government agencies, power generation issues, his trip to the Soviet Union, and national parks, among other issues.

Access

Open.

Usage Restrictions

According to the deed of gift signed April 8, 1976, copyright of these materials has passed to United States Government upon the death of the interviewee. Users of these materials are advised to determine the copyright status of any document from which they wish to publish.

Copyright

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research." If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excesses of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law. The copyright law extends its protection to unpublished works from the moment of creation in a tangible form. Direct your questions concerning copyright to the reference staff.

Transcript of Oral History Interview

These electronic documents were created from transcripts available in the research room of the John F. Kennedy Library. The transcripts were scanned using optical character recognition and the resulting text files were proofread against the original transcripts. Some formatting changes were made. Page numbers are noted where they would have occurred at the bottoms of the pages of the original transcripts. If researchers have any concerns about accuracy, they are encouraged to visit the Library and consult the transcripts and the interview recordings.

Suggested Citation

James K. Carr, recorded interview by William W. Moss, May 25, 1971, (page number), John F. Kennedy Library Oral History Program.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE

Gift of Personal Statement

of James K. Carr

to the


JOHN F. KENNEDY LIBRARY

I, James K. Carr of Sacramento, California do hereby give to the John F. Kennedy Library, for use and administration therein, all my rights, title and interest, except as hereinafter provided, to the tape recording and transcript of the interview conducted at San Francisco, California on November 18, 1970 and May 25, 1971 for the John F. Kennedy Library. The gift of this material is made subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. The interview is to be opened immediately to general research.
2. Researchers who have access to the transcript of the interview may listen to the tape; however, this is to be for background use only. Researchers may not cite, paraphrase or quote from the tape.
3. I retain literary property rights to the interview until my death, at which time the literary property rights shall pass to the United States Government.
4. Researchers may not publish quotations without my written consent in each case for so long as I retain property rights to the interview.
5. Copies may be provided to researchers and to other institutions, on request, for deposit in their collections.
6. This agreement may be revised or amended by mutual consent of the parties undersigned.



JAMES K. CARR


ARCHIVIST OF THE UNITED STATES

March 29, 1976

MONTH, DAY, YEAR

April 8, 1976

MONTH, DAY, YEAR

James K. Carr—JFK #2

Table of Contents

<u>Page</u>	<u>Topic</u>
21	Relationship between the Forest Service and National Park Service
25	Oil imports
26	Dispute about power lines with the Federal Trade Commission
26	Dispute with Mexico about the Colorado River
27	Columbia River Treaty with Canada
28	Trust territories
29	Relationship with the Budget Bureau
30	Relationship with Congress
31, 35	Power generation issues
32	Trip to the Soviet Union
33	National parks

Second of Two Oral History Interviews

with

James K. Carr

May 25, 1971
San Francisco, California

By William W. Moss

For the John F. Kennedy Library

MOSS: Let me start by asking you about the relations of the Interior Department with other departments and agencies, starting off with the Agriculture Department. There's a historic overlap between the Agriculture and the Interior Departments going back to the Gifford Pinchot days and so on, the question of what the Forest Service should do and what the Interior Department should do, and as I understand it this was more or less resolved by agreement between Freeman [Orville L. Freeman] and Udall [Stewart L. Udall] as to who was going to do what. How much insight do you have into the way that came about? What were the issues and how were they resolved?

CARR: Well, I don't know that I can give you all the issues and how they were actually resolved. It's true that there was this historic dispute between the departments, and as you'll remember, the plan was that the U.S. Forest Service should be in the Department of the Interior. When Secretary Udall and Secretary Freeman were appointed, they were both very much aware of this, and they were also aware of some of the career employees in both departments that appeared to want to carry on this so-called feud. I think the two of them very early in the administration decided that they, if anyone, could bring about some reconciliation between the departments in these areas of the dispute. It was largely the result of a personal relationship between

Secretary Udall and Secretary Freeman that they took up various issues and resolved them. One that comes to my mind is the Flaming Gorge recreation area, where the secretaries themselves, as I recall, sat down and decided that this would be an appropriate division of responsibility between the Forest Service and the Park Service [National Park Service]. I think later they found that it'd be even more efficient for one agency to run it, and I think that's the way it is now.

When they established the Whiskeytown National Recreation Area, in northern California, here again was multiple use versus a purist value of a park service. Secretary Freeman and Secretary Udall agreed on a draft legislation, which more or less wrote the multiple use provisions of, so they say, Forest Service law used for that national recreation area. I suppose that I could list a number of them if I could think about it, but it was a case where the two secretaries were very close together, attended a lot of social functions together, saw each other frequently, and both knew each other prior to their appointments; and they took these respective things and seemed to keep up with them most of the time, but it just was not going to be a fight.

MOSS: Okay. Now, one of the footnotes to this was, of course, that they moved Edward Crafts [Edward C. Crafts] over to the Interior to run the Outdoor Recreation Bureau. How did that develop?

CARR: Well, as far as Ed Crafts was concerned, he was a fellow in the Forest Service that had a very fine grasp of the recreational aspects of public lands, and, very well liked by the conservationists. Here, if anything, was a person who had established a reputation that he was not in the pocket of any user of the national forests. So I think when names were being up, naturally there were some that were very well known in park service circles and other areas where they might be considered for anti-“multiple use.” My guess is, and I can't prove this point, however, Secretary Udall, in order to bring about support from a wide group including people that were concerned about the Park Service program of outdoor recreation, decided that if they could get somebody that was well-known in other circles, such as, let's see the American Forestry Association, for example—Crafts was very well liked by that group—so I think when he considered some of the supporters of Ed Crafts he felt that he could get broader support for the whole outdoor recreation picture if he had that kind of administrator.

MOSS: What about this whole business of multiple use versus the purists? It really came to a head, didn't it, in the Udall administration? What are your views on the two positions?

CARR: Well, multiple use is a good phrase which very often has been used to mean that public land should be used for every possible use regardless. And some

administrators, I think, were reluctant to put some priorities on those uses. When we first began national recreation area legislation, it's my recollection that certain uses were permitted. For instance, mining claims and others, as I recall, were permitted insofar as they didn't interfere with the fundamental use. The same would be true of harvesting timber. There was no absolute prohibition, as I recall, against harvesting timber, but it should be done with recreation primarily in mind, and aesthetics, and not to be used as a nice turn in order to justify some lumber company coming in and harvesting the timber, which has happened in some areas.

I think Outdoor Recreation interlocked to bring this together under Ed Crafts and some of the people that worked for him. There was some talk, you know, that had there been more of a willingness at the National Park Service to recognize diversified recreation as against the, you might say, preservation concept in national parks, that there wouldn't have even been another bureau. That same function could have been carried out as a division of the National Park Service.

MOSS: The national parks very much wanted that bureau.

CARR: They did, but they got into this philosophy area where it just probably wouldn't have worked and they wouldn't have the materials of the Forest Service and others if certain people in the National Park Service had taken over. They just were unwilling to bend. And the interesting thing about it was that there was a school of thought in the National Park Service, there were some of the younger fellows in the National Park Service very much concerned that the National Park Service philosophy was going to cut them out of outdoor recreation on a diversified basis, which they thought was coming and should be [inaudible].

Then there were discussions in the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historical Sites, Buildings and Monuments and other places. In fact, I remember one luncheon with the advisory board where we pointed out that the more diversified national recreation area developments that we could bring about, the more we would take these people who wanted to water-ski and camp and everything out of the national parks and give the national parks some chance to survive as wilderness areas. For a while, you know, they were just opposed to any kind of uses of this kind under the federal government.

MOSS: This gets off my outline a bit, but I think it follows logically. The whole question of what the National Park

[-23-]

Service was to do came to a head. John Carver [John A. Carver, Jr.] going out there to Yosemite [Yosemite National Park] and in effect reading the riot act to the Park Service...

CARR: That's right.

MOSS: And Connie Wirth's [Conrad L. Wirth] resignation in 1964. What do you

recall of these two incidents?

CARR: Well. You want to remember that Connie Wirth has a very intense devotion to the National Park Service and some of the early day leaders of the Park Service, and had worked so long and so hard in this field, that it was probably expecting too much to expect Connie Wirth to all of a sudden become a great promoter of diversified outdoor recreation and, you might say, greater use of the parks. There were people who just were not of what were called the wilderness groups.

On the other hand, I think, if John Carver were to do it again, he would have been a little gentler in trying to get across some of these ideas. It was unfortunate that there resulted in some personality clashes there because, I guess, in each side they were a little more rigid than they should have been under the circumstances in defending their own positions.

Interestingly enough, you see, I was kind of in between during some of this where I maintained and have ever since maintained, a very fine relationship with Connie Wirth. He felt always that he could come talk to me about the problems and philosophy. At the same time, John Carver and I had a similar relationship. So I became somewhat the father confessor trying to reconcile a little bit of these two strong views.

MOSS: Well, how did it happen that the two views had to clash? Was it simply the personalities, or...?

CARR: Primarily personalities, and then there was some timing that was a little unfortunate. Now for instance, you mentioned the Yosemite speech of John Carver, and that was at the time when it became known Connie was going to resign. Actually there was an agreement earlier with Connie, Secretary Udall, and I that Connie was going to resign, and he was planning on doing it in his own time and in his own way. I was personally sorry that it did come about the way it did because when it was first discussed, it was not going to be handled that way. Connie wanted to change jobs and get out as a consultant and concentrate on some of the things that were uppermost in his mind instead of handling all the administrative detail.

[-24-]

MOSS: Yes. Okay, let me move on then, and talk about the Interior and the Corps of Engineers [Army Corps of Engineers]. Again, you have an overlap between the Reclamation Bureau and the Corps. You've got a geographic distribution responsibility.

CARR: Right

MOSS: But you still have a conceptual overlap. And you have a particular case in which there was an overlap not between Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers but the Bureau of Indian Affairs. This was the Kinzua Dam controversy in New York and Pennsylvania. Do you recall anything of that?

CARR: That's one that I'm very hazy on and one that I did not get into really at all.

MOSS: Okay. Well, let's just skip that one. Let me go on and ask you about a matter with Commerce Department and Office of Emergency Planning on oil import quotas. The story, as I understand it, was that the locus of authoritative review of oil import quotas was taken from the Interior Department by President Kennedy [John F. Kennedy] and put into the Office of Emergency Planning; that it was later brought back, after President Johnson [Lyndon B. Johnson] took over, to Interior because President Johnson didn't want to have anything associated with oil quite that close to home. Do you remember anything of this?

CARR: I don't remember too much about that. The oil import program in the Department of Interior was supervised very closely by the Secretary himself and assisted at times by Otis Beasley [D. Otis Beasley], the assistant secretary and very familiar with all of the problems. I think that going into the Office of Emergency Planning under Ed McDermott [Edward A. McDermott] was part of a whole problem of resources generally that got into such subjects as stockpiling. There was this question of stockpiling, the question of energy, and Ed McDermott, being a very vigorous fellow, began to raise questions in these fields, and he mentioned them to Commerce.

I can remember one meeting chaired by Ed McDermott where I found myself at complete odds with Secretary Hodges [Luther H. Hodges], Secretary of Commerce, because I was in effect the spokesman defending the Interior Department views on a number of different metals. Obviously, speaking with the background of the people that were working in those fields, influenced perhaps by some of the interests in those fields, and I got into that meeting and got shot down pretty much by Secretary Hodges on the amount of metal and minerals we needed in certain stockpiles.

[-25-]

I think this same question as to whether or not we needed all these things or should be done this way, prompted the changeover to Ed McDermott's office on oil. It was just a reflection of a concern that maybe the White House didn't have all the facts they needed, and the best way to do it was to put a tough lawyer like McDermott in there asking the questions.

MOSS: Okay. On regulatory agencies, there was a jurisdictional dispute, if you will, between the Interior and the FTC [Federal Trade Commission] on the question of right of ways and control of power lines going across public lands. There's a nice little jurisdictional question. Do you recall it?

CARR: Yes. I remember it. I remember the issue; I can't remember any....

MOSS: As to whether Interior was to control the assigning and building of the transmission lines through its power to control the right of way?

CARR: Yes. I think, I think this got into the private versus public power disputes

where, if FTC had the control, they could in effect approve a system, which system would not be approved by the Department of Interior and therefore would not be in competition to the Interior Department power program. Now, as far as the details are concerned, I must admit that I can't remember just what some of those were, but I do remember the issue.

MOSS: Well, let me ask you if you had anything to do with resolving the issue, at all.

CARR: No, I didn't. I think this ended up pretty much in John Carver's area as far the public land and approval was concerned, and also the Solicitor's office.

MOSS: Okay. Let me move on then to the State Department and ask you about the question of the Colorado River salinity dispute with Mexico. I noticed here in the *Washington Evening Star* [*Washington Star*] of May 4, that the issue is still very much alive.

CARR: And it always will be with us until we get some real solution to it down there. Well, I got into that off and on. I'm trying to think now just when I first got into it. It was not very long after I was Under Secretary that the issue was raised and we appointed a group of consultants, as I recall, to reexamine this from the scientific standpoint. I'm trying to think of the name of the fellow in charge of it.

[-26-]

Our thought at that time was, would it be possible to develop a desalt plant down there that would be a combination power and desalt plant that could assist in cleaning up the water just before or just after it went over the Mexican border. Out of that grew some other alternatives by the Reclamation Bureau, and we had a number of meetings with the State Department. But I don't recall that we ever made any substantial dent in the total problem because it was just a case where you didn't have enough water to flush out the bad muck.

MOSS: Do you recall any exasperation on the part of the State Department because Interior was not moving faster on it? I've had some indication that the State Department was very interested in showing Mexico some substantial progress, or at least interest, and they felt that Interior, particularly Reclamation Bureau, was dragging its heels a bit.

CARR: Yes, I recall that there was that general feeling and I don't remember the assistant secretary who was involved with the State Department, but there was a strong feeling on the part of the Reclamation Bureau that they knew the answers to the river and the State Department didn't, and, I think there was a certain amount of foot dragging there at times in getting the solutions.

MOSS: All right, on the Columbia River Treaty, it just seems to be a question of delays because of the failure of Canada to ratify. Was there anything else from

the point of view of Interior that was contributing to these delays?

CARR: No, I think we had a pretty good relationship there, when we had Charles Luce [Charles F. Luce] as administrator. In fact, I can remember one time when I was scheduled to speak in Spokane, to announce that we had reached agreement on certain phases of the development, and, the morning of the speech scheduled for about ten-thirty or eleven o'clock, at nine o'clock I received word that the agreement was off. I can remember that my speech before a large group—and I think Senator Magnuson [Warren G. Magnuson] was there—consisted primarily of telling jokes because I didn't have much else I could do under the circumstances, having just been notified the deal was off.

But we had, I think, with Bennett [Gordon R. Bennett] up there in British Columbia, and the Bonneville Power Commission, and all the others, a good relationship with Canada, and it was just a case that it was so complicated and each side trying to be sure their interest was protected. I think Chuck Luce and Ed Weinberg [Edward Weinberg], the former solicitor (associate solicitor for Water and Power), could probably give you much more information because they handled the details.

[-27-]

MOSS: Also with the State Department, there's an overlap on the question of the Trust Territories and possessions. The United Nations requires an annual report on the Trust Territory, and it's my understanding that the General Assembly on occasion makes noises asking for annual reports on Guam, Samoa, and the Virgin Islands as well. And that there was some to-do between Interior and State on this. Do you recall it? Joe Sisco [Joseph John Sisco] over at State, John Carver at Interior?

CARR: The concern of the State Department over the Trust Territories grew primarily from the fact that the Trust Territories did not receive regular attention from the Secretary but rather were under John Carver's supervision as assistant secretary. I say that because there were three times that I remember—I can't give you the dates—three times that I was scheduled to go out to the Trust Territories so that they could at least have the Under Secretary available, and something else happened where I was sent off to another assignment.

John Carver was intensely interested in the subject, did a good job, as far as I'm concerned. But I think it just grew out of the fact that, as it very often happens in these State Department affairs, where if you don't have the very top man there, they feel that it isn't receiving the attention that it should. And that moved along slowly. It's a very, very difficult problem and involved money.

MOSS: What is there that could have been done in the Trust Territory, for instance, to make things better? What's the basic problem?

CARR: Well, there was general public relations problem in the Trust Territories; I think that's what Carver said. And then when you realize the tremendous

expanse that they covered and the difficulty of getting to see these people and the time involved, there is only so much you can do in assuring each one of these groups that their interests are being heard.

Then when it comes to things like developing their resources, I can remember working personally trying to develop fishery resources, working with Assistant Secretary Briggs [Frank P. Briggs] and others. I was amazed at the time it took to talk to various commercial interests who might be interested. And then the difficulty of people not being trained to do the job that would be necessary if they were going to make it economically. It was just a tremendous big area with enormous number of variegated problems and not enough people to get around to do it.

[-28-]

MOSS: Was there any talk of the question of—again this goes to State Department and perhaps to Defense—the islands as a strategic interest of the United States, the question of a pullback perhaps from the Asian perimeter and bases in Saipan and whatnot, this kind of thing?

CARR: No, I don't remember any discussions of any consequence along those lines. There was more a feeling that we had a moral obligation to do something about this area that was under our trust and it was very difficult to do. And, some people worked really hard trying to get it done and this included members of Congress, Mike Kirwin [Michael J. Kirwin] and Wayne Aspinall [Wayne N. Aspinall].

MOSS: Did you make any attempts to turn studies, for instance, over to private groups, or to encourage studies by private and academic groups to work on the problem?

CARR: I don't recall too much of that.

MOSS: What about relations between Interior and the Bureau of the Budget? Sam Hughes [Philip Samuel Hughes], I guess, was the one who did more of the Interior work than any one else. What was the role of the Bureau, and did they have any particular lines that they were continually trying to foist on Interior? I know in several cases Budget has its own perspective on a problem and insists that thus and so be written into a bill just this way, and it sort of galls the Department. This kind of thing.

CARR: Well, there's no question that the Bureau of the Budget over a period of years starting back in the early forties, perhaps earlier, became a very strong group in government beyond anything that had been experienced just a few years earlier. Probably it's best illustrated when I was being interrogated by the Senate Committee [Senate Judiciary Committee] prior to their approval of my nomination as Under Secretary of the Interior, and Senator Anderson [Clinton P. Anderson] asked me, since I was from California and the Secretary was from Arizona, what would I do if I found myself in great conflict with the Secretary over the Colorado River question. And I said, "Well, if I reached a

point where I couldn't be the alter ego of the Secretary and speak on a matter of policy in good conscience, I'd resign." I said, "I would in effect be going against the policies set by the government." And he said, "Oh, don't worry about that. If you find yourself at complete odds with the administration on policy," he said, "you can go to work for the Bureau of the Budget." So I think that expresses it pretty well.

[-29-]

There were certain people in the Bureau of the Budget that were able through their knowledge to become quite strong and adhere closely to some particular views that they had, and it became pretty difficult at times for the Department to get through their views of a conflicting policy. But we had good relations. I had good personal relations with the fellows in the Bureau of the Budget, particularly Elmer Staats [Elmer B. Staats].

MOSS: Okay, where you talked about Congress there, let me ask you to reflect a moment on the way that congressional relations were handled by Interior. Were some noble successes or failures? And what about the people from Larry O'Brien's [Lawrence F. O'Brien] office? What's your estimate of the way that they were working with regard to Interior matters?

CARR: Well, the first part. We had, I think, good relations with certain people in the Congress because Secretary Udall had served in the Congress and understood how it functioned. There were, naturally, personality problems in the Congress and we had to at times be sure that we didn't send the wrong man up to the Hill in light of these conflicts. Some of the department heads were very good about looking out for their particular interests, almost too good at times as far as the overall department policy was concerned.

When it came to matters on appropriations, Secretary Beasley kept a very close touch with the Appropriations Committee [House Appropriations Committee], either Secretary Beasley or I went up to talk to Congressman Kirwin about it.

John Carver worked very closely with Congressman Aspinall and they had a good rapport. I also had a number of friends up there having been what is now called the staff director for the Interior for a short while. I served as a consultant for the Interior Committee in 1951 and 1952, and then when there was a change in the Eisenhower Administration [Dwight D. Eisenhower], I helped the chairman pull the committee together and the committee staff, and then reverted back to primarily consultant on water and power matters.

We all had our different relationships with the Congress. I'd say Secretary Udall spent more time on authorizing new programs. He took a great interest in trying to get the authorization bills through, and when it came to appropriations, very often we worked with department heads and Secretary Beasley and myself and others for appropriations.

MOSS: Do you recall an occasion when you gave a dinner for Mike Kirwin down at the Department?

[-30-]

CARR: Yes, I do. I don't remember the particular occasion but we all got together and put on a dinner for Mike Kirwin and members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations down in the basement of the Department in the cafeteria, a great event. I know that Mike was a fellow who appreciated that, and made a lot of joking remarks about how much this would mean to us in terms of appropriations because we were smart enough to recognize who was on the committee. [Interruption]

Yes, when I started to talk coal slurry pipelines, this process that was developed in the Bureau of Mines where you could keep it fluid and a high percentage of water and still burn, it looked like this might be feasible, and we did have some demonstrations that were feasible. Then the coal producers and the railroads got together and realized this was a threat and they began to talk "unitrains." And otherwise, you know, we'd have the coal cars buried and some other train, all of this meant additional cost. The net result was that we brought down the cost of energy.

At the same time we were working with the coal people, you had the nuclear power people working and trying to do something, they hadn't gotten too much momentum at that time. We had hydro competition in some areas, not an awful lot, and oil and gas. And it was a case of urging these various people to do the best they could and in some cases just let the chips fall.

I remember working real hard, for instance, trying to get a project down at Key West, a nuclear power project that would produce power and desalted water, and we lost out on that one, I think, on an oil plant. But there was a case where the cost of energy was lower. We probably achieved a good result by just saying this is the way we're going to do it.

The same thing occurred in the electric power field. We were the ones that promoted the first extra high voltage DC transmission of electricity. And, at the time, I sat next to Mr. Kennedy a member of the Edison Institute [Oklahoma Electric], who told me at lunch that I was silly to be even thinking in terms of these voltages and this kind of transmission of power and these distances, particularly the voltage distances. I think it was a month later his company announced that they were going to do it. Here was a case where we just pushed certain people into it.

MOSS: You also had, going on from that, that whole national grid concept. How was this projected in the Department? How did the power companies react to it?

[-31-]

CARR: Well, they reacted violently in places because it interfered with their own little domain, but there was no question that we were not keeping up technically with other countries in the world, notably Sweden, England, and the Soviet Union. That's one of the reasons that Secretary Udall and I went to the Soviet Union, was to see what they were doing and also, on the return trip, I took a smaller delegation to Sweden and to England.

MOSS: As an aside, since you mentioned the trip to the Soviet Union, what do you recall of that trip? Anything stand out in your mind in particular?

CARR: Well, there were a lot of things that stood out. One was, for me, a feeling of almost oppression. Not that people weren't trying to be gracious, but the whole atmosphere was one of lack of freedom. I think it was my reaction at times that some of the people with whom we traveled were intensely interested in what was going on in the United States because they couldn't get that information at home. For instance, photographs of our way of life, and automobiles, and homes, and children, and what people had and all, this wasn't for general publication in the Soviet Union and they were delighted to see photographs of life in America. And they asked us a number of different questions. But there was a kind of a "Big Brother's watching you" attitude on the whole trip, as far as I was concerned.

MOSS: Was there anything that they were doing that you felt was very worthwhile, very rational and logical that you brought back?

CARR: Oh yes. They were adopting some of the principles of the Swedish method of transmitting electric power at high voltages in a direct current. They also had their grid system all the way from Siberia through the Urals and Moscow, taking advantage of the different times of the day and the different power loads which was essentially what we were trying to do in some areas of the United States. This gave us some encouragement.

They, in dam construction, were doing things differently than we were to keep down costs. They had a lot of pre-cast concrete structures that the Reclamation Bureau didn't have in the United States. And so, I think there were any number of places we came back with things we saw them doing that deserved some more consideration on our part.

[-32-]

MOSS: Okay, let me move quickly to national parks. I'll tick off a number of these and ask you if you have any recollection that you think ought to be put on the record. There's, of course, the Cape Cod [Cape Cod National Seashore] one that President Kennedy had particular interest in; Padre Island [Padre Island National Seashore], a Johnson interest, I'm sure; Point Reyes [Point Reyes National Seashore] perhaps you had interest in that one; Cape Hatteras; Canyonlands [Canyonlands National Park]; the Rainbow Arch Preservation [Rainbow Bridge National Monument]; the Indiana Dunes [Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore] question; the Oregon Dunes [Oregon Dunes National Seashore]....

CARR: These fall into the category of what I said when I said Secretary Udall was primarily interested in authorizations of new areas, so he took the lead in almost all of these. On Cape Cod he worked closely with the President. As a result of that I did not have much to do with Cape Cod; there were a few things as acting Secretary, that's all. On Padre Island, that definitely was one between Vice President Johnson and Secretary Udall. I didn't even go to Padre Island; the secretary handled that. I did get involved in Fire Island [Fire Island National Seashore]...

MOSS: Yes. Yes.

CARR: ...at New York and made some proposals which were adopted by the Congress, and I testified on that bill.

MOSS: I notice now President Nixon [Richard M. Nixon] is going after a much wider New York harbor.

CARR: Well, that may be. We did the best we could...

MOSS: Yes.

CARR: ...under the circumstances, and I was the one who proposed the compromise to get the bill out.

MOSS: Yes. Yes.

CARR: On Point Reyes, yes, I did have a very personal interest in that one. There were a number of the people who were concerned about it and knew the area. I worked hard to see that it was developed, I handled a lot of the details of negotiations with people who were involved.

MOSS: What about Clem Miller's [Clement W. Miller] role in that?

[-33-]

CARR: Clem did a great job on that and was sort of the spokesman and was the rallying point of a number of conservationists who felt that Clem could carry the ball. And, let's see, you mentioned the dunes?

MOSS: Yes.

CARR: The Indiana Dunes, Secretary Udall worked completely on that. The same with Oregon. Almost all of those were his personal accomplishments.

MOSS: Do you have the same feeling about the question of the National Park Service and the White House and Mrs. Kennedy's [Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy] efforts, that this was primarily a Udall show?

CARR: Yes. I would say that that was.... That was the type of thing that he got really enthusiastic about, and the way we assisted him was carrying the ball on other things while he did that job.

MOSS: Yeah. Okay, let me move to Indians and the whole question of moving away

from Seaton's [Frederick A. Seaton] termination policy and bringing industry to reservations. How much did you get into this?

CARR: I got in that very little. A little bit on the accelerated public works programs and some ideas on what we should do. But here again was a special area of interest for Secretary Udall and certain other people in the Department and I had all the work I needed so I let them handle most of that.

MOSS: Okay. How much did you get into public lands, for instance, the moratorium on applications to control speculators early in the game?

CARR: I didn't get into that an awful lot as far as any decision making was concerned. I sat in on a number of meetings with Secretary Udall and Assistant Secretary Carver. I'd say John Carver carried the ball on that.

MOSS: And negotiating the grazing fee hike?

CARR: Yes, that was one in which he kept fairly close touch with some of the congressional leaders, and as you know, that was a kind of a difficult one politically. I assisted in meetings but I didn't have the final decision. I contributed here and there but not as much as Carver did.

[-34-]

MOSS: Okay, let me ask you about the Hanford Reactor question and the wheeling arrangements that were worked out and the whole northwest business, which are somewhat related. You have the seven-ten split on federal and private lines....

CARR: We used the Pacific Northwest [Pacific Northwest Power Company] power pool as something of a model. It could be done there and Chuck Luce was particularly successful in putting this together, and since I had more background in power and water, I did get fairly well involved. But, most of the time I came in with Chuck Luce being quarterback. In other words, we'd reach a certain point where it would be advisable for somebody from the Secretary's office be present or to make a speech, I was the one that spoke and gave the speech for and sold the Hanford Bonds. This was a case of where Chuck Luce and to some extent Secretary Holum [Assistant Secretary Kenneth Holum] would get this pulled together—primarily Luce—and then we would go to the Secretary and we would decide what it was that either he or I could do at the moment to keep things going. We were convinced we should work out a wheeling arrangement, we should optimize the investment that was made by both the federal government and the private industry.

MOSS: Okay. Our time is running long here. Let me just ask you to comment on the revision of standards for water and power projects, the replacement of Budget

Circular A-47 which would liberalize recent criteria.

CARR: Well, all I can say is that I was in it for years, off and on. It was an area where the private power companies were constantly working to change A-47 and get standards over at the Bureau of the Budget which would make it more difficult to develop federal hydro projects. That's what it boiled down to.

MOSS: Uh-huh. And finally with the support from the Democratic congressmen, Anderson and others, you got this through. As a Senate Document [Senate Document 97, 1962] not as a Budget Circular.

CARR: Yes. We managed to come out of it with some pretty good guidelines, but it was the same old power fight.

MOSS: Okay. Thank you very much. I won't take any more of your time.

[END OF INTERVIEW #2]

[-35-]

James K. Carr Oral History Transcript – JFK #2
Name Index

A

Anderson, Clinton P., 29
Aspinall, Wayne N., 29, 30

B

Beasley, D. Otis, 25, 30
Bennett, Gordon R., 27
Briggs, Frank P., 28

C

Carver, John A., Jr., 24, 26, 28, 30, 34
Crafts, Edward C., 22, 23

E

Eisenhower, Dwight D., 30

F

Freeman, Orville L., 21, 22

H

Hodges, Luther H., 25
Holum, Kenneth, 34
Hughes, Philip Samuel, 29

J

Johnson, Lyndon B., 25, 33

K

Kennedy, Jacqueline Lee Bouvier, 34
Kennedy, John F., 25, 33
Kennedy, Mr., 31
Kirwan, Michael J., 29, 30, 31

L

Luce, Charles F., 27, 35

M

Magnuson, Warren G., 27
McDermott, Edward A., 25, 26
Miller, Clement W., 33, 34

N

Nixon, Richard M., 33

O

O'Brien, Lawrence F., 30

P

Pincot, Gifford, 21

S

Seaton, Frederick A., 34
Sisco, Joseph John, 28
Staats, Elmer B., 30

U

Udall, Stewart L., 21, 22, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33,
34, 35

W

Weinberg, Edward, 27
Wirth, Conrad L., 24