

ones that we want to submit proposals are the busiest people, the most informed people. We have organizations who would like to bid on every one of our projects, but we don't want their bids, necessarily.

As a matter of fact, some of them we don't even invite. We have a selective list to whom we send our requests for proposals, only those who we think can adequately perform. If we sent out a request for proposals on an "iffy" basis that we might not have the money, we fear that the busy people, whom we really want to attract, would say, "Well, we are not going to waste our time on this. We have better things to devote out time to." And the ones that we don't want to attract would be the very ones who would want to speculate and would be willing to come in with proposals, and then they would build in extra dollars into their proposal to take care of the time that they might lose by reason of us not getting the money.

So we think, in the long run, we can accomplish our program better, more efficiently, by doing it the way we outlined.

Senator CHURCH. I think that that is an ample answer. Let's get on with Senator Hayden's questions.

Mr. PEARL. Yes, sir.

Senator CHURCH. The second question is: At this same hearing it was stated that there were 16 studies awaiting funding. Why didn't the Commission request the balance of its original \$4 million in the 1968 appropriations to proceed with the funding necessary to complete these studies? Did not this failure to obtain the funds already authorized merely create further delay in completing the contract studies?

Mr. PEARL. We could not spell out all of our needs and therefore we could not satisfy the requirement to show how we could live within the \$4 million limitation, and we would have placed in jeopardy the possibility of our personnel being paid if we used the funds for contract work, assuming the Congress had granted the money, and then, if any additional authorization were not granted, we would be in a position of having to wind up our work and laying off personnel with an incomplete job.

Senator CHURCH. Four or five of these studies had their study proposals circulated to the Commission's official family by mid-May. Yet testimony before the House committee indicated that some of them are not scheduled to begin until March 1968. Why delay, on the plan basis, these studies when undoubtedly the Commission will be hard pressed to complete the review and write its report in the few months after the studies are terminated?

This bears, I think, on an earlier question that Senator Jordon asked.

Mr. PEARL. We have to schedule or stagger the request for proposals aside from anything else because some of the people to whom we send these requests overlap, and there are just so many that they can handle at any one time. If we are going to the University of Idaho, for example, to ask them to submit a proposal on a particular study, they have said to us, "Don't give us another one to work on at the same time," and then they want to know whether they will get that contract before they receive a proposal to submit a bid on another study.

These proposals have to be staggered for that reason, and this is why, as shown on the chart, we have some grouped for starting approx-