

the programs could be supported. You seem to have no great disapproval with that, Dr. Cain. All the agencies could then be put together. In that way you would have a responsibility to see that it doesn't sprawl out. As I think about it, it would seem to me that it would be perfectly manageable in that way.

Dr. CAIN. Another need is for holding the U.S. National Committee together and in existence and we are now talking about—

Mr. DADDARIO. I am not trying to get rid of it.

Dr. CAIN. I know. Perhaps 80 people are involved through the parent committee and the nine sections officially and directly involved. It has been this mechanism that has been able to finance and to sponsor and to help organize the various meetings out of which the sectional programs have matured. It has brought the people together to interact, to think together, to rub ideas off on one another and come out with something to do which can be done and is worth doing. Part of the job isn't the doing itself. The first part goes to the concepts of what it is about. The second part goes to how are we going to do it; what methodology we are going to settle on if our data is not standardized. This applies to our own scientists of various disciplines as well as it does between nations. There is this continuing need for these conferences and symposiums as data comes in; you never do it exactly the best way at the start. You need the national committee for purposes of helping the evolution of the program as we go down the road and begin to find out the meaning of the scientific data we are gathering, maybe the gaps that were overlooked and some deficiencies in the use.

I would envision that the international committee needs to continue throughout the life of the IBP. It is not big money in terms of the whole amount, it is 1 percent for administration.

Mr. DADDARIO. You are talking about the life of the IBP. How do you see this funding grow from this point on? How long do you believe that it will be effective? How do you step out of the picture?

Dr. CAIN. I think there are two comments on this. The national committee planning for the second phase, which is the active research phase, is in terms of 5 years. We are not looking down the road any further than that.

The other point is that the IGY was called the International Geophysical Year. Some of the consequences are still going. They validated themselves. The Congress and the people recognized this was worth further support. It is my personal feeling that the IBP banner will be irrelevant after the first 5 years. We won't need this special identification.

Mr. DADDARIO. Which is an additional reason for supporting this kind of funding.

Dr. CAIN. It is a good deal of money to call seed money but in effect it is this sort of thing. If it proves its worth, it will continue to flourish.

Mr. DADDARIO. You touched earlier on the criticism there was through administering this program by bringing moneys in from the various agencies and there was some budgetary argument against doing it. What is your suggestion to meet that argument?

Dr. CAIN. You mean an identifying pool for IBP?

Mr. DADDARIO. Yes, as I understand some of your remarks—