

ever, if I may, that on page 10, for example, the five programs on which a dollar sign has been placed—these have been planned by the national committee in sections. There are others which haven't matured to this stage of planning. Then when we are referring to the research project proposals which have come in from individuals—small teams—this figure is based on the record of the first 5 months of 1967.

There are two points to emphasize.

One is that the scientific community has gotten tremendously excited about this as something worth doing. These are already all busy men. They have been doing science. That is their life.

Now, they want to do this sort of thing. Some of them have been doing this and see an opportunity to do more. Others have perhaps been in other activities and want to get on this because it is exciting to them and looks very much worth doing.

Then, the bulk of the rest of the testimony is devoted to a few examples of past experience of U.S. and other governments where there have been costly mistakes because of the absence of ignoring of fundamental ecological knowledge. We would like in the future to help avoid these kinds of mistakes.

Then, there is some discussion of cases in which there are current questions before us where I, in my testimony, feel that we are not at the present moment giving adequate attention to the ecological aspects of our operations. For example, there is a case on page 16 in which I referred to the Commission studying a sea-level canal somewhere around the Isthmus of Panama or somewhere around North and South America.

I was very much impressed a year or so ago by the unconcern for the probable consequences of what they were talking about doing, both in terms of biology in the sea-level connection between two oceans that have been separated for millions of years of geological time and the consequences, if they were to dig this ditch by atomic crater.

In other words, the ramifying changes of things which happen when you do something like this simply were being ignored or largely ignored. There are other examples here. I don't want to emphasize them.

I mention one right in our own department and I will say we have been talking about it for several months and that is the weather modification problem. The early work on weather modification and this program as a research and experimental pilot program has grown in the last 4 or 5 years up to \$5 or \$6 million a year and it is only in the last 2 months that any attention has been paid to the consequences, as to whether you can make it operational or not.

I am talking about the consequences with respect to natural vegetation, with respect to agriculture, with respect to the general economy of regions. Heaven knows the legal problems that might arise from it. I feel that there are many things right now in Government that deserve an ecological kind of thinking about the problem, which means that you put your emphasis upon the interrelation among things in systems.

My summary turned out to be as long as my testimony, I am afraid.

Mr. DADDARIO. Well, we are pleased to have it and I might say that you find yourself in complete agreement with your Commission.