

Mr. DADDARIO. Well, I think it is important for us to discuss it. I didn't take it really that that was what you intended to mean.

I agree with you, it is important. This committee finds generally that when we have a request such as this come before us from the administration, that there is a great deal more to it than either they or we originally saw. We have tried to feed into these hearings as much thinking as we possibly could, so that we might be able to generate around it the kind of support through testimony such as yours, which will have a meaningful effect on the other Members of Congress. I do agree with you that it is a very important subject.

We have had the recommendation made to us, as an example, sometime in the past by one of the witnesses that we ought to be developing at this time the scientific and technical capabilities which the country now has available in the field of theoretical ecology.

Dr. RAY. Yes.

Mr. DADDARIO. This fitted in with social science in a very strong way.

What is the feeling amongst you about where we stand now in this whole area? What do we need to do? Why do we need to do it? How many people ought to be trained? How far away are we from having the kind of national capability that we need in this whole field of biology and ecology?

Dr. RAY. That is a loaded question and difficult for me to answer. I think we are quite a way from accomplishing this myself. But I must define the way that I personally think about these things.

I have been involved in the field, for instance, of conservation for a long time. Not all scientists are essentially conservationists or vice versa. Now, immediately, when you take in the field of conservation you bring in the social sciences and a certain amount of consciousness, rightly or wrongly, about the effects of what you are doing biologically.

It appears to me that the biggest problem we face is not the solution of why a river is being polluted, for instance, or what happens to a bit of atomic waste dumped in the north and how far it takes to go south. This can be found out—well, it can't be found out quite that authoritatively, but eventually that data can come and we have a nice report sitting on our desk. The problem is what are we doing about it? Now, here is the place you pointed out, and Mr. Brown, it is well and good to find out about these problems, but it is like birth control in India. What exactly do we do about it? How do we integrate this body of knowledge? And here is where I think the IBP has its major role, not only in data gathering and data processing but possibly putting before various agencies, from State to international, the information that they need to solve some of the very great social problems. Because the IBP is all about human welfare. This is the place we lag. Perhaps there should be an international social sciences to go along with the IBP, I don't know.

I suspect we are going to have to come to that. I think the scientific technicians as well as scientific personnel will always rise to meet a demand. I believe we are going to be able to train the number of people in all sciences as these demands come up; even marine science, which lags far behind. I am in underwater marine science, diving, and vehicles, and such things. We don't have very many technicians, but they are proliferating at a fantastic rate.