certain nonuniversity research institutions in Argentina, the Latin-American Studies Association, among its other efforts, is reportedly trying to interest American foundations in providing alternative positions for the Argentinian scholars in Argentina.

It also appears that some unofficial American emissaries, and perhaps some official ones as well, have been striving to muster whatever influence they possess in Argentina to persuade Ongania to end the crisis by apologizing to the professors and changing his position. It has to be said, however, that the tendency to discourage migration, however decent its motivation, is open to the interpretation that, when all is said and done, it constitutes an indirect form of American support for the Ongania regime.

The major exception to the policy of discretion is an effort being mounted by the National Academy of Sciences on behalf of Argentinian graduate students. The Academy believes that, while eventually the senior scientists will find ways to continue their careers, the education of the students will be severely disrupted. Accordingly, the Academy is attempting to coordinate efforts to find places for the students in American universities, despite the fact that the applications are apt to arrive at unfortunate times in the academic year and that departments may have to dip into reserve funds to accommodate them. According to Joseph Bunnett, University of California professor of chemistry who visited Argentina for the Academy with the Latin American Studies Association team, the number of students affected is probably no more than 30, not more than 10 of whom would be in the same field.—ELINOR LANGER

Congress: Debate Over Science Jurisdictions

Congress from time to time takes a look at its internal organization and procedures to see if it is equipped to meet the demands of the day. These moments of introspection often follow sharp comment by outsiders that the congressional machinery is out of order. Such criticism, which had reached a high level of intensity prior to last year's unusually productive session of Congress, helped inspire the establishment, in early 1965, of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. It was understood, of course, that the committee was not to propose drastic reforms threatening those privileges and immunities which members hold most dear.

Thus the Joint Committee's recent recommendations are not revolutionary in the least. However, they do include a few proposals sure to produce conflict within Congress. One such recommendation is that for a rearrangement of certain committee jurisdictions in science, research, and education. Heavy resistance to these jurisdictional changes already is evident.

The committee, a temporary 12-member body made up of equal numbers of senators and representatives and of Democrats and Republicans, is chaired by Representative Ray J. Madden of Indiana and Senator A. S. Mike Monroney of Oklahoma. Its report, made public in July, contains a wide variety of recommendations, calling for such things as greater staff support for committees and individual members, more expeditious conduct of committee business, tighter restrictions on the number of committees on which a senator may serve, a prohibition of proxy voting in committee, the establishment of an ethics committee in the House, and more comprehensive regulation of lobbying.

No recommendations dealt with super-sensitive questions such as whether the custom of selecting committee chairmen strictly on seniority should be altered or abandoned, or whether Senate rules should permit filibusters. The committee was barred by its mandate from recommending changes in House and Senate rules other than those pertaining to the organization and jurisdiction of committees.

Publication of the report followed a 16-month study which involved hearing the views of almost 200 witnesses, including numerous congressmen, political scientists, and spokesmen for various lobbies and interest groups. No testimony from people in the physical or natural sciences was received or specifically solicited, although the committee announced that anyone wishing to testify would be welcome.

In its report the committee said, "Congress can best bring a greater order and efficiency to its supervision of the Government's science and research programs by concentrating their review in as few standing committees as is practical." Accordingly, the committee recommended that the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee be redesignated the Committee on Science and Astronautics, making its name correspond to that of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics.

The Joint Committee report and subsequent draft legislation to implement the recommendations call for the National Science Foundation, the National Bureau of Standards, and the Environmental Science Services Administration (ESSA) to be transferred to the renamed committee. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare would lose jurisdiction over NSF, while the Commerce Committee would lose jurisdiction over the Bureau of Standards and ESSA.

The House Committee on Science and Astronautics already has jurisdiction over NSF and the Bureau of Standards, but, under the Joint Committee's recommendations, its jurisdiction would be broadened to include ESSA, for which the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and Merchant Marine and Fisheries are now largely responsible. In short, the Joint Committee tried to address itself to complaints, sometimes heard within the scientific community and elsewhere, that committee responsibility for science and technology is too fragmented.

The far simpler question of committee responsibility for education also was looked at critically. Neither the House nor the Senate has a committee devoted exclusively to education, even though annual federal support of education is now on a multi-billion-dollar

scale. Noting this, the Joint Committee recommended that the House Education and Labor Committee be divided into two major committees. Similarly, responsibility for education would be taken from the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and vested in a new committee.

Congressional committee chairmen generally react to recommendations that their legislative jurisdictions be reduced with a hurt look and an expression of amazement that anything so damaging to the public interest could be seriously proposed. In the case of the Joint Committee's proposals, the reactions have varied from an indignant outburst to a measured criticism of the jurisdictional changes recommended. Some of the chairmen affected have not yet reacted at all, at least not publicly.

Predictably, the flamboyant chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, Representative Adam Clayton Powell of Harlem, has complained of discrimination. No House committee but his had been marked for major surgery, he said. Powell called the proposal to break up his committee a "personal attack on me as a black congressman."

The chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, Senator Warren G. Magnuson of Washington, said, at a hearing on 31 August conducted by Senator Monroney, that the proposed jurisdictional changes in the science field fail to take into account the close intertie between scientific activity and agency missions. Science cannot, he said, be dealt with collectively, with distinctions between basic research, applied research, and development ignored.

He observed, for example, that the scientific work of the Bureau of Standards is closely related to the mission of its parent agency, the Department of Commerce. The National Science Foundation, as a granting agency supporting general scientific research, is not mission-oriented. Yet the Joint Committee had proposed, Magnuson noted, that the Bureau of Standards as well as NSF be placed under a Senate Science and Astronautics Committee.

As another case in point, Magnuson cited the proposal for the Commerce Committee to lose jurisdiction over ESSA while retaining jurisdiction over oceanography. "This would result in a separation of marine science and significant portions of practical meteorology and atmospheric sciences which is both unrealistic and impractical," he said. "The interaction between the oceans and the atmosphere is just now becoming understandable."

Even if the jurisdiction of the Senate space committee were broadened at the expense of other committees, he said, scientific activities would continue to be carried out by a multiplicity of government agencies. Congress never has seen fit to establish a Department of Science and Technology, he noted. "Even the Office of Science and Technology does not have decision-making jurisdiction over all of these [scientific] programs," Magnuson said. "It merely provides advice and assistance to the President with respect to developing policies and evaluating and coordinating programs. This is far different [from] the proposed legislative authority of the new science committee."

Magnuson said he had learned from the Joint Committee's staff that the proposals to concentrate jurisdiction over science affairs in the Senate space committee were inspired by Senator Birch Bayh of Indiana. In fact, the Joint Committee's 2400-page record of the hearings contains little about legislative jurisdictions in the sciences other than the Indiana senator's few remarks on the subject.

Weak Foundation

Bayh suggested consolidating legislative jurisdictions in this field as a "corollary" to establishing a joint House-Senate review and advisory committee on research policy. In Magnuson's view, this off-hand suggestion was a weak foundation for the jurisdictional realignments now proposed. Bayh's principal proposal, to establish a research policy review group, was not adopted by the Monroney-Madden committee. Such a group inevitably would invade the field now occupied by subcommittees on research of the House and Senate Government Operations committees.

In weighing the merits of the Joint Committee's proposals to consolidate jurisdictions over scientific affairs one can distinguish between "policy in science" and "science in policy." It is the latter, especially, that Senator Magnuson is thinking of when he says that scientific activities and the government missions which those activities support should be considered together. The Joint Committee itself seems implicitly to acknowledge that this view has some validity by excluding certain major areas of science policy, such as defense research and oceanography, from its consolidation proposals.

"Policy in science" questions, such as those concerned with government-university relations, the supply of scientific manpower, and the fixing of priorities for the support of basic research, perhaps are best dealt with by House and Senate committees assigned to review government science policy generally. This is the broad review function undertaken by the Senate Subcommittee on Research, and, to a lesser extent, by the Research and Technical Programs Subcommittee of the House.

These two bodies, established within the last 2 years as subcommittees of the government operations committees of the House and the Senate, are too new to permit a full appraisal of their effectiveness and potential. The record is not blank, however. For example, the Senate subcommittee, chaired by Fred Harris of Oklahoma, is aggressively exploring sensitive policy issues such as those involved in the geographic distribution of federal R & D funds.

The House subcommittee, under Representative Henry S. Reuss of Wisconsin, sometimes has given the appearance of a group in search of a role, but perhaps it will find its way. How much influence the Reuss and Harris subcommittees will have on the development of science policy will depend heavily on the quality of their reports, for they handle neither legislation (there are a few exceptions, such as reorganization measures) nor appropriations bills.

Any hope that these bodies, or any others that Congress may establish, will be able to guide policy-in-science decisions generally is likely to prove illusory. If a congressional committee somehow should manage to establish an intelligent surveillance over the vast domain of government science activity, its chances of having its advice regularly accepted by government science administrators, and by other congressional committees whose varied and often conflicting interests would be affected, would be virtually nil. An occasional success in decisively influencing congressional or administration policy is probably the most that such a group could aspire to.

The House Science and Astronautics Committee may succeed, through the subcommittee on science, research, and development which it established in

1964 under Representative Emilio Q. Daddario of Connecticut, in its current effort to push the National Science Foundation into a science-policy leadership role that NSF has eschewed. But the Daddario subcommittee, though widely respected, is far from being the recognized overseer of government research policy. That a Senate committee on science and astronautics would have greater influence on government science policy than the Daddario group has had seems unlikely. Indeed, most senators are neither as willing nor as able as their colleagues in the House to devote themselves meticulously to subcommittee work.

Congress seems to have no choice but to depend on the administration to set research priorities and to come forward with properly balanced scientific programs. As Don Price observes in *The Scientific Estate*, the Executive Office of the President is the best place to try to achieve a comprehensive and objective review of program proposals and alternatives. There, the Bureau of the Budget and the Office of Science and Technology collaborate on program appraisals in an atmosphere which, in theory at least, is free from outside pressures and is pervaded by a spirit of loyalty to the President and his goals.

Nearly all the recommendations of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress for realigning committee jurisdictions in the science field probably will be contested, and their adoption by the House and Senate is very much in doubt. Opposition can arise within a committee that would gain jurisdiction as well as within one that would lose jurisdiction. For example, Senator Magnuson, a popular and influential member of the Senate establishment, is a high-ranking member of the Aeronautics and Space Committee. The chairman of this committee, Senator Clinton P. Anderson of New Mexico, who is yet to react visibly to the Joint Committee's proposals, may find his relations with Magnuson awkward if he does seek to have his committee's jurisdiction broadened.

The Joint Committee professes to entertain the hope that its recommendations will be adopted at the present session of Congress. This seems scarcely realistic, however, in view of the fact that the session is far advanced, the backlog of unfinished legislative work is considerable, and the pressures for adjournment in an election year are immense.

Although the fate of the proposed realignment of committee jurisdictions is highly uncertain, there seems no reason why a number of the Joint Committee's other recommendations cannot be adopted before the end of the next session of Congress. Generally, these other proposals, such as the one to break up the popular "Tuesday to Thursday club" and put Congress on a 5-day work week, would amount to not much more than squirting oil in the congressional bearings. However, one recommendation that might well be accepted calls for the establishment of a permanent Joint Committee on Congressional Operations, which could study the need for more far-reaching reforms.

If this body should be created, one piece of advice it should consider is that which Charles L. Schultz, director of the Bureau of the Budget, gave the Monroney-Madden committee. He said, in effect, that many legislative committees of Congress are spending so much time on highly detailed annual authorization bills that they neglect broad policy issues and questions of major program alternatives that they might be considering.

Schultz said that, 20 years ago, 95 percent of all programs, with the exception of one-time items such as construction projects, were authorized for a long or indefinite period. Now about one-third of the annual budget is subject to reauthorizing legislation before the appropriations committees can begin considering it. For example, the House and Senate Armed Services committees now require the Pentagon to obtain specific annual authorization for purchases of much of its hardware, such as ships, aircraft, and tanks, and for the research and development on this equipment. (The annual reauthorization process has contributed to the long delay in getting this year's appropriations bills through Congress. Though it is 10 weeks since the start of the new fiscal year, seven of the 12 major appropriations measures are yet to be passed. The federal agencies concerned are not left without new funds, but their spending must not exceed levels established by the previous budget.)

It seems entirely possible that, instead of looking to realignments of committee jurisdictions, Congress might gain more in legislative effectiveness by calling out into the open those of its committees that are now often wandering in a forest of legislative detail.—LUTHER J. CARTER

Announcements

A report entitled "Opportunities for **Postdoctoral Research in Biochemistry** in Japan," prepared under the auspices of the National Science Foundation, was released this month. Copies are available on request from the U.S.–Japan Cooperative Science Program, NSF, Washington, D.C. 20550.

The International Conference on **Water for Peace** will be held in Washington 23–31 May, under the aegis of the State Department. Papers are being solicited on several categories of water programs: planning and development, basic data, technology and research needs, education and training, organizing, economics, and financing. About 500 papers will be accepted, a maximum of 100 from the United States. Abstracts of not more than two pages, single-spaced, are required by 1 November; notifications of acceptance will be sent by 15 November. Additional information is available from Richard C. Hagan, secretary general of the conference, Department of State, 2201 C Street, NW, Washington, D.C.

The **National Institutes of Health** closed their London office as of 12 September, as part of an effort to consolidate NIH activities for Europe, the Middle East, and Africa. The research grant, fellowship, and other NIH programs in areas covered by the London office will continue as before, but with administrative responsibility centered in the European office in Paris. Correspondence should now be addressed to Peter Condliffe, chief of the European Office, NIH, 2 Avenue Gabriel, Paris 8.

Recent Deaths

Vernon H. Cheldelin, 50; director of the Science Research Institute, Oregon State University; 23 August.

Robert Burgette Johnson, 44; chairman of the social studies department at Wilberforce University; 23 August.

Carlos Martinez, 52; professor of physiology and director of the oncology laboratory at the University of Minnesota; 24 August.

S. Marx White, retired chairman of the department of medicine at the University of Minnesota medical school; 28 August.

Howard E. Wilson, 64; dean of the school of education of U.C.L.A.; 12 August.