

# Science in the News

## **Funds for NSF and NASA: Senate Votes To Restore Cuts Made in the House**

The Senate has voted to restore the \$30 million the House cut out of the National Science Foundation budget, and to not only restore \$39 million cut from the space program, but to add another \$20 million to the budget request. The bill providing money for the NSF and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, as well as money for a dozen or so other independent agencies (independent, that is, of the ten cabinet departments) now goes to a House-Senate conference.

The NSF budget is following the steps foreseen by the foundation: a cut in the House, restoration in the Senate, followed by a compromise leaving NSF with all the money (about \$180 million) they really expected to get when they set up their budget. The NASA budget is a little more complicated. The Senate Space Committee, chaired by Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson, has been sharply critical of the space budget. Johnson thinks it should be bigger anyway, but he and his committee are more immediately disturbed by what they see as a lack of sophistication on the part of the NASA budget makers.

### **Honesty or Naivete**

They say the space program was delayed this year because NASA failed to allow some leeway for unexpected expenses, particularly money for back-up rockets for firings that did not go off as planned. They said they failed to make allowances, as other agencies do, for the normal cut in the budget to be expected in the House. NASA officials said they were just trying to be perfectly honest with Congress, but the committee seemed to feel there is a point where honesty passes into naivete. Beyond the specific criticisms of NASA's budget-makers the Space Committee applied the general Demo-

cratic criticism that the Budget Bureau, rather than the responsible agencies, is making the important decisions; that there is too much thinking about what we can afford to do and not enough about what we need to do.

But the agency has not been completely subservient to the Budget Bureau. The Bureau, it seems, suggested a guideline of \$515 million to the agency, but T. Keith Glennan, the NASA administrator, told the committee that "I just couldn't believe it, so we didn't accept it." The eventual estimate reached was \$915 million, which is probably just about what the agency will have when the bill gets out of conference. It will very likely get the additional \$55 million Johnson's Space Committee authorized as well, but this will come through a supplemental appropriation after the new Congress convenes.

## **The School Construction Bill: The Victim Is Revived after Being Pronounced Dead Several Times**

There may yet be a school construction bill, but it will have to come as the result of some of the most intricate Congressional maneuvering in years. As early as late afternoon of the day the bill reached the House floor it was clear that there was a majority in Congress ready to vote for a compromise bill acceptable to everyone except those opposed to any school bill at all.

Arthur Flemming, the Administration's Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, was in the gallery when the bill was being debated in the House. Just after the Powell amendment barring aid to segregated schools had been adopted and the bill, for the moment, appeared headed for defeat, Flemming sent down a suggestion for a compromise move that would have both eliminated the Powell amendment and substituted a bill that the President would be sure to sign. The Democratic lead-

ers, their backs against the wall at this point, were ready to accept Flemming's proposal, but the Republican leader, Charles Halleck, who was against any school bill, blocked the Administration move. The bill then appeared to be killed on a preliminary vote, but was revived and then passed on the formal roll calls that followed.

The bill then went back to the House Rules Committee, which had earlier held up action for 2 months, until it became clear that the school aid forces had the strength and tactical position to bypass the committee. Now two new roadblocks arose: there were two southerners on the Rules Committee unalterably opposed to any school bill. Five other Democrats were for school aid, and a sixth was "persuadable." But together they made up only half the committee, and a majority was needed to send the bill forward to its next step, a House-Senate conference. One of four Republicans on the committee would have to support the bill, and none appeared to be ready to do so. On top of this, Republican leader Halleck was ready to put Clare Hoffman of Michigan, probably the most conservative man in the House, on the House conference committee in place of Peter Frelinghuysen of New Jersey, who had seniority. Together with Graham Barden, of North Carolina, this would make a 2 to 1 majority of the House conferees opposed to any bill. They would combine to prevent the conference from reaching any agreement, so killing the bill.

At this point Vice President Nixon let it be known that he was working on Halleck to get the school bill through. Yet when the Rules Committee met last week no Republican vote was forthcoming and the bill once more appeared to be at death's door. It was an extremely peculiar situation. For Nixon's acknowledgment that he was working on Halleck was a tacit admission that it was the senior House Republicans who were killing this popular legislation which had the support of the Republican Administration. On the eve of his campaign for the Presidency Nixon had laid his prestige on the line on this issue. If the bill got through, Nixon could properly claim some of the credit. But because he had laid his prestige on the line, it was both surprising and damaging that all of the Republicans on the Rules Committee nevertheless voted against the bill.

Some Republicans tried to explain

the situation by claiming that the Republicans were holding out for definite assurances of a compromise that would avoid any possibility of an embarrassing Presidential veto of the final bill. Whether this was true was open to some doubt since there had been earlier reports that a compromise agreeable to the President had already been informally agreed upon. Whatever the true facts, it still remained that if the Republican leadership continued to block the bill it would be a blow to Mr. Nixon. Once the Vice President had publicly involved himself it appeared to be a matter of political necessity that the bill go through, no matter how much Halleck would have preferred to have it blocked.

The Rules Committee met again on Friday of last week and Tuesday of this week without taking any further action on the bill. Yet there appeared to be a very broad feeling among both Democrats and Republicans that the committee would eventually reverse itself and allow the bill to get to conference. Theoretically the Rules Committee could block it again on its way back from conference to the House for final passage, but this was regarded as unthinkable. It looked, after 10 years of frustration, as if there would at last be federal action to alleviate the nationwide shortage of 140,000 classrooms.

### **Pauling vs. the Senate Internal Security Committee: Contempt Action Likely as He Refuses To Give Names**

Linus Pauling, the University of California Nobel-prize-winner, happened to be in Washington last week, and the Senate Internal Security committee took the occasion to call him up to Capitol Hill and ask him to tell about a nuclear test ban petition he circulated in 1958. The committee allowed Pauling to explain his position at length, which he did, often with eloquence.

He said the petition, signed by 11,000 scientists, was initiated entirely by himself and that there were no hidden forces or hidden motives to be uncovered; that he simply thought it a bad idea to continue nuclear weapons testing, which, he said, seems now to be the official view of the United States government. The committee asked him for the names of the people he had written to asking them to help gather signatures, and also the names of those who had responded to his request and sent back lists of signatures. Pauling

said he couldn't understand what business it was of the committee to want to know these names.

#### **Legality Denied**

He said he would supply the committee with a list of the people he had written to, since that was entirely his own responsibility and implied nothing about the attitudes of the recipients. But he declined to supply the names of scientists who had cooperated in gathering signatures. He said he couldn't see where the committee had any legal right to ask for these names and that he knew from personal experience that giving the names to a Congressional committee could lead to reprisals against the people who cooperated in gathering the signatures who, he said, had been doing nothing more than exercising their constitutional right to petition the government.

The tone of the hearing was fair, even genteel. But at last it took on a familiar ring. The committee issued a formal demand that Pauling return August 9 with the names. Pauling told reporters that he "surely would not" give the committee the names. The committee will, presumably, cite him for contempt. It will then be up to the Justice Department to prosecute the case, and to the courts to decide whether the committee had the right to ask for the names. Recent Supreme Court decisions make the committee's position doubtful.

One step in this procedure may inject the affair into the presidential campaign. A person is cited for contempt of Congress, rather than for contempt of a particular committee. Congress is not likely to be in session to vote on the citation. If it is to take effect it will have to be authorized by the presiding officers of the two houses. In the Senate, of course, the presiding officer is the Vice-President.

#### **Un-American Science**

Richard Arens, the staff director of the House Un-American Activities Committee, has told reporters on a number of occasions that he has "enemies" who are constantly working to take his job away from him. The enemies seem to be making some progress.

The source of his difficulties is Arens' extracurricular work for a number of individuals and organizations of the sort that even William F. Buckley has

called psychopathic. One of the most curious, and the one which seems to have gotten Arens into the deepest trouble, is a committee, consisting mainly of Arens himself, which is helping a New York millionaire named Wycliffe Draper to give away grants for research in "genetics and immigration." What Draper would like is some good solid scientific evidence that Negroes are congenitally inferior to whites, and a nice, wholesome, workable plan to "immigrate" them back to Africa. Draper apparently felt that the responses his offers of funds were getting were an insult to his dignity. He seems to have engaged Arens to avoid any more such unpleasantness, for Arens was to provide him with the names of people who could be expected to accept Mr. Draper's generous offer in support of science. All of this was brought to the attention of Francis Walters, chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee, who reportedly did not seem much upset, and to Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn, who appeared extremely upset. If Rayburn has his way, which he generally does, it is believed that Arens will no longer be staff director when the next Congress convenes.

#### **U.S. Support for Foreign Research**

The House has passed its version of a bill to allow the use of foreign currencies for grants and fellowships to promote medical research abroad. The program will use money accumulated through the sale of food surpluses. The bill now goes to conference with a broader bill already passed by the Senate, which allows spending of \$50 million a year for this purpose.

This will be the newest of a number of programs authorizing the use for scientific and educational purposes of foreign currencies accumulated by the U.S. government. The Fulbright scholarships, of course, have long been financed in this way. Another program, again using funds obtained through the sale of food surpluses, allows the Department of Agriculture to make research grants to foreign institutions. Last week, for example, the Department announced seven grants to Polish institutions for studies of plant genetics, livestock parasites, and forestry. The total for these agricultural grants has been running to about \$1.6 million a year, and is expected to increase.—H.M.