

This must be recognized as only one part of what we are after. The other part—and I would say a larger and in many ways a more important part—is that which will be carried out by nongovernmental scientists.

Undoubtedly, in many cases there will be cooperation between the two sectors of our scientific public. What I would like to make specific here is that the national committee itself, particularly as the nine sections have developed program concepts and as they have tried to put boundaries on them so that they don't sprawl all over the field of biological science, they are developing multidisciplinary programs with good plans and good focus which will in each case be largely nongovernmental—whether it is the polar study or the Hawaiian study or the river basin study, or whichever one of these identified action area programs it is.

Then, the third phase of the program that is developing is a very gratifying interest of individual scientists to put forward projects which are part of IBP. The scientist as an individual feels that here is a place where he can do something along this line, that this is the kind of research he wants to do, and that it is IPB-related.

So, the third part is projects put in by individual scientists or small teams in a given laboratory as distinct from the programs that have been designed by the national committee itself.

And the Federal ability to assist this work of non-Federal science is in some instances very limited.

The ability to make grants or contracts for getting something done that would be part of IBP is limited in some of the Federal agencies and in some cases where it is crucial to their purposes it is limited.

One of the problems that I see is how do we get the money for more adequate support for IBP research for nongovernment science?

Mr. DADDARIO. You feel if the funds are available you would get a strong reaction as to important projects?

Dr. CAIN. We know that. We have had 89 proposals come in in which the authors feel what they proposed to do was part of the IBP program.

Then, judgments are made and out of the whole array there is some whittling down as is normal.

This is by the national committee and then the funding agency as they decide on the comparative scientific merit. The history of the first 5 months of this year is that these 80 proposals were cut in half again, down to about a quarter of the number and dollar value by the granting agencies.

To wind this point up, as far as I wish to make it, I hope that some way or another we will find new money for the traditional granting agencies who are in the business of supporting nongovernmental research. I think that is the point. How it is to be done is another matter. I don't know how it should be done.

Mr. DADDARIO. Without going into it, you have, then, obviously established an evaluating process.

Dr. CAIN. Yes, we have that in the national committee and the granting agencies have their procedures which are well established.

There are some figures on page 10 of my prepared statement, I don't see any particular point in going into them. I would emphasize, how-