

know that it would be difficult, taking into consideration the types of projects which are involved suggested and the many more which will be coming in, to come up with some kind of a figure. But what are you contemplating here as a mixture, that is which way the great amount of funding be spent?

Dr. GALLER. Mr. Chairman, I don't mean to beg the question in terms of a proportion; I would like instead to offer a suggestion.

First of all, after listening both to the witnesses before this subcommittee and some of the discussions at the U.S. IBP National Committee and the subcommittee levels, I have been impressed with the kind of Indian rubber fiscal yardstick that we have been using, one that stretches from \$10, \$20 million, to \$100 million plus.

I feel that the U.S. National Committee and its subcommittees must develop a "hard" priority list of projects. I hasten to add, there does exist a list of scientifically meritorious projects that have been culled from the many that have been proposed. These projects that are now being advocated for support are all highly interesting, scientifically.

However, although I am not a fiscal expert, I do appreciate the tight money situation that we find ourselves in and I recognize from a practical point of view that we will have to be highly selective in implementing the many meritorious proposals that have come before the U.S. National Committee.

What I am suggesting is that before we accept any of the fiscal estimates that have been presented to this subcommittee, we should seek concrete evidence that there has been a hard, searching assessment of the proposals that have been put forth, to insure that only those proposals that are of overriding scientific importance have been selected and serve as the basis for the fiscal estimate for the U.S. IBP.

Secondly, as far as the R. & D. agencies are concerned, it has already been pointed out that they are supporting a number of IBP-related projects that are related to the agencies' missions. These projects will be supported whether or not they receive the blessings of the IBP because they are primarily mission oriented.

Many of these projects are indeed closely associated with IBP objectives and will augment the core program of the IBP but they are independent of the IBP. I would not be prepared, Mr. Chairman, to suggest a percentage breakdown of support directly for the IBP and support through the various agencies, unless the agencies first commit themselves to direct support, financially, of the IBP.

Through the IGY, if we were to look back to the IGY I think we would discover that a very substantial part of the support came from the R. & D. agencies.

Mr. DADDARIO. Well, then, if we take what you have said, you have no serious opposition to the mission-oriented agencies finding themselves involved in this program?

Dr. GALLER. Absolutely not, sir.

Mr. DADDARIO. Would you look with horror on our getting this program off the ground by the participation of these agencies, even on what appears to be a haphazard basis? We might not be able to originally make a determination as to the amount of funding, but might use it as the means through which we could give impetus to further funding in the future. I am not talking about far off in the future, but when