

last-ditch filibuster is apparently guaranteed.

At this point, therefore, it appears to be largely up to the Senate to determine whether the performance of Congress this year will confirm or confound its critics—JOHN WALSH

### **Mixed Band of Sponsors Propose Investigation of Federal Research**

The burgeoning of federal research programs in recent years has inspired growing misgivings in Congress about coordination and control of these programs, and last week this uneasiness found expression when the House Rules Committee opened hearings on a proposal, originating with four of its members, for the creation of a select committee in the House to investigate federal research.

The Rules Committee provides a significant forum for this particular discussion. Not only is the committee a kind of microcosm of liberal-conservative forces in the House of Representatives but also its prestige virtually assures that influential committee chairmen and members will take the hearings seriously and declare themselves candidly on the issue.

Introduction of the resolution caused not a little speculation because the four Rules Committee sponsors are at least as often divided as united on the legislation which comes before the committee en route to the floor. Rules Committee Chairman Howard W. Smith (D-Va.) and Clarence J. Brown (R-Ohio), ranking minority member, are conservatives who very often see eye to eye on restricting spending and federal spheres of activity. On the other hand, Representative Carl A. Elliott (D-Ala.), who before he was named to the Rules Committee served on the House Education and Labor Committee and is regarded as progenitor of the National Defense Education Act, and Richard W. Bolling (D-Mo.), who was one of late Speaker Sam Rayburn's lieutenants, are viewed as representing differing strains of liberalism.

Several other House members introduced similar resolutions, including Representative John Fogarty (D-R.I.) and Melvin Laird (R-Wis.), chairman and ranking minority member, respectively, of the Appropriations subcommittee which handles the budget of the Public Health Service's National Institutes of Health, and Olin E. Teague (D-Tex.), chairman of the Veterans Af-

fairs Committee and second ranking Democrat on the House Science and Astronautics Committee. Because this support cut across both party and coalition lines, there was some mystification about the intent of the move for an investigation of R&D. The Elliott Resolution (H.R. 455), on which the hearings, formally, are being held, specifies that the committee shall not restrict itself in its inquiries but shall give special attention to "i) the overall total amount of annual expenditures on research programs; ii) what departments and agencies of the Government are conducting research, at what costs and with what results; iii) the amounts being expended by the various agencies and departments in grants for research to colleges, private industry and every form of student scholarships; iv) what facilities, if any, exist for coordinating the various and sundry research programs, including grants to colleges and universities as well as scholarship grants."

Under the resolution, the Speaker of the House would appoint a five-member committee and name a member as chairman. The committee would be expected to make its report by 1 September 1964.

On these terms, a committee would have a roving commission. Such a committee would be expected to collect complete data on the extent of federal research programs and the amount of money being spent on them. But in the matter of evaluation of the programs the resolution is by no means clear.

There is a group of economy-minded legislators who believe that the rapid growth of the annual federal research budget—an increase of some \$10 billion in a decade—has gotten away from Congress, and that control must be re-established, on grounds of congressional responsibility and fiscal soundness. At the hearings last week, this point of view was expressed by one legislator who said, "We want to put some kind of horizon on the one program which has no limits—research."

There were indications during the 2 days of hearings last week that some of the economizers would like the investigating committee to look into specific projects with a view to judging whether or not they were worth while. Congress until now has concerned itself mainly with laying down the broad lines on which research was to be conducted and with nonscientific details such as contracting procedures. Congressional investigators who pushed into new ter-

ritory would probably have their competence in research evaluation and their motives sternly questioned.

Another group of legislators sees the growth of federal research efforts as both necessary and beneficial, but feels that if overlap and waste exist, they should be uncovered now, put in proper perspective, and corrected, lest they be disclosed later by hostile critics and used to discredit the research program in general.

These legislators seem to feel that the investigating committee should look closely at overall federal organization for research and point out how duplications in research can be ended and how anomalies, such as the differences in overhead payments paid by different agencies, can be corrected.

Opposition to the whole idea of an investigating committee was expressed at the hearings by some of the chairmen of committees that have authority over agencies which conduct and sup-

### **Deputy Director for OST**

Colin M. MacLeod, a microbiologist at New York University's School of Medicine, has just been named Deputy Director of the Office of Science and Technology in the Executive Office of the President.

The \$20,500 post has been vacant since OST was established 13 months ago. The appointment is subject to senatorial confirmation. As number-two man in the agency, MacLeod, along with OST director Jerome B. Wiesner, would be available to testify before Congress.

The new deputy director, who is noted for research in bacterial genetics and immunology, has been active as a government consultant. His appointment marks the first time a life scientist has been selected for full-time service in the presidential science advisory machinery. MacLeod is currently chairman of the life sciences panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee and head of the PSAC group that recently reported on pesticide hazards. His appointment comes at a time when OST is becoming increasingly involved in federal programs in health and medicine.

port research—most strongly, perhaps, by House Armed Services Committee Chairman Carl Vinson (D-Ga.). The military last year spent about half of the \$14-billion-plus that went into federal research, so it is not surprising that Vinson might interpret an investigation of research operations as an incursion on his committee preserves.

Vinson pointed out that a new Armed Services subcommittee on research and development headed by Representative Melvin Price (D-Ill.) was formed this year and was, in fact, about to begin hearings of its own. Several other chairmen or influential members of science-oriented committees joined Vinson on Tuesday in assuring Rules members that their own committees are ready and able to keep a proper rein on research.

On Thursday, however, the resolution drew qualified support from House Commerce Committee Chairman Oren Harris (D-Ark.), whose committee this session embarked on reviews of the operations of the Food and Drug Administration and the Public Health Service, which are both under Commerce jurisdiction.

Harris expressed doubts about the value of the proposed new investigation if the committee merely collects and assembles data provided by the agencies, but said he would favor it if the committee makes an effort on its own "to put together all the facts across the board." Harris went on to say that such a committee would need an "ample and experienced staff," and he also expressed doubt that 1 year would provide sufficient time to organize and carry out such a study effectively.

Representative Laird urged that the committee not investigate individual projects but that it take a broader view and look at such things as the "complications of relations between government and the universities"—for example, "contract and overhead problems."

At the end of 2 days of hearings (more may be held but are not yet scheduled), the shape and scope of the proposed probe is far from clearly defined. The hearings, however, have served to put the discussion of congressional patronage of research into sharper focus than ever before, and, certainly, some of the key figures in the House have for the first time laid their cards on the table.

As for the prospects of the resolution itself, it requires action only by the House, and no group of sponsors is in a better position to see its proposal brought to the floor.—J.W.

### **Environmental Health Center: PHS Project Stalled on Several Counts; Site and Scope Are Still in Dispute**

The Public Health Service's proposal for an Environmental Health Center, stalled for 3 years by congressional haggling over location, has now been stalled in a variety of other ways as well, and prospects for the center have never been more gloomy. Congressional politicking has by no means run its course and, within the administration, voices formerly acquiescent have begun openly questioning the wisdom of locating the center in Washington, as the PHS wants. Serious infighting, exacerbated by congressional pressures, has broken out within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare over the future of the department's water pollution control programs, which were slated to play an important role in the proposed center.

The center was first proposed by the Public Health Service in 1961, as a means of coordinating and emphasizing its growing programs in environmental health. Various environmental health units—food and milk protection, air pollution, water pollution, radiological health, and occupational health—already form a shadow environmental health bureau within the Service, and these would be transferred to the center as its nucleus. But the center was pictured on a grander scale, ultimately costing \$60 million and employing 4000 to 5000 people on an annual payroll of around \$45 million. The hope was that such a center would stimulate both research into and action on some of the country's growing environmental hazards.

Since 1961, the PHS has insisted that the center, to be effective, had to be located in the Washington area. Many reasons were adduced, including the alleged cultural and scientific superiority of Washington, but the case rested on the argument that many other government agencies had active programs in environmental health, some of them in conjunction with the PHS. Only in Washington, the PHS has repeated for 3 years now, could the necessary administrative coordination and scientific interchanges be accomplished. The PHS was also known to feel that only in Washington could it be assured of a strong voice in policy-making on environmental health problems.

Others, outside the Service, doubted that the Washington location was de-

sirable, but the PHS pulled along with it, in the trail of its own conviction, two separate advisory panels, one convoked by the Surgeon General, the other, by the President's Science Adviser. Eventually the proposal found its way into two successive Presidential health messages to Congress; in the latest message, in February 1963, Kennedy specifically asked Congress to approve a Washington site.

All along, however, Congress has doubted that the Washington location was crucial, and it has twice rejected the PHS proposal. A variety of objections have been enumerated: Washington is too crowded; every agency wants to locate there; dispersal of key facilities is desirable in case of nuclear attack; and—a recurrent theme—"there is a place in my district that is just the spot." In all, between March 1961 and February 1963, at least 46 communications from congressmen and senators were received by HEW pointing to the value of locating the center in the deserted munitions plant or the old naval station or just somewhere on the spacious lands of the *n*th congressional district.

#### **Hassle over Site**

Congressionally inspired difficulties about the site were compounded within the PHS itself, which was unable, in the 1-year interval between the 1962 and 1963 appropriations hearings, to make a definite choice of a spot within the Washington area. This and other evidence of what its report called the "procrastination, indecision, and confusion in the executive branch" so irritated the House Appropriations Committee that, for the second straight year, it disallowed the \$2,761,000 budget request, strongly recommending that, the next time around, the Service be prepared with "firmer plans" and "better evidence of support and cooperation." The Senate Appropriations Committee approved a Washington site, came through with \$1,441,000—about half of what was requested—and had to fight an attempt on the floor to take even that away. Whether the Environmental Health Center will have any money this year, and if so, how much, awaits the decision of a House-Senate conference on the bill. But even if the PHS gets the money, its troubles will not be over, for, as the hitches have continued to multiply, supporters of the Washington site, always lukewarm, have turned distinctly cold.

Why the President's chief advisers,