

very clearly to the American people in 1960—that resources do not fit in compartments. Nature is one system, and, therefore, the case for a Department of Natural Resources is much stronger today than it was previously.

I still get back to the fact that I think the best way we help produce a Department of Natural Resources is to have it evolve, and the best way to have it evolve is to have people understand, as you are trying to help them understand, what the rationale and the logic is in terms of governmental organization.

Secretary UDALL. NO, Senator. I was indicating that, if the Corps of Engineers people feel that perhaps we should carry on the recreational function, I think we ought to give serious consideration to this. Maybe this is a sound idea, but I have not gotten into this in any depth. Until I can sound my own people out—and I think I should—I would not want to give you a flip answer here in terms of what I think should be done.

Senator Moss. Well, as I understood it, this was more a suggestion by the Secretary of the Army, that they might well like to be rid of these functions in the recreation area, and I wanted to point out that we do not necessarily leave recreation management with those who construct the reservoir, because we are busily creating national recreation areas around our reservoirs.

Senator Hansen and I were sitting in on a hearing yesterday on that very subject. And if the National Park Service is organized so that it can operate a recreation area in Glen Canyon or Whiskeytown, or wherever else, I do not see why it would not be equipped to take on the recreation functions of the Corps' reservoirs.

Secretary UDALL. Well, my initial reaction is that we perhaps should do this. I am not negative on it at all, but I do not want to commit my Department until I have had a chance for everybody to be heard but I

has come up recently on the Little Dell project out of Salt Lake City?

Secretary UDALL. Senator, I have just followed it at a distance. I