

are so similar in application as to make it more than to split authority. Further, the goals and objectives of the public and private programs are so intertwined that the programs should not be separated administratively.

III. HOW IT SHOULD BE DONE

How should reorganization of the federal natural resource agencies take place? Three possible choices present themselves for centralizing natural resources responsibilities:

1. *Minimum.*—Minimum transfer of principal resource agencies and programs now in other Departments to the Department of the Interior with the exception of the *construction* functions of the Army Corps of Engineers. (The planning and water research functions would, however, be transferred to a water development bureau in the Interior.)

This approach would be simply a recognition of the political power of the Corps of Engineers and a means of avoiding their bare-knuckled pressures. It would leave unresolved the problem of coordination of water management and development programs. Although the planning function would be transferred, the Corps would soon find a way to revive this power. In any case the division of responsibilities between the two Departments would continue to result in waste and friction, and inhibit realistic programming in this vital field.

2. *Coordinating committees.*—Another possibility is to have a Council of Resource Advisers and a River Basin Coordinating Council. These are attempts to obtain unification through compromise by establishing another "coordinating" layer between the President and his executive action agencies. Presumably, planning, research, and reconciliation of conflicts would be assigned to river

ment of Natural Resources. This would be similar to the Council of Economic The cleanest and most effective procedure would be to transfer all resource functions to Interior and then to concentrate all efforts to gain congressional acceptance. Offsetting the pressure groups opposed to this transfer will be several hundreds of conservation and other organizations which will support complete reorganization. This will take generalship, strategy, and an effective information effort during the 60-day period of grace during which Congress may deny the President's action.⁵

The attached organization chart sets forth the "model" or organization of the new Department of Natural Resources.⁷

The Reorganization Act of 1949⁸ gives the President power to transfer outside agencies to Interior by Executive Order. Legislative authority would be needed to change the name of Interior to Department of Natural Resources.

The organization of resource activities resulting from these proposed changes would centralize all responsibility for development and management of natural resource programs (except for the T.V.A.) in a Secretary of Natural Resources. The Secretary would have an Under Secretary and staff assistants for program coordination, public affairs, and so forth. There would also be an advisory board on natural resource policy with the Secretary as chairman. Regional or river

⁵ Reorganization Act of 1949, 1 U.S.C. § 133z (1949).

⁶ Note 5 supra, § 133z-4.

⁷ See chart appended.

⁸ Note 5 supra.