agement problem. This is the reason for the program to go to a Department of Natural Resources. This to me was the best argument for doing that.

As times change, as thinking changes, we will probably see the movement of activities in and out of the Department, but I think this will be done on a pragmatic, piece-by-piece basis.

The Congress last year—and this subcommittee was involved—created a new Department of Transportation, yet this was not a mere what we have a status quo situation. It certainly has not been any status quo business as far as my Department is concerned in the last few years. It has been a very dynamic situation. Whether we change the name or not, I think my Department, as I said at the outset, is more a Department of Natural Resources than any government that I am familiar with has today. And I think that this process will continue. How it evolves will depend on the judgment of this committee, on the feelings of the people of the country, and on what kind of organization we want our Government to have.

Having said that and exposed some vulnerable points, Mr. Chairman, I think I will rest my initial statement on that.

PUBLIC DISCUSSIONS ARE ESSENTIAL

Senator RIBICOFF. I followed your argument, Mr. Secretary, and I gather that you like the idea of Department of Natural Resources. I also gather, since everybody is against you and you cannot get the approval of the President and the Bureau of the Budget, that you feel you might as well do the best you can with an unhappy situation, as far as you personally are concerned. This is what I sense from what you said.

However, be that as it may, I [illegible]

I think we should look at this, and I was interested in that they proposed it.

Senator RIBICOFF. One of the values of a hearing such as this is that pieces of services come out in greater focus.

Now, basically, the Corps of Engineers does an outstanding job. I