

Advisers for this purpose, and establish a Presidential Advisory Committee on Natural Resources under the Council of Economic Advisers.

6. Present divisions have no logical justification. With respect to the land resource agencies now in the Department of Agriculture, the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service, the supposed justification for the former agency is that "trees are crops," and for the latter that farm lands suffer the most from erosion. Neither claim has validity in fact.

Most Forest Service activity is centered on the management of 180 million acres of public lands, the national forests; that which is directed towards private forestry assistance is kept completely separate from all regular farm crop programs and is not even integrated with Soil Conservation plans on the same ownership. At least half of the private forest lands on which assistance is given are held by non-farm landowners. Even the Forest Service research function is separate from the Agricultural Research Service.

The Soil Conservation Service program is also unrelated to other Agriculture Department efforts. It is concerned with practices for the protection of the basic soil resource, regardless of ownership. It is not integrated with other farm programs concerned primarily with production, marketing, price, and supply regulation. Some of the most serious erosion problems are connected with new highways and suburban developments and have no relationship to farm land. Rapidly developing new programs and old programs in conflict of many points with programs inaction will result in embarrassment to the Administration.

7. Lacking any central responsibility at the cabinet level for resources policy and management, the Bureau of the Budget is forced into the role of coordinator and arbiter between the various agencies. Probably in no other area of federal responsibility does the Budget Bureau exercise so strong an influence and leverage over programming.

The present role of the Budget Bureau exceeds its normal responsibilities. Given the present structure of Federal natural resource activities, it has been the only agency which has any interest in, or capability for, developing a truly national resource program. This is particularly important for the development of new programs. New needs require new activities. The evaluation of goals and means to meet these goals require specialized attention and expertise that cannot be provided by fiscal specialists in the Bureau of the Budget.

8. Natural resource agency appropriations are developed as a group by the Bureau of the Budget and (since 1954) the House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees, regardless of the fact that functional agencies are scattered among many Departments. The legislative committees in the Congress continue to divide responsibilities along older but less consistent lines.

9. Federal organization of resource activities is in sharp contrast to the organization of those states with the most successful conservation programs. These States, *e.g.*, Michigan, New York, Wisconsin and Minnesota, have single departments which embrace all phases of resource management under central direction.

10. Federal organization of resource activities is also in sharp contrast to the organization of other major Federal programs. Every other sector of federal responsibility, *e.g.*, labor, agriculture, health, foreign affairs, is assigned to a single governmental Department, which is publicly understood to have central authority. This concentration of authority give citizens a sense of involvement