

qualms about publicly criticizing Rachel Carson's attacks on pesticides and the chemical industry, but when two faculty members asked permission to give testimony that was expected to be adverse to industry at a pollution hearing last year they were advised by the university administration to submit re-

marks in writing but not to testify in person. The administration told *Science* the men had done little research on pollution and "would have folded under cross-examination," thus discrediting the university.

In another case, a faculty member who was designated by the university

to study local water resources concluded that a reservoir proposed by the Du Pont Company—and for which the company is buying up land in anticipation of making it available to public authorities—was economically unsound. The university refused to publish the study on the grounds that the

NSF Budget: House Committee Votes \$100-Million Cut

The House Appropriations Committee last week arrived at the astounding conclusion that the National Science Foundation has too much money in the bank from past appropriations—and, accordingly, it sliced \$100 million from NSF's request for the coming year. Since the Senate is yet to be heard from, and any differences between the two chambers must be resolved, the final verdict is uncertain. But, in very simplified terms, and without regard to the budgetary gyrations now afflicting all federal agencies, NSF currently has an appropriation of \$495 million, plus a \$21-million carryover from the defunct Mohole project. For the coming year, the Administration sought \$500 million, plus \$27 million that was frozen and later released in the current appropriation. The decision of the House committee was to set the appropriation of new money back to \$400 million.

In arriving at the \$400-million figure, the House Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee specifically noted that, at the end of fiscal 1968, NSF will still have on hand from past appropriations \$657 million in obligated but unexpended funds, plus \$46.5 million in unobligated money. During hearings on the budget, held in closed session at the end of February and just released last week*, NSF director Leland J. Haworth explained that the \$657 million was for commitments that stretch over several years, such as long-term grants and construction projects. As for the unobligated money, Haworth explained that part of that sum had been frozen and later released by the Bureau of the Budget, and that NSF was in the process of allocating it to various programs. The subcommittee, however, was unimpressed with these explanations, for in its report, issued under the imprint of the full committee, it referred to the unexpended sums, and mysteriously stated, "The Committee recognizes the competence of the Director and Members of the National Science Board and recommends that they make the necessary contractual adjustments in the institutional and fellowship grant programs to effectuate the economies proposed. The Committee recognizes the necessity of this action because of the budgetary situation, while appreciating the importance of the work and the long-range beneficial effects to the Nation of the programs of the National Science Foundation."

The subcommittee also cut back sharply on the budget request for the Office of Science and Technology, and altogether eliminated \$500,000 for a comprehensive

study of energy resources. Not counting this sum, OST sought \$1.9 million, compared with its current appropriation of \$1.5 million. The committee's verdict was for \$1.7 million.

Meanwhile, the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee has added an important provision to the NSF bill (H.R. 5404) authored by Representative Emilio Q. Daddario (D-Conn.) and passed last year by the House. In the Senate version, which is yet to come to the floor, NSF would annually be required to receive congressional authorization for its appropriation, rather than operate under a continuing authorization, as it does at present.

Technically, what this means is that each year the President would have to propose, and Congress would have to pass, a law authorizing the existence of NSF before an appropriation could be voted. In actual practice, this is a commonplace process for many federal agencies—NASA and the Defense Department among them. If the Senate provision is adopted, the principal effect would be to subject NSF to a new set of committee hearings in each house, prior to the traditional appropriations hearings. The new hearings would be for the purpose of preparing a bill setting forth the NSF jurisdiction and, most important of all, specifying a ceiling for the appropriation. In terms of congressional politics, such hearings can cut either way—they can be used by a friendly authorizing committee to boost an agency, or they can be used to cut it up. In the case of NSF, it would probably be the former, since, in the House, NSF's authorization would come before Daddario, a longtime friend of NSF; in the Senate, the prospects are less certain, though not too bad. For examining the Daddario bill, the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee created a temporary subcommittee on science, chaired by Senator Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.), who last year fought hard and successfully on the floor in behalf of the NSF appropriation. Kennedy's subcommittee expires with the 90th Congress, but if the bill should pass with the authorization provision intact, Kennedy has a good chance of heading up a new subcommittee to handle NSF affairs. What must be emphasized, however, is that most of the final say on money rests with the appropriations subcommittees, and these, as has been demonstrated in recent years, are not overflowing with affection for NSF.

In passing the Daddario bill, the Senate committee left intact all the other provisions. Most significant are those calling for specific authorization to support the social sciences, the creation of four assistant directorships, to be filled by presidential appointment, and clarification of the authority of the National Science Board.

—D. S. GREENBERG

* *Hearings, part 1, Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development, Appropriations for 1969*, 1224 pages; *Report*, 40 pages, both available without charge from the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.