

With representation from all of the responsible agencies, some with divergent views and interests, and staff from these agencies working with all of us in concert, I think that we came up with a report which perhaps has a better prospect for implementation than might otherwise have been the case. Some recent actions of HEW suggest that this is true as a matter of fact.

This also meant that we could get on with the job fairly fast. We had a very hard working group.

Almost immediately after the panel's creation, I was successful in getting some 40 additional people to serve on subpanels with specific expertise in required areas of competence. We then broke the job down into components, and set up subpanels, dealing with such topics as the total U.S. energy sources; the requirements of the country for the next 50 or 100 years or more; turbines, steam engines, fuel cells, batteries; air pollution, current gasoline engine, etc. We had medical people specifically acquainted with atmospheric problems and the health aspects of pollution. These subpanels, then, looked in depth technically in their area of competence, and then the panel as a whole tried in its best judgment to evaluate the data developed. In the evaluation process we just didn't have medical or business people, scientists, or physicists or chemists, but a composite group of broad experience in science, industry, and government.

We may have come up with somewhat tougher recommendations, perhaps, with respect to our recommended action, if we had reflected the majority view regarding recommendations. By arriving at a report in which all of the members concurred, call it consensus or what you will, I think perhaps we did a better job and are now in a better position to recommend action than might otherwise have been the case.

I was impressed with Mr. Tunney's last statement about management. All through our studies that was one of the things with which we were greatly concerned. Technical problems are relatively simple. If you get competent people to sit down and analyze, let's say, a zinc air battery, or a sodium sulfur battery, against some fuel cell, or steam engine, you can develop factual data that can be interpreted with a high degree of certainty. You don't argue about these technical problems.

When one examines the question of how to run an organization, or how the Government should get on with the job, there are differences of opinion and shades of view. Judgment and experience becomes important.

This question of management is terribly important in industry and Government, particularly in our changing technological society. From a broader viewpoint this country has a very difficult task right now in many areas and particularly in the allocation of our scientific and engineering resources as a whole, if we are to solve many national problems. There are only so many people. It is all very well to talk about let's set up another department; let's have another Council. Councils and committees are composed of people; there aren't many available people that know this game—let's say of ecology, for example.