

I think these are not just pulled out of a hat. What is left here has been cut down through the action of a research council, which includes all of the proponents for various parts of research, and we could have a research program here which would be twice this much and it would be a good program, in my opinion.

But these are cut back in various places. And I might say in response to the question on economics, we have increased the economic studies substantially over what they have been in past years. But the reason for the 4-year long-range program is we can't get all the answers in 1 year, due both to the need of making breakthroughs and follow-ons and findings and also due to the limitations of financial availabilities.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Thank you very much.

Chairman MORGAN. Any further questions?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MORGAN. Mr. Gross.

Mr. GROSS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to know what your accomplishments have been since the last time you were here? I haven't heard you state in specific terms your actual accomplishments.

Mr. FOSTER. We have no agreements since the last time that we were here that have been negotiated. We have put forward and developed a number of ways in which we believe the objectives of the bill can be carried out better.

The President's program, the five points that were put forward in January, the most significant proposals for arms reduction that have ever been made by any nation, were developed through this research program and through the activities of this Agency.

They have not been accepted by the Soviet Union. They have not been accepted because, for example, the proposal of stopping the production of nuclear delivery vehicles and limiting the development of the characteristics of them is novel and requires inspection.

If we did not have this program, we could build 400 or 500 additional nuclear delivery vehicles in the course of the next 2 years which may cost in the order of \$10 or \$15 billion. If we do get an acceptance of this phrase, there would be at least the possibility of this sort of saving.

We are talking of one-tenth of 1 percent of an investment in here which could conceivably result in a savings of these billions of dollars. This has been put forward at Geneva. It has been discussed in detail. We have had much give-and-take between ourselves and the other side on this. We did get in April a simultaneous announcement of the cutback of the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes on the part of the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union—the planned production.

We did get the education further of participants in Geneva in this field. We did put forward three other possibilities, the comprehensive test ban and we did make a great deal of additional progress in what might develop in the future—

Mr. GROSS. When you say "we" are you taking all the credit for what you claim—

Mr. FOSTER. I am telling you what the Agency has done. We don't take full credit for any of this.