

In November, under the Environmental Physiology Subcommittee of IBP we will hold in Caracas, Venezuela, two conferences to plan cooperative research between biologists in this country and biologists in Latin America. One of these will be directed toward the characteristics of the so-called weed species. I am using this in the sense of the English sparrow as a weed, eucalyptus as a weed; any kind of organism that has been able to follow man around the world and therefore become a pest is a weed in this concept.

We don't know very much about the characteristics of these things that make them weeds, and South America is full of these weeds just as is North America; in many cases, the same species.

We will have South Americans and North Americans identifying their counterparts in planning actual research programs. My own interest is in something related to this: the problems of convergent evolution in similar environments.

This gives us an understanding of how these ecosystems we are talking about have evolved, because in South America we have areas that are very comparable in their physical environment to North America. Many of the organisms that live there are very similar in ecological niche; but the ecosystems may be developed in part from different stocks of plants and animals that have evolved similar niches.

Again we are going to set up cooperative programs with the people in South America. Again this will take money. But I think there is a big spinoff from this kind of effort in simply upgrading biological science in Latin America, upgrading our own relations with Latin American biologists. The relations with South American biologists are fine; the communication is terrible in my experience. The people there are enthusiastic about these programs, and I see a chance to perhaps avoid a possible Vietnam, for example, in South America simply by developing this kind of liaison with these people, this kind of cooperative research. I am not talking about expeditions down there to collect specimens. I am talking about working cooperatively with these people. There is a big difference in their minds.

These are the kinds of things that are in the mill right now and this is why I am more optimistic than Dr. Ripley about IBP.

Now there are aspects of IBP that have simply consisted of identifying on-going research and the Government agencies identifying individual projects by various people and saying well, this fits what we are talking about in IBP so this is part of our IBP program. Well, I think this is pure bookkeeping.

What I am thinking about is these programmatic things that could not be done without a big effort, and these are the ones that will cost money.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Brown.

Mr. BROWN. Looking at the statement which Dr. Blair has submitted—on page 4, the last paragraph—I think we have a key which, in my opinion at least, can establish the base for justification of the funding when he says that:

The IBP effort of the United States can serve as an effective umbrella for many of the proposed activities related to environmental quality and baseline environmental studies with which the Congress is currently concerned. Vir-