

Chairman MORGAN. Any further questions?

The Chair wants to state that we have no requests to be heard from any outside witnesses. We had a telephone call the other day from the Friends Committee on National Legislation, who want to appear in support of the Agency. They sent me a letter. We will ask them to file a statement. I remember 2 years ago we had representatives of the Atomic Energy Commission here, as well as the CIA, the Defense, and the State Departments testify.

I don't see any reason why that type of testimony would be valuable this year. I do not believe that there is any doubt whether the other agencies supported this Agency.

I think that issue was well covered in the testimony in 1963. If you want Mr. Foster back for further questioning, if you feel you have further questions, I am sure he will be available. If not, the Chair would like to proceed with the markup of the bill as soon as possible.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. The only thought I have, Mr. Chairman, do you think we will have any trouble on the floor with the 4-year as compared to the 2-year?

Chairman MORGAN. We have to fight that out when we go into executive session for the markup of the bill. I think the Director and the President both feel strongly that it should be a 4-year authorization. I had consultations with the Director in December.

I know they are convinced that this will help in strengthening the research part of the program, as in keeping key personnel. I think this is to be decided when we go into executive session.

The bill as you know is very short. The amount of money to be authorized is the entire bill.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. There is a question I want to ask before we leave. First I would like to say, Mr. Foster, I would be one of the last as a Member of Congress, or in any other capacity, to discourage research. I know it is necessary, and necessary in your Agency.

Yet I know and feel, and I think many Members of Congress feel that in many agencies of Government a lot of money is wasted under the label of research.

Doesn't our total Government research figure run about \$13 or \$14 billion out of the total budget?

How do you go about determining the type of research contracts you will negotiate? Who do you have in your setup to negotiate these contracts and what are the qualifications of those individuals in determining the kind of research projects to contract for?

Research budgets can grow and grow and one of these days you could be spending more and more money on matters that are not as relevant as they ought to be to arms control.

For example, Mr. Farbstein and others were concerned about your making studies as to the economic impact of closing military installations. I think enough agencies are already in existence to do that sort of thing. It ought to be done by some agency. I can conceive of situations where in carrying out the purpose of the act you might be called upon to make a study as to the advisability from a defense standpoint of closing certain installations, strategic ones and so forth.

But I wonder if you could just give us a little fuller picture of just how you go about this business of making decisions as to the type of research contracts you enter into and how far you will go.