over if the academic science community lacks comparable problem-solving potential. Problems and approaches not yielding rewarding results after a reasonable time should be discontinued but certain long range research should be encouraged. The unit should not become the national monitoring agency for any environmental condition but might perfect techniques or engage in research necessary to establish whether such monitoring might be prudent. My personal view is that in most cases it should not create new national facilities except where a reasonable case is made that other agency goals preclude effective management of the necessary unit.

6. An inter-agency committee alone is quite sure not to perform a lead role in finding imaginative new aproaches to environmental problems, and is unlikely to be very effective even in controlling its member agencies' current bad practices.

7. Consider seriously the wisdom of setting up a council of ecological advisors for the executive branch of government, as has been proposed by several bills over the past year or so. A word of caution here. Advisory boards are only as good as the people on them. Several bodies concerned about the environment have appointed panels of prestigious scientists, engineers and administrators, none of whom had a clue as to how an ecosystem functioned—some were even unaware of the term. One would hope that ecologists would have an opportunity to make an input to such a potentially important function.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE STUDY

(THE FOLLOWING STUDY WAS FURNISHED TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE SUBSEQUENT TO ITS HEARINGS ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY)

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

MARCH 1968.

The attached report was prepared in response to a request by the President to the Directors of the Office of Science and Technology and the Bureau of the Budget to recommend how the Federal Government may best direct its efforts toward advancing scientific understanding of natural plant and animal communities and the ways in which they are influenced by man and his activities.

This report emphasizes the need to conserve and to increase our understanding of our unspoiled wildlands—forests, grasslands, deserts, streams, and lakes.

The report proposes

setting aside on Federal lands additional natural preserves for scientific purposes, and

conducting surveys and research so that we will understand better the impact of environmental changes.

Additional information is available from Dr. Donald R. King, Executive Office of the President, Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20506; 395–3516.

DONALD F. HORNIG, *Director.*

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, D.C., January 24, 1968.

Memorandum for the President.

Subject: Advancing scientific understanding of natural plant and animal communities.

At the time of your February 1965 Message to Congress on Natural Beauty, you instructed the Directors of the Office of Science and Technology and the Bureau of the Budget to recommend how the Federal Government may best direct its efforts toward advancing scientific understanding of natural plant and animal communities and their interactions with man and his activities.

Our review indicates that no one agency now has or should have exclusive jurisdiction in this area. Ten agencies are now carrying on activities—as an essential part of their respective missions—that are related to scentific understanding of natural plant and animal communities or "wild lands" which include forests, grass lands, deserts, swamp lands, alpine regions, lakes and streams,