

figures in congressional concern over science policy, it would be a mistake to assert that the concern can be traced solely to conventional pork-barrel motives.

One of the cosponsors of the Curtis resolution in the Senate was Senator Fred R. Harris (D-Okla.), who happens to be chairman of the newest of the science subcommittees, the Senate Operations Committee's subcommittee on government research. In defending his subcommittee's budget on the floor of the Senate on 16 February, Harris listed several questions in which the subcommittee is interested and which it proposes to examine. They make up a fairly accurate summary of the major questions which Congress would like answered. Harris listed them as follows.

First. Are the large expenditures for research and development and the various component research project expenditures necessary and justified?

Second. To what extent are improved administrative procedures required to guard against or eliminate unnecessary or improper overlapping and duplication among the Federal agencies?

Third. How may we establish broad national policies for making value judgments on how much emphasis will be given to various fields of research concerned, as compared with others, and for the best use of our limited national research manpower resources?

Fourth. How may we better provide for the dissemination of research results for governmental, institutional and industrial use?

Fifth. How may we be more certain of fairness in the distribution of Government research contracts among potential research contract recipients, particularly institutions of higher education?

It is not only the cynics who believe that the location of some science facilities and even the award of some grants have been influenced by legislators in particular seats of power. But most lawmakers accept the principle that the national interest as well as local interests must be served in matters affecting science, and that these matters should not be classed with rivers and harbors projects and new post offices. So long as the machinery for making the big decisions on locating facilities remains makeshift, however, pork-barrel temptations in federal science will remain strong.

The prominence of NSF in most congressional proposals to reconstruct this machinery is nearly inevitable. PSAC and OST belong to the Executive and are really out of reach of Congress. NSF isn't. And NSF, after all, was

originally created as an agency with unique responsibility for promoting scientific research and education.

The Daddario proposal for revamping NSF's basic law has as a chief point the return to the National Science Board of the top-level policy-making function which it was originally given and has never exercised. The board, which is made up of distinguished nongovernmental members of the scientific community, has acted essentially as policy maker for the Foundation, not for federal science.

The attitude of the board and of NSF toward the proposal will presumably be made clearer in the coming hearings, but there are signs that Daddario's proddings are not unwelcome. Any important changes, it is safe to predict, however, would be preceded by a period of quiet, high-level diplomacy to secure the support of PSAC and other interested parties for any alteration of the board's role.

What seems to be developing in federal science's ruling triad—Congress, the Executive, the science establishment—is a feeling that the need for comprehensive planning for science is growing urgent and that old patterns of action should not be repeated. In the past, if one planning body proved unsatisfactory, another was created, as the NSF, PSAC, OST progression and the proliferation of congressional committees suggest. Now the view seems to be that it is finally time to name the place where the buck stops.

—JOHN WALSH

### **Congress: Private Universities Say Unemployment Pay Should Not Cover Their Faculty, Students**

Private colleges and universities and some other nonprofit, tax-exempt organizations currently find themselves more closely concerned than they are accustomed to be with the deliberations of the tax-writing House Ways and Means Committee.

The committee has been considering a major revision of the unemployment compensation law, the first since it was enacted in the heyday of New Deal social legislation in the mid-thirties. And administration proposals, which the committee has been pondering, include a recommendation that employees of nonprofit religious, charitable, and education organizations be brought under coverage of the law.

Until now, nonprofit organizations eligible to receive tax-deductible contributions have not been required to participate in the program. In most states voluntary participation has been possible, but relatively few educational or health service institutions have taken up the option.

In general, the private institutions now oppose inclusion of their employees in the program—at least, inclusion on the same terms as employees of regular business enterprises. Their arguments have been of two main sorts. First, it is pointed out that these institutions perform a public service function and should not be treated as ordinary profit-making enterprises. Second, it is claimed that conditions in the nonprofit education and health institutions differ from those in the general employment market. It is argued that involuntary unemployment is rare among professionals in this sector, that even employment of blue-collar workers is very stable, and that, therefore, taxing these institutions would put an unwarranted financial burden on them.

It is noted that publicly supported institutions performing the same functions would almost certainly not be included in the extension of coverage. Private institutions argue they would suffer from application of a double standard. Bringing the employees of state and locally supported institutions into the program could conceivably be done. But there are doubts about the constitutionality of such a course, and it is unlikely that Congress would include public employees.

When hearings on the administration proposal were held last summer there was some feeling that the educational institutions involved had not pressed their case as effectively as they might have. In part this would appear to be the result of the noninvolvement of the public institutions. Representatives of the public institutions have, in general, more experience in lobbying and fewer inhibitions about it—or, if lobbying is too pejorative a term, about pursuing legislative goals.

In recent weeks that deficiency seems to have been remedied by the efforts of some of the larger private universities in getting their story across to the legislators.

The total cost to the private nonprofits of inclusion in the unemployment compensation program on a regular basis was not estimated in any detail at the hearings, but individual

schools, colleges, and universities did make individual projections. Smith College, for example, calculated the cost to it of adoption of the administration proposals at \$100,000 this year, increasing to between \$150,000 and \$170,000 in 1971. A big private university with a \$30-million annual payroll would pay more than \$1 million in unemployment compensation taxes, at the 3.25-percent rate on the payroll recommended in the bill. Such bellwether institutions in the private sector as M.I.T. and Stanford, which have large numbers of people employed on research projects in jobs which don't fit neatly into faculty or student categories, have a special problem.

Unemployment compensation is supported by taxes on employers. Employees do not contribute as they do under other portions of the social security law. The unemployment compensation program is an interesting hybrid—a state-administered program established by a federal statute. Of the 3.1-percent tax now set by federal law, only 0.4 percent goes to the federal government, for administration and to finance special programs of extended benefits during time of economic stress.

A carrot was used, rather than a stick, to prevail on the states to fashion their own programs. Employers in the program are allowed a 2.7-percent federal tax credit for contributions to state programs. This is made attractive by providing an "experience rating" system under which an employer may pay less—often considerably less—than the 2.7 percent state tax (if his workers' unemployment compensation claims are low) but may still claim the full 2.7-percent tax credit. Businessmen in most places encouraged the state legislatures to institute unemployment compensation programs.

Amendments proposed by the administration call for a number of major changes besides bringing about 5 million workers under coverage (employees in small businesses and large farming operations are the major groups to be affected, apart from employees of the nonprofits). The annual wage base on which the payroll tax is levied would rise from the present \$3000 to \$5600 in 1967 and \$6600 in 1971. The federal portion of the tax would be increased from 0.40 to 0.55 percent, so the total rate would be 3.25 percent. With these additional funds, a federal program of "adjustment benefits"

## Medicare: Enrollment Extension Likely

President Johnson snatched from a slow-moving Congress last week a politically popular proposal to extend the 31 March deadline for Medicare enrollment to 31 May (*Science*, 18 March).

As the deadline approached, bills proposing the extension began to proliferate. Organized pressure came, ironically, from the Republicans, whose spokesmen bear few scars from their long opposition to the program. A statement last week from the Republican Coordinating Committee (an arm of the National Committee) accused the administration of "inexcusable failures" and of victimizing the elderly with "endless red tape." The Republicans claim that because of difficult requirements, such as insistence on documentary proof of age, and a generally high-pressure campaign which confused and alienated potential beneficiaries, about 5 million eligible citizens had not enrolled.

According to the administration, Republican estimates are far too high: the official word is that 17 million people over 65 have enrolled in the medical insurance program, leaving 1 million who have deliberately decided against enrollment and another million who have simply not responded. "We have the slips of paper," said one government official. "I can't imagine where the Republicans got their figures." Republican officials say the figures are based on unofficial calculations made around the country.

Despite somewhat nasty charges, the spirit is bipartisan. The reason is that the extension is universally desired. The deadline was initially devised to make sure that the Social Security Administration would have time to put the program in order before benefits actually began being paid on 1 July. In that sense, it has already served its purpose. Thirteen million people have already received their insurance cards, and the Social Security Administration will clearly have enough time to deal with the latecomers as they sign up. The proposed extension has no enemies.

—E.L.

would be created outside the state programs. The federal program would be designed to give an additional period of compensation to workers with good employment records who lose their jobs as a result of automation or, presumably, of a decline in the economy of the region. The additional funds would also be put into federal grants to defray two-thirds of state benefit costs in excess of 2 percent of total wages. The proposed legislation would also provide federal standards on such matters as requirements for eligibility and amount of benefits, matters which have heretofore been left to the states.

As this was written, it appeared likely that the Ways and Means Committee was very close to unveiling a bill amending the unemployment compensation program. How closely it will resemble the administration bill is hard to say, since Ways and Means both has a reputation for independent action and likes to keep its executive-session business to itself.

The fact that an overhaul of unem-

ployment compensation is anticipated is itself noteworthy, since, for three decades, expansionary changes have been opposed by business interests and often by state-government representatives who resisted change either on states-rights grounds or from fears that increased costs to employers might make their own states less attractive to new industry.

The fate of the nonprofits will probably be determined by their treatment in the Ways and Means Committee bill, since the House, at least, tends to accept committee recommendations in such matters.

The arguments on which the case of the nonprofits rests were summed up in testimony given before the committee in August by William P. Tolley, chancellor of Syracuse University, for the American Council on Education.

Asking first that nonprofit educational organizations be exempted from paying the 0.55-percent federal portion of the tax because such a percentage would amount to more than the esti-

mated cost of benefits to employees of such institutions, Tolley went on to make these points.

These nonprofit organizations are already engaged in rendering public service and to the extent they pay unnecessarily into the Federal unemployment insurance fund, then to that extent their resources are diminished to carry on the work for which they exist.

This Federal unemployment insurance tax does not apply to Federal, State, or municipal employees. Federal employees are covered under a cost reimbursement plan as are some State employees. Nonprofit organizations which perform public welfare services should be given the same exemption from this part of the total unemployment insurance tax.

Secondly, exempt from unemployment insurance tax coverage the faculty and other professional staff members. Such persons have, in effect, no unemployment since the demand for teachers and professional personnel, such as doctors, research engineers and scientists, et cetera, greatly exceeds the supply.

For example, at the University of California on the various campuses the number of budgeted but unfilled teaching positions has almost doubled in 2 years: 438 in 1964 as compared to 262 in 1962.

In addition, 651 positions budgeted for regular professors and instructors in 1964-65 were filled with temporary, provisional, or part-time appointees compared

with 531 2 years earlier. Professional personnel are in similar short supply.

It should also be noted that most research scientists and engineers at educational institutions are hired for specific projects or specific periods related to contracts or grants and accept such assignments with that understanding.

Third, exempt from coverage the students, in regular attendance at nonprofit educational institutions, and their spouses. The students and their spouses should be exempt from coverage since their attachment to the labor market is temporary and geared to the students' stay at the institutions.

The ACE statement, in essence, claims that universities are recession-proof but indicates a willingness to see blue-collar workers included in the unemployment compensation program. Other organizations have argued for a blanket exemption for educational institutions. Equal treatment for public and private institutions of the same type is urged. It has also been noted that the special character of employment in universities and colleges would make it possible for working students or student wives, or even faculty members, to work during the regular school year and vacation at the expense of the unemployment compensation fund.

Partisans also suggest that inclusion of the employees of nonprofit organizations with good employment records is being sought now by some because the payments of these organizations would help with expected heavy costs of other to-be-included groups, particularly farm employees, who are expected to have high unemployment patterns.

For the nonprofits, the experience of the past year has been an unsettling one. The stakes are high when tax legislation is under consideration, and Ways and Means Committee business often creates a bear-garden atmosphere for lobbyists. The private educational and health service institutions were not as practiced as other interest groups in getting attention, but lately they seem to have been doing better.

They would probably settle now for inclusion in the system under the special arrangement by which they would reimburse the state fund for benefits actually drawn by their employees. While it is risky to predict such things, there seems to be a good chance, if influential Ways and Means Committee chairman Wilbur Mills concurs, that this is in the cards.—JOHN WALSH

## Vietnam: Jungle Conflict Poses New R&D Problems

Even though the Defense Department has long been served by a huge military research and development apparatus, which now spends more than \$6.5 billion a year, the Vietnam war has thrown up its own special challenge to the giant R&D machine. The jungle environment and the nature of the conflict, which combines the characteristics of conventional and guerrilla warfare, have demanded innovations in strategy, tactics, and equipment. Moreover, the urgency of these demands has required drastic shortening of the 5- to 10-year period usually required for producing new military equipment—from the initial concept, through research, development, and testing.

John S. Foster, Jr., director of defense research and engineering, recently told congressional committees how the R&D effort for the Vietnam war was proceeding. Two projects to improve and expedite R&D activities in support of the U.S. effort in Vietnam have been initiated within the past 2 years—JRATA and PROVOST.

In April 1964 the Joint Research and Test Activity (JRATA) was established at Saigon as part of General William C. Westmoreland's Military Assistance Command, which exercises overall direction of U.S. forces in Vietnam. JRATA pulled together the test and evaluation activities which were being carried on in an uncoordinated

fashion in Vietnam by the Army, the Air Force, and the Advanced Research Projects Agency.

These activities, together with those of a new Navy research and test unit, have kept their separate identities but have been under the central direction of Brigadier General John K. Boles, Jr., an officer experienced in military research programs and a graduate of Harvard's advanced management program. JRATA, regarded as a highly useful link between combat units in the field and the R&D apparatus in the United States, consists of about 150 people of whom perhaps 30 are civilian engineers and scientists, including some anthropologists, political scientists, and other social scientists.

Project PROVOST—Priority Research and Development Objectives for Vietnam Operations Support—was begun last year in an effort to make new and needed material quickly available to the forces in Vietnam whenever this could be done by acceleration of effort. Directed by the office of Defense Research and Engineering, PROVOST is essentially an administrative procedure