

you. Mr. Daddario and I were in Brighton, England, seven or eight years ago. The United States had only been talking of science policy for three or four years. The European nations, including our sister country Britain were beginning to notice there important issues also.

This is a good forum for not only finding knowledge but distributing it, disseminating it and using it. What is more important to your government is getting the correct facts, the right knowledge, the methods of disseminating it and the methods of using it. I am very glad to be here and I might say in conclusion that Congressmen are well known for having been born with no terminal facilities.

**The Chairman:** Thank you very much, Congressman Fulton, for your very wise words.

**Congressman Daddario:** Mr. Chairman, I would now like to ask Congressman Charles Mosher of Ohio to make some remarks. He has been my counterpart on the Republican side of the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development. To show the bipartisan or non-partisan nature of our activities, on many occasions he and I have jointly submitted bills to the Congress about matters affecting science and public policy. The latest was a bill to restructure the Department of Interior into a Department of Natural Resources and Population. This has developed considerable interest—I regret to say, more on the Republican side than on the Democratic side. But since there is now a Republican President in the White House that means it probably has more of a chance than otherwise. I would appreciate hearing at this time from Mr. Mosher.

**The Honourable Charles A. Mosher, Representative from Ohio:** Mr. Chairman, of course I also feel very privileged to be here this morning. I have been very much stimulated by the opportunity to look over some of the material that has been produced by your committee. I am fascinated by noting that the problems you are wrestling with reflect the same ones that we have. However, my mood here this morning is to be more of a learner and questioner than a speaker. One question comes to my mind, because I am very conscious of the difference between our governmental processes. The relationship between our legislative branch and executive branch is very different from yours. Therefore I should like to know what will be done with your report. You have had many specific sugges-

tions made to you, and you will be making specific recommendations. Will these be strictly advisory to the Government or can you, in your Parliament, initiate specific legislation to carry out some of your recommendations even if it might be against the wishes of the Government?

I am thinking of a particular situation in our own Congress. We took the initiative back in 1966 in another committee on which I serve. I am the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Oceanography for the Merchant Marine Committee. We took the initiative in creating a commission which was chaired by J. Stratton, the very distinguished scientist and leader in our country. The commission, after two years of solid accomplishment, brought in specific recommendations for the reorganization of our Government regarding the uses of the seas. It recommended the creation of a new independent agency to be named the National Oceanographic Atmospheric Agency which would give new visibility to functions that now are terribly fragmented and scattered through many Government agencies.

I cite this as a specific example of a legislative initiative intended to improve the mechanism by which science policy is made in our country. That recommendation met with immediate resistance in the executive branch. It would require removing from the Department of Commerce, the Environmental Science Services Agency. ESSA would be put in this new agency, with the Coast Guard from our Department of Transportation and the Bureau of Fisheries from the Department of the Interior. In the bureaucracy there was immediate and terrific resistance. The Nixon Administration has asked us specifically to wait and not to act on this legislation which has already been processed in our subcommittee and is before the full committee for action. The Nixon Administration is asking us to wait until at least April or May when they expect to make some recommendations. Interestingly enough, on a completely bipartisan basis the mood within the committee is not to wait, because we feel that we have so much momentum in what we consider to be an extremely important area to meet a crucial need. Our mood is to keep up that momentum and to keep the pressure on and maintain the leverage on the executive in order to accomplish something in this field and not let them sit back and forget. We are, therefore, proposing to bring this legislation to create the new