

when they finish their mission objective, and some of them, in fact, do, but how about talents that we are developing?

I believe we develop a talent in our laboratories which is scarce in this country. This is the ability to take knowledge and apply it. These people learn certain things as they go along. They learn things not related to their mission objective which sometimes allows us to accomplish other programs and which sometimes is not even used as it ought to be because this is not their particular mission.

In many areas, this particular talent of taking different sets of facts, if they were given flexibility, might be a helpful asset.

Dr. CANTLON. I agree thoroughly with that. I couldn't endorse it more strongly.

Dr. DEEVEY. I was going to say there was one point I would disagree with Dr. Cantlon on, and that is the notion that the groups must automatically dissolve when the problems are solved.

Environmental problems won't go away, because slightly different, but related problems, will always exist, and the idea of the national institute is surely a permanent one.

Dr. COLE. Is the Rand Corp. the sort of model you are referring to?

Mr. DADDARIO. I am not thinking so much of the Rand Corp. I am thinking about how we can better utilize our great applied capabilities which have been developed in our national laboratories.

Dr. CANTLON. I would strongly endorse that. I was thinking of a place like Oak Ridge National Laboratory, which is now, in fact, developing a fair competence in pollution problems, and have, I believe, a major proposal before AEC.

No, my remarks were not intended to suggest we dispense with existing national laboratories. Rather, I feel that we shouldn't create a "pollution NASA," that is, one monstrous overriding new Federal agency for monitoring, for researching, for developing, and for enforcing in the area of environment.

Mr. DADDARIO. I look askance at the idea of developing new institutions. I do think that we have too much of a tendency to do this. Somewhere there might exist something which we can utilize better. One of the reasons we are holding these hearings is to get your view of how you are going to accomplish these programs. We are looking to the management of things.

Even though it isn't your job, you are working in them, especially you, Dr. Deevey. Therefore, we would like to ask you about it, because we can then come to a judgment as to whether or not we are in fact managing things as well as we ought.

Dr. DEEVEY. The National Center for Atmospheric Research has been described by one of my colleagues as NSF's outstanding creation, and I tend to subscribe to that. Several other programs have been sponsored by NSF, and one, at least, where there was major operating rather than research supporting activity was not, let us say, the most successful of the NSF's operations by a long shot.

Mr. DADDARIO. And you need not name it.

Dr. DEEVEY. The National Center is a good thing and it will be useful and instructive to study the relation between NSF and the National Center when it was first thought up, and to look at it now as it now exists. It is not NSF's operating arm in atmospheric science,