

and the Food and Drug Administration.”

The HEW tent covers not only medical research and health agencies, but the Social Security Administration, the Office of Education, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the Welfare Administration, and an assortment of federally aided institutions.

This mixture of missions results in a fragmentation of congressional jurisdiction. While the legislative committee for the health agencies is the Commerce Committee, the Social Security Administration falls under the sway of the Ways and Means Committee, and the Office of Education reports to the Education and Labor Committee. HEW also serves several masters among the Senate committees.

The new study recalls a series of hearings* focused directly on PHS held in the spring of 1963 by another House Commerce subcommittee, the subcommittee on health and safety headed by Representative Kenneth A. Roberts (D-Ala.), who was defeated in the debacle for Democrats in the November elections in his home state.

Chairman of the new special committee will be Representative Paul G. Rogers (D-Fla.). Other members are Democrats Lionel Van Deerlin of California and J. Oliva Huot of New Hampshire; and Republican J. Arthur Younger of California and Willard S. Curtin of Pennsylvania. Rogers is the only one on the special subcommittee who served on the Roberts subcommittee during the PHS hearings. Harris is chairman of the parent investigations subcommittee.

According to Harris, “A principal purpose of our proposed study will be to consider the conclusions and recommendations of the Wooldridge report.” [The Wooldridge report, made public in March, was the product of a committee of 12 distinguished nongovernment researchers, physicians, and administrators appointed by the White House to study the administration and quality of research at NIH (*Science*, 26 March 1965). Chairman of the panel was Dean E. Wooldridge.]

It is evident, however, that sheer growth in the budget and scope of activities of HEW is a factor in the new appraisal of the department. In announcing formation of the special subcommittee, Harris said, “There is grow-

ing concern in Congress over the rapid expansion of the size and activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.” He noted that NIH research funds rose from \$28 million in 1950 to \$570 million in 1963 and that HEW will administer expenditures of an estimated \$2.2 billion in the coming fiscal year for health research and training, public health services, and related consumer protection programs. He observed, “I think the time has come for us to take a hard look at how these expanded programs fit into the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as a whole.”

The Roberts subcommittee study followed the conventional congressional practice of set-piece testimony by agency officials followed by questioning by committee members. Occasion for the hearings was a bill (H.R. 2410) “to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide greater flexibility in the organization of the service and for other purposes.” The bill was introduced by Harris at the request of the administration.

The subcommittee study ended inconclusively since no action was taken on the proposal. (A not very deeply submerged issue in the hearings was the question of the Surgeon General’s authority in the location of a new environmental health center, a question which was resolved only late last year with a Solomonic decision to cut the center into three parts (*Science*, 15 Jan. 1965).

Whether the new Rogers subcommittee will follow a different course remains to be seen. The Roberts subcommittee hearings and the Wooldridge report provide a foundation to build on, but the kind of action which results from the study will depend on how closely the subcommittee actually examines the management and the activities of PHS.

Several people are being added to the investigations subcommittee staff, and Rogers has made the statement that he is not going to hold hearings until a good deal of digging is done. This approach is likely to yield considerably greater results than the common congressional practice of using hearings to gather facts rather than to evaluate them critically.

Rogers says he wants to bring the study to a positive conclusion during the 2-year life span of the present Congress. The kind of action to be taken by Congress, Rogers says, must

be determined by the investigation. A modest reorganization of PHS administration on the lines of the Harris proposal in the last Congress is a possibility. But at the other extreme looms the perennial question of whether to break up HEW.

Advocates of partition are certain to press harder as the new school bill and, presumably, medicare swell the budget, the programs, and the staff of HEW and make the Department even more difficult to administer. HEW’s portion of the administrative budget is already over \$7 billion, which puts it in third place on the list of departments which spend the most; it follows the Department of Defense (\$50 billion a year) and the Treasury, which expends some \$11.5 billion of its nearly \$13 billion annual budget in paying interest on the public debt.

Suggestions for new departments always abound and ideas for separating HEW into two or three cabinet-level agencies have been promoted virtually since the department was created in 1953. The logic of creating a Department of Education, or of Education and Research, has perhaps been argued most strongly; but Congress has tended to resist giving cabinet status to what critics see as a “ministry of education” or a “ministry of welfare.” The new broad responsibilities of the Office of Education in education, manpower training, and poverty programs could change this. But, at any rate, the Rogers subcommittee study, in examining PHS and FDA in particular, is sure to draw attention to the peculiar structure of HEW in general.

—JOHN WALSH

Weather: New Report Sketches Anatomy of National Program and of Coordination Problem

The Science Policy Research Division, established last fall in the Library of Congress to provide a stronger source of science advice for the House and Senate, has made its debut with a report on federal weather programs.

The report,* prepared at the request of the House Government Operations Committee’s military operations subcommittee, chaired by Representative Chet Holifield (D-Calif.), is essentially

**Organization of Public Health Service*, printed for use of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 1964.

* *Government Weather Operations*, available from the Committee on Government Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515

a pulling together of information hitherto unavailable or at any rate difficult to obtain, since at least 17 agencies, military and civilian, are involved in research and operational programs germane to weather. The report strikes a blow in the cause of better coordination of weather programs both by the agencies which administer them and by the congressional committees which authorize the programs and appropriate the money.

A subcommittee introduction to the report says that it "presents for the first time in a single public document a systematic account of weather programs of many kinds, conducted for many purposes by many different agencies, including those shared with the rest of the world as well as those benefiting only the United States."

The data are incomplete, the report concedes, because of differing record-keeping practices among the agencies. But the report should succeed in its design of being helpful to the committees of Congress, to officials of the executive branch, and to "other interested researchers and users of weather data outside the Government."

One reason for the subcommittee's requesting the study was that, in the restrained language of the report, the subcommittee "has been aware of a dispute or disagreement that existed among the Air Force, the Federal Aviation Agency, and the Weather Bureau with respect to the jurisdiction and operation of certain weather services." These ruffled relations have resulted in efforts at high executive levels to construct interagency coordinating apparatus, but these efforts have not yet solved the problem.

Involved is an annual budget of approximately \$431.5 million for meteorological services and research in the atmospheric sciences. It is estimated that some \$237.1 million of this is spent on services and \$194.4 million, on R&D. Of the \$431.5 million total, the military services spend well over half and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, about \$103.8 million. National Science Foundation support of research in the atmospheric sciences topped \$20 million this year.

The report gives details of federal agency participation in weather programs and makes clear distinctions between the funds spent on meteorological services and those spent on atmospheric research, which in many cases only very indirectly supports endeavors such as weather forecasting or

weather modification. The report makes the point, in however restrained a way, that the state of the art is advancing so rapidly that a close link is necessary between operations and R&D.

In its first published product, the Science Policy Research Division in the Legislative Reference Service happens to have come to grips with a problem of coordination of a "multi-agency program" of the kind the division's director, Edward Wenk, Jr., was confronted with in his former post in the Office of Science and Technology, where he served as executive secretary to the Federal Council for Science and Technology. Oceanography and water research are two other subjects where "national programs" to set goals and agency roles have been deemed advisable.

The new report, to be sure, is only a first, fact-gathering step toward more effective coordination of the weather program. Future plans of the Holifield subcommittee appear to include the collection of more up-to-date information, the holding of hearings to assess this information, and then the making of recommendations on what national priorities in the weather program should be and how they should be achieved. This approach will not banish interagency and intercommittee rivalries, but the Government Operations subcommittee, as a neutral with no ties to any particular agency, has the credentials to play the honest broker.

—J.W.

Pollution Politics: LBJ Retreats on Opposition to Measure Curbing Pollution from Automobile Exhaust

A few years ago, a high government science advisor was reported to have warned John F. Kennedy that the biggest domestic political embarrassments of his administration were likely to arise in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a huge rambling bureaucracy whose diverse functions and functionaries have always in some measure eluded the efforts of the political leadership to coordinate and control them. The prophecy came true for Lyndon Johnson early this month when, in one of those unexplained political snafus that make the image-makers work overtime to redeem, the administration was suddenly revealed to be opposing an air pollution control measure which Johnson himself was seemingly on record as endorsing. The

administration quickly pulled back and is now supporting the measure, but not before the sincerity of the President's commitment to health and conservation goals was seriously and publicly called into question.

The bill that provoked the incident—a proposal to require auto manufacturers to equip their vehicles with devices to control emissions from automotive exhaust—had been gathering support for some time. Congressional action grew out of extensive hearings begun in early 1964 by the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, headed by Edmund S. Muskie (D-Maine). Muskie, who became head of the special subcommittee when it was created in 1963, has used his mandate to "extensively explore" pollution problems to become one of the most knowledgeable and effective conservationists in the Senate.

When the committee was created, Congress was on the verge of authorizing a major extension of federal air pollution programs, giving the Secretary of HEW power to initiate abatement actions and sanctioning federal grants to state, regional, and municipal governments to stimulate abatement measures on a local level. The initial efforts of the new subcommittee were directed toward passage of the bill, which was passed as the Clean Air Act in December 1963. When that had been accomplished, however, the subcommittee began more detailed studies of air pollution, holding hearings in Los Angeles, Denver, Boston, Chicago, New York, and Tampa, as well as Washington, and developing considerable expertise in a highly technical field.

In a report on its investigations, issued late in 1964, the committee concluded that while air pollution posed an increasing menace there was still "an opportunity to conquer [it] before it grows to major proportions." The committee found that "automotive exhaust was cited as responsible for some 50 per cent of the national air pollution problem" and recommended legislation to provide a minimum national standard that would limit exhaust emissions from gasoline-fueled motor vehicles. It also recommended that attention be paid to the problem of diesel exhaust, that a program of grants for the construction of community solid-waste disposal facilities be established, that a Federal Air Pollution Control Laboratory be created, and that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare take