

advice, all would have been well. By all accounts, it appears that Holloman, like most people, has a preference for his own ideas. But in view of the virulence of industry's response to the concept of government-supported industrial research, it appears that no amount of sugar coating or tact could convince America's successful firms that some of their taxes should support research that clearly would aid less successful firms.

The intent now is to reorient the program toward research that would help industry, but not any particular industry. Clearly, this can be done, and, in fact, it has been done by NBS for years through its materials standards research. But the preparation of voluminous data on the properties of a particular building material, for example, is quite different from the original concept, which was to prod industry into jumping into the mainstream of science and technology.

Under the revised CIT concept, the Commerce Department is encouraging industry itself to set up cooperative research associations. And it is also encouraging a regional approach to the problems of stimulating economic growth through research and development. As part of these efforts, the Department earlier this month convened a meeting of state, federal, and industrial executives to inventory industrial research activity and stimulate thinking about state and regional efforts. This work is in its very early stages, and so far its main fruit has been an agreement that the Department should sponsor an annual national conference along with periodic regional conferences.

—D. S. GREENBERG

Congress and Science: Inquiries into R&D Are Currently Quiet

The various congressional inquiries into federal activities concerning research and development are currently in phases of quiescence or off-stage staff work. But it is reasonable to expect that by early spring, when major bills are well along in the legislative process, the members will be showing more interest in their R&D studies. The following is a status report.

Elliott Committee

By far the most ambitious inquiry is the one that has been assigned to the House Select Committee on Government Research, chaired by Representa-

tive Carl Elliott (D-Ala.). The committee, which was given \$553,000 and a little over a year to conduct a comprehensive study of federal R&D activities, took testimony from a total of 72 witnesses at hearings in November, December, and January. (When these hearings are published, probably around mid-March, notice will be carried in *Science*.)

After making an analysis of the hearings, the committee staked out ten studies of gargantuan proportions. As reported by the committee, these are:

1. Administration of research projects.
2. Major research facilities.
3. Fiscal and contractual policies.
4. Impact of government research on higher education, industry and business, and geographical areas and states.
5. Providing student assistance.
6. Inter-agency coordination of research projects.
7. Statistical review of government research. (Cost and purpose of federally financed activity.)
8. Documentation, dissemination, and exploitation of research results.
9. Manpower for research.
10. National goals and policies.

The day-to-day conduct of these studies has been in the hands of an eight-man staff which will now be joined by a technical director, William B. Farrington, a M.I.T.-trained geophysicist who is vice president of the Empire Trust Company of New York. In addition, two advisory groups have been appointed. Serving on the General Advisory Committee will be:

Harvey Brooks, dean of engineering and applied physics, Harvard;

Paul W. Bachman, vice-president of Koppers Company, Inc., and chairman Research Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers;

George Feldman, attorney, and member of the board of the Communications Satellite Corporation (COMSAT);

Beardsley Graham, president of Spindletop Research Corporation and member of the COMSAT Board;

Nelson W. Polsby, professor of political science, Wesleyan University;

Alex X. Pow, vice president, University of Alabama;

John W. Whelan, professor of law, Georgetown University;

Edward C. Wise Jr., senior specialist for science and technology, Library of Congress, who will serve as consultant.

Serving as members of the Science-Engineering Advisory Committee, which will consult with the Select Committee, will be:

Lloyd B. Berkner, president, Graduate Research Center of the Southwest;

Robert C. Berson, dean, South Texas Medical School, University of Texas;

Donald Douglass, Jr., president, Douglass Aircraft Corporation;

Max Tishler, president, Merck, Sharp and Dohme Research Laboratories;

Henry Heald, president, Ford Foundation;

Pendleton Herring, president, Social Science Research Council;

John H. Rubel, vice president for long-range planning, Litton Industries, Inc.;

Albert B. Sabin, Children's Hospital Research Foundation, University of Cincinnati;

E. V. Smith, dean, School of Agriculture, Auburn University;

Elvis Stahr, president, University of Indiana;

Charles Townes, professor of mathematics and physics, M.I.T.;

J. W. Beams, University of Virginia, department of physics.

In addition to appointing these groups, the committee has sent questionnaires to all federal agencies involved in research and development. Further hearings will probably be held, but they have not been scheduled as yet.

As for what is likely to come out of this, the committee staff acknowledges that it will have to perform a vast amount of difficult work if it is to produce a meaningful report by the end of this year, when the committee's mandate automatically expires. If it does produce such a report, it is probably safe to assume that the committee will receive an extension.

However, experienced staff members on other committees with R&D jurisdiction are frankly skeptical about the likelihood of Elliott's group coming up with anything significant. It should be pointed out that there is considerable competition among committees in this area, and the skeptics may be speaking from self-serving viewpoints, but they feel that it would be a good trick to produce a comprehensive report on even one of the ten study areas in a year. Furthermore, they argue that there is little illumination to be obtained by sending questionnaires to federal agencies. "They put their best foot forward and tell you only what they want to tell you," one experienced staff member remarked. The reply of the Elliott committee is that the questionnaires are only an opening wedge in

the inquiry, and that when the time comes, the committee will produce material to justify its existence. In any case, despite early fears within the scientific community, the Elliott committee is yet to demonstrate any "get science" attitudes.

Daddario Committee

Close by the Elliott committee, in terms of jurisdiction, is the subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, chaired by Representative Emilio Q. Daddario (D-Conn.).

This subcommittee, which is a creature of the inter-House rivalry over research and development, was established by its parent committee last August when it became apparent that Elliott's investigatory proposal would go through. (Its birth date precedes the Elliott committee's by 3 weeks.) While Elliott was putting together a staff, the Daddario committee held a series of hearings at which eight scientists and science administrators presented their views on problems of science and government. The committee subsequently issued a 14-page statement spelling out 20 science-government issues that it feels bear exploring. (Copies of these documents—*Government and Science Hearings and Government and Science, a Statement of Purpose*—may be obtained without charge from the Science and Astronautics Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., 20515.)

At the moment, the entire space committee is deeply involved with space legislation for the coming fiscal year, but a number of activities for the Daddario subcommittee are in the early stages of planning. Among these are working arrangements under which the National Academy of Sciences and the National Science Foundation would provide both advice and supporting studies.

Since the subcommittee is a creation of a benevolent parent committee, it faces no deadlines, and it is going about its business in an unhurried and careful fashion.

Fountain Committee

The oldest of the current congressional inquiries into government support of science is that of the House Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, which is a subsidiary of the Committee on Government Operations. Chaired by Representative L. H. Foun-

tain (D-N.C.), this subcommittee, since 1957, has been looking into NIH's administrative practices, and it can take the credit or blame for NIH's decision to adopt tighter accounting procedures. At the moment, Fountain and his principal staff aide, Delphis C. Goldberg, are looking into fellowship and training grant programs, but no hearings have been scheduled.

In the meantime, relations between Fountain and NIH are as chilly as ever. Fountain feels that NIH, though he concedes it has "improved" to an appreciable degree, is yet to demonstrate proper regard for the sanctity of the taxpayers' money. NIH, in turn, feels that Fountain fails to understand that research cannot be put on a time-clock basis. With these feelings governing the relationship, communication between the two camps remains formal, limited, and a trifle hostile. One element of indeterminable significance is that some of NIH's friends in the House have been expressing concern over the effect of Fountain's work, and they are a source of some comfort for NIH's Bethesda, Maryland, headquarters.

The Fountain Committee has issued a series of reports and hearings, limited quantities of which are available without charge from the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Room 101, George Washington Inn, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., 20515. Titles are: *NIH Administration of Grants Programs of Research and Training, 1961 and 1962*; *Health Research and Training, House Document 321*; *The Administration of Grants by the National Institutes of Health, 1958 and 1962*.

PHS Review

Finally, the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is in the midst of an apparently leisurely review of a bill that would authorize the Surgeon General to reorganize the Public Health Service. Chaired by Representative Kenneth A. Roberts (D-Ala.), the subcommittee has the authority to write basic legislation affecting the PHS, but since it had been a long time since it had exercised this jurisdiction to any significant extent, it took the approach that it had better first educate itself about the PHS's vast array of activities. Accordingly, it held a series of hearings last April, May, and June at which PHS officials did little more than tell the

subcommittee what it is the PHS does. After this, the subcommittee sent questionnaires to 19 educational institutions, seeking information on the impact and extent of federal aid. As might have been anticipated, the institutions almost unanimously agree that the impact is beneficial and the extent is too limited.

One effect of the slow pace of this inquiry is that the PHS, and its principal subsidiary, NIH, cannot expect any serious consideration of legislative proposals until the subcommittee has completed its work. At present the committee says that it plans further hearings, principally on NIH, but no date has been set. Publication of last spring's hearings has not been scheduled, presumably because the committee wants to put the whole works inside one cover.—D.S.G.

Narcotic and Drug Abuse: Report of Advisory Commission Prescribes for Old Problems, New Dangers

When the report of the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse was finally released late in January, everyone could agree that it was not the product of one of those high-level, high-minded, august, ad hoc study groups which labor long and then recommend a few discreet half measures, further study of the problem, and more money for research.*

This President's commission, chaired by Federal Appeals Court Judge E. Barrett Prettyman, delivered a list of 25 recommendations which, if put into effect, would work a virtual revolution in the administration of the nation's narcotics and drug abuse laws and the management of addicts.

Not everybody in positions of authority and influence agrees with all the recommendations, and indeed some of them have inspired die-hard opposition. What direct effect the report will have on law and policy must remain, for a while at least, a moot question. The report has been sent out to the agencies affected for study and comment, and this will take several weeks. The position of the White House is far from clear. And Congress has not really been heard from, although its reactions can be predicted on the basis of past performance.

But whatever its fate as a blueprint for legislative and administrative action,

* The report is available from the Superintendent of Documents, GPO, Washington, D.C. Price 55¢.