

out being specific, it is not good in practice to force such large enterprises as IBP to go begging to agencies which too often have their own interests to defend and which do not like doing the bookkeeping and financing for other agencies.

No; I do not suggest or even foresee the creation of another empire. But I do see the need to fund world problems differently than more local ones, and I do see the absolute necessity for putting some toothy funds behind House Concurrent Resolution 273, which endorsed the IBP. I'm afraid we are going to look pretty silly if we don't. The conflicts of interest will be too obvious and the program will not, I would venture to say, achieve wide support from the biologists.

The funds most needed are those for ecological and other field-oriented research, for training of personnel, and for data-sorting centers. There should be a real effort made to keep the overhead minimal and Parkinsonism at bay. As things stand today, however, the IBP has no real teeth, can endorse, but not fund, and cannot possibly do the job it has set out. It is a bit like trying to build a good pie with 100 bakers directed by a committee. The IBP's pie needs the vintage fruits of research from an oven stoked with the wherewithal of a congressional appropriation.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Brown.

Mr. BROWN. I would be interested to know, if you have thought about it, to what extent do you feel that the IBP could be supported by the mission-oriented agencies in contrast with the more general types of support that you are discussing here? Is there a percentage that you could pick out of the air?

Would you say that perhaps 20 or 50 percent of the program could be supported by the mission-oriented agencies?

Dr. RAY. I really don't know, sir. I must point out that I am a biologist with not too much administrative background and I have to phrase my answers in that context.

I would be hesitant to pick a percentage. I think that this will come from the proposals that are received by the IBP itself.

It may be that the IBP National Committee can very well direct a proposal to an appropriate agency which has within its scope the funding of such a program. It may be, as is the case with some that I know of and am connected with, that there is no appropriate agency.

I think it would be a little premature for me to say exactly what that proportion might be.

As you pointed out earlier, in discussing the matter with Dr. Galler, there is international cooperation among scientists anyway. There will continue to be international communication, IBP or not. However, some programs, as those having to do, for instance, with marine mammal population, with which I am connected, can't be funded through any single agency I know of.

Mr. BROWN. We have discussed in this committee the ways of handling this administratively. I guess the most often referred to process would be through the National Science Foundation and then through the Foundation to the committee or to other groups that would be interested. Do you see any problems in connection with funding that would go through these channels, specifically the National Science Foundation?