There is a need to get things done earlier rather than later. We certainly can't allow the scientists to go along as they have in the past and say, what difference does it make when it comes about.

This can come about 25 or 30 years from now.

In this area the answer needs to be developed sooner. We cannot wait before we at least begin putting things in motion to prevent the negative aspects from becoming more pronounced than they presently are. This is one of the reasons why organization is necessary. The problem is ours. But we need some guidance from you as to what tools you best need to do this particular job.

Dr. CANTLON. One comment in this vein:

It is conceivable that the model developed in the IGY and IQSY and is beginning to emerge in the IBP may actually be a more prudent model for certain of these kinds of operations. One would assume that if a concerted attack on a pollution question were successful, then that particular group ought not to live after it solved its problem. Indeed it should be restructured to solve the next priority problem.

Mr. DADDARIO. Should not be or should not be structured after it solves the problem.

Dr. CANTLON. The group should break up and a new one be restructured with different scientists around a different problem. You see my point is that it is conceivable that our existing model of government agencies may not be the best model for the kind of crash program that I think really is warranted in areas of environmental stress problems.

It is conceivable that what you need is a coordinating group that gets separate line item funding to address itself to one sort of phrasing of the problem. It could have a definite lifespan, the unit breaking up and dying automatically without ossifying and burdening the taxpayers in perpetuity. A new array might then be developed such that scarce talent continually reforms in a kaleidoscopic way around the particular problem to be solved. The universities, the national laboratories, and the pertinent Federal agency laboratories could be the talent reservoir. In a sense we have done this in wartime.

Maybe the sort of flicker we are seeing in these international cooperative scientific ventures is a suggestion of another way of doing it nationally without creating a new monstrous Federal agency to do it. Rather for any particular problem one or more of the Federal agencies might have some significant talent, which could be augmented from the body of talent that exists in the educational institutions and national laboratories. You should not remove too many scientists from their educational institutions or you dry up the source of the next generation of scientists in these areas. What we may want is a short lifetime problem-solving array that disappears when its problem reaches the level where it can be partitioned out to the pertinent action agencies for administering the selected courses of action.

Mr. DADDARIO. Dr. Deevey, you have been in this for a while. Do you go along with that?

Dr. DEEVEY. I think I do.

Mr. DADDARIO. Isn't that what we presently are doing? You don't see all of the development where programs are created and then almost before they get started they are just completely washed out. Mission-oriented laboratories, as an example, are presumed to end at the time