mended above." It added that "the highest priority in new accelerator construction should be assigned to the recommended steps toward highest attainable energy," but that the MURA machine "is an essential component of a balanced program and should be constructed provided that it will not delay the authorization of the steps toward higher energy."

The panel's language is, of course, open to various interpretations, and MURA supporters naturally interpret it to be an unqualified endorsement of their proposal. But within the administration the budgeteers appraising the Ramsey report are, not unreasonably, concluding that the panelists were taking a roundabout way of saying that, while MURA would be nice, it's not altogether essential.

Presidential Advisers

In this they are supported by a number of White House advisers who contend that the great and expensive machines should be looked upon as national rather than regional resources, available to all researchers, with the physicist around the corner having no more access to it than his colleague across the country. This is an admirable goal, but the reality of it is questionable. It's true that jet travel and airline scheduling probably make it easier to get from Chicago to Brookhaven, N.Y., than from Chicago to Madison, Wisconsin, but this overlooks the fact that when a $150-million reseach facility is planted on the countryside, all sorts of usually desirable things start to happen to the surrounding area. New industry rushes to the area—as it is now doing, for example, at the previously barren site surrounding NASA's Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston. And other federal agencies take to placing facilities and funds in the region, which is part of the story of the Cambridge and California phenomenon.

In connection with the Midwest's dissatisfaction over the distribution of research funds, a pertinent question would be whether, if $150 million is to be spent in the area, it might not be more fruitful to spend it on something other than the proposed accelerator. However, the issue hasn't been cast in those terms, and with the Midwest legislators afflicted by what might be called a Cambridge-California complex, they are taking their stand on the MURA proposal.

—D. S. GREENBERG

New Overseers for Federal Science

The House Science and Astronautics Committee, which has devoted itself primarily to bringing up NASA, is moving into broader fields of federal science.

A new ten-man subcommittee on science, research, and development has been organized, and the chairman of the full committee, Representative George P. Miller (D–Calif.), has announced that the new subcommittee will have the following ambitious objectives.

1) Overall evaluation of scientific research and development.

2) Strengthening of congressional sources of information and advice in the fields of science and technology.

3) Achievement of the most effective utilization of the scientific and engineering resources of the United States in the effort to "accomplish" goals which affect the lives of all Americans.

4) Congressional oversight of the National Science Foundation.

Chairman of the new subcommittee is Representative Emilio Q. Daddario, a third-term Connecticut Democrat who represents the Hartford district. The 45-year-old Daddario has served on the Science and Astronautics Committee since it was created in 1958. He has demonstrated a special interest in bioastronautics and is credited with exercising influence on federal policy in this field, unusual for an individual member operating without a chairmanship or other means of leverage which seniority bestows.

The ranking minority member of the committee is R. Walter Riehlman (R–N.Y.), who had relevant experience as chairman of the House Government Operations military subcommittee during the first Eisenhower administration, when there was a Republican majority.

A Well-Distributed Membership

Other members of the committee are Democrats J. Edward Roush of Indiana, Thomas G. Morris of New Mexico, John W. Davis of Georgia, Joe D. Waggoner, Jr., of Georgia, and Edward J. Patten of New Jersey and Republicans Charles A. Mosher of Ohio, Alphonzo Bell of California, and James D. Weaver of Pennsylvania. The fairly broad geographical spread of the subcommittee membership may well reflect the growing awareness of the regional effects of federal contracting for R&D.

The Science and Astronautics Committee has had three subcommittees dealing with different aspects of the space program, and creation of a fourth regular panel is a logical result of Chairman Miller's declared intention to extend his committee's active suzerainty to science as well as astronautics.

In the broader perspective of Congress as a whole, the new subcommittee constitutes further evidence of the quickening interest in Congress in restoring legislative control to the research budget, an interest which has resulted in the spawning of several new panels and special studies.

A practical effect of the subcommittee's creation is likely to be to bring the National Science Foundation under the more or less continuing scrutiny of a legislative committee. NSF is one of the agencies which operate under a continuing authorization. Each year the NSF appropriation is examined by the appropriations committees of both houses, but its policies and operations have been only intermittently reviewed by the House space committee, which has been preoccupied with NASA.

The subcommittee will hold its first hearings next week on the general subject of the relations of science and government. Three star witnesses are scheduled: Frederic Seitz, president of the National Academy of Sciences, will appear on Tuesday; Jerome B. Wiesner, presidential science adviser and director of the Office of Science and Technology, on Wednesday; and physicist Edward Teller, professor at large at the University of California and well-known adviser and critic on nuclear policy, on Friday.

Then, on 23 October, NSF director Leland J. Haworth is scheduled to appear before the subcommittee to discuss the operations of his agency.

—J.W.