diseases in which the insects are the vectors, are carried with them.

We are working closely with the meteorologists to develop a cooperative program between biologists and meteorologists to study these problems of dispersal and transportation and the viability of different kinds of airborne organisms.

This particularly appeals to me because it is something like oceanography. As you may know, the oceanographers are interested in a group of organisms called plankton that float in the ocean and are moved around by the ocean currents. This is a project to study atmospheric plankton, which both the meteorologists and the biologists up to now have pretty much neglected.

Still another major program is the one that Dr. Smith is the director of, and this bears directly on the problems you were talking about, Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago: The problems of pollution of our lakes, our rivers, and our streams, and how they are affected by what happens on the land.

Dr. Smith is interested in using the most modern techniques of systems analysis and computerism to study the interactions between the plants and animals on the land and the plants and animals in the water, how they affect the environment and how the environment affects them, particularly what ecologists call the flow of energy through the system, which is quite different than it is in a cultivated field, for example.

These are four quite diverse programs, the Hawaiian project to study the interaction between the peculiar island species and the new species, the airborne biological materials program, the study of the polar peoples, and the study of drainage basins and ecosystems. And we are trying to develop other similar programs: One that has just come up deals with the times of the year at which different biological events occur in different places, what is called phenology.

Now, we might talk a little about organization, what we hope to do, and how much it is going to cost.

As I stated, there is a national committee under the aegis of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering. It has a counterpart in the Federal Government: The Interagency Coordinating Committee for the International Biological Program. Dr. Carlson here is the chairman of that committee, representing the National Science Foundation, and it has representatives from AEC, Agriculture, HEW, Defense, Interior, Smithsonian Institution, NASA, and other Federal agencies.

One of our problems is financial support. This goes beyond the resolution, but if I may, I would like to take advantage of this forum to say something about it: At the present time all projects under the IBP go to the regular granting agencies like the National Science Foundation or the National Institutes of Health, simply as projects. We do not say whether they are good or bad. We simply say that we think they are relevant to the IBP, they will benefit by international cooperation, and they fit into our program. But we do not try to say whether they are good or bad projects. It is the prerogative and the duty of these granting agencies themselves to evaluate them from the quality point of view.