

Executive Office Commission, The Tennessee Valley Authority.

3. The scattering of program responsibility among Departments has resulted in a welter of confusion and cross-purposes. This applies both to the development of consistent legislative policy and to program administration. This is especially important at the local level. This situation is spectacularly inefficient and actually dangerous to the public interest in our divided water programs. The present responsibilities of the Federal Government put great strains on the budget. Yet competition among agencies "to get business" contributes to inefficient water resource development and waste of public funds. Water resource development, instead of taking place within a framework of consideration of national objectives and resources, takes place as a result of "logrolling" and "pork-barrel" politics. This is tragic when one considers the expanding demands for water-derived products as well as for all other natural resources.

4. Many conflicts arise because of the special interests of the various agencies. A typical situation in water resource development would find the Corps of Engineers (Defense) concerned with river basin planning and flood control; Soil Conservation Service (Agriculture) concerned with watersheds; Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife (Interior) concerned with fish habitat and recreation.

Attempts to resolve these conflicts have been made. One popular device has been the establishment of interagency coordinating committees in Washington and on local levels. Nevertheless, lacking any central authority short of the President, the member Bureau and Department representatives on these permissive committees are unable to resolve basic conflicts of interest. Line-operating authority disputes cannot be reconciled by dissection. The President's explanation of his decision to offer a Special Message of Natural Resources revealed his concern with the problem of coordination. He said:

"This statement is designed to bring together in one message the widely scattered resource policies of the Federal Government. In the past, these policies have overlapped and often conflicted. Funds were wasted on competing efforts. Widely differing standards were applied to measure the Federal contribution to similar projects. Funds and attention devoted to annual appropriations or immediate pressures diverted energies away from long-range planning for national economic growth. Fees and user charges wholly inconsistent with each other, with value received and with public policy have been imposed at some Federal developments."³

The President pledged action in his Special Message to redefine resource responsibilities within the Executive Office, strengthen the Council of Economic

¹ Hoover Comm.—Report on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, 267 (1949).

² H.R. Doc. No. 255, 86th Cong., 2d Sess. (1960).

³ Address on Natural Resources, N.Y. Times, Feb. 24, 1961, p. 12, col. 1.