

Dr. GALLER. Yes, sir, I quite agree, Mr. Chairman.

I hope that I have not given the impression that I am not well impressed with the programs in ecology and environmental science that have been initiated by the several Federal agencies. Quite to the contrary, I am impressed. I am very pleased to see the initiatives that have developed in the Department of Interior, in the Atomic Energy Commission, in the Office of Naval Research and in the National Science Foundation. With the exception of the National Science Foundation, however, these programs of ecological assessment are essentially agency-focused programs. They address themselves to the solutions of problems that fall within the missions of the several agencies.

The IBP offers us the fabric to construct the canopy of a truly national program, and more than a national program, a national ecology policy that we do not have at present.

Mr. DADDARIO. Well, I don't know that I would be as you so laudatory about the programs which the mission-oriented agencies have in this field. I think they are doing a great deal of work which is helpful. At the same time, I fail to see, in our atomic energy program, for example, the development of a capability which does in fact predict the consequences of these changes. We have had numerous people come before us giving testimony as to the consequences of these activities, and their inability to come to any determination as to whether they are good or bad. I just wonder if you ought to be so satisfied?

Dr. GALLER. I am not satisfied, Mr. Chairman, but I do feel that in general the agencies are doing an excellent job.

Even if we are given all the money requested and assigned the best scientific resources available, it does not necessarily follow that we will come out with answers to difficult problems except over an extended period of time. Some of the consequences that we are discussing today really will not fully reveal themselves except over extended periods of time. So that is a factor to be considered in reviewing existing research programs.

But there is much more that must be done, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen, that is not being done. I voice my personal prejudices and enthusiasms when I express the view that unless we recognize that ecology deserves a major investment at the national level, we will continue with this present patchwork arrangement that is unsatisfactory for solving national problems that transcend the missions of any single agency, public or private.

Mr. DADDARIO. I would agree that it will take us a long period of time to determine the nature of the consequences if we continue to follow the same line of approach as we are now in the habit of doing. But if we, during the course of the development of our technology, determine that a consequence could come and that it will take us a long time to make a determination to its effect, in most instances adverse, there ought to be built into the research at that time the ability to eliminate the ill side effects.

I don't believe that we are doing a good job in this particular area. We are allowing things to happen about which we have no knowledge and we make no planning to enumerate it at its source. The point