

the National Defense Education Act (NDEA); the college work-study program; the program of educational opportunity grants under the Higher Education Act; and the guaranteed loan program under the Higher Education Act], the House adopted three more restrictive amendments.

The first, introduced by Representative Neal Smith (D-Iowa), provided that "No loan, guarantee of a loan, or grant . . . shall be awarded to any applicant who has been convicted by any court of general jurisdiction of any crime which involves . . . force, trespass, or the seizure of property under control of an institution of higher education. . . ."

The second, introduced by Wyman, denied educational assistance to "any individual who, at any time after the effective date of this act, willfully refuses to obey a lawful regulation or order of the university or college which he is attending or at which he is employed when such willful refusal is certified by the appropriate university or college authority to have been of a serious nature and contributed to the disruption of university or college administration. . . ."

The third, introduced by Representative William J. Scherle (R-Iowa), denied assistance to "any individual convicted in any federal, state or local court . . . of inciting, promoting or carrying on a riot, or convicted of any group activity resulting in material damage to property, or injury to persons. . . ."

Wyman's amendment was placed in the portion of the bill relating to NDEA, but the congressman intended it to apply to all of the educational aid programs covered in the bill, and a House legal expert believes it is worded in such a way that it does, indeed, apply to all four programs. The matter may be clarified before the bill becomes law. The other two amendments clearly apply to all four programs.

The three amendments passed easily by voice votes, but the strength of feeling against campus rebels became fully apparent when a separate vote was demanded on Wyman's amendment. The tally was 306 yeas, 54 nays, and 73 not voting.

Congressmen who supported the amendments generally argued that it is a "privilege" to receive federal financial assistance and that the taxpayers should not be expected to support students who disrupt university life. As Repre-

sentative Otis G. Pike (D-New York) expressed it: "I have told my own children . . . that they can do anything they want to at college. They can tie up the dean. . . . They can steal papers out of the office. They can do anything, because I am physically unable to prevent them. My son can beat me up, and my daughter is too old for spanking. But, if they do these things, they are not going to do them at my expense. They are going to do them at their own expense. . . ."

Opponents criticized the amendments on a variety of grounds, including the following:

► Some of the amendments punish individuals without due process of law, a factor which may make them unconstitutional.

► All of the amendments discriminate against the poor, since they would not affect wealthy students who are not receiving federal assistance.

► The amendments constitute a threat to academic freedom since the federal government would, in essence, be intruding in internal university matters.

► The amendments attempt to use scientific and educational aid programs as a punitive device, a use for which they were never intended. If Congress wants to punish college demonstrators, it should use a more direct approach.

► Federal assistance is not a "privilege" or a reward for good behavior, as Congress seems to think, but is an investment aimed at producing trained manpower and research in the national interest. The amendments may thus undercut the national interest.

► The amendments might actually aggravate tense campus situations because there would be bitter controversy over whether to invoke the sanctions.

► The amendments introduce numerous practical difficulties. Will they, for example, discourage banks and other lending institutions from participating in the guaranteed college loan program?

The future of the restrictive legislation is not completely clear. Congressman Wyman plans to offer similar amendments to every suitable bill that comes along. Meanwhile, the House Committee on Education and Labor, whose chairman Carl D. Perkins (D-Kentucky) expressed concern over the lack of thought given to the ramifications of the amendments, plans to hold hearings on the best way to deal with college disruptions. And whatever the House does must still be approved by

the Senate, with any differences resolved in a joint House-Senate conference committee.

Some observers think the restrictions are so unworkable and so unlikely to be invoked that it may not make much difference whether the legislation passes. Others believe the legislation might be challenged in court. But one wag is convinced he has hit on a sure-fire way to stop the drive for restrictive legislation. He suggests that students form a Wyman for Congress Club and hold a disruptive demonstration at the University of New Hampshire, in Wyman's home state.—PHILIP M. BOFFEY

APPOINTMENTS



E. T. Hayes



W. R. Hibbard, Jr.

Earl T. Hayes, deputy director of the Bureau of Mines, to director of the bureau. Hayes is succeeding **Walter R. Hibbard, Jr.**, who is leaving to become vice president of research and development of Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corporation. . . . **John K. Hulm**, director of the solid-state sciences department, Westinghouse Research Laboratories, will represent private industry on the NSF Advisory Committee for Science Education. . . . **James M. Roxburgh**, administrator of the scholarship and fellowship programs at the National Research Council in Ottawa, to secretary of the Medical Research Council. . . . **George C. Sponsler III**, director of the Center for Exploratory Studies for the Federal Systems Division of IBM, to executive secretary of the division of engineering of the National Research Council. . . . **Donald F. Squires**, deputy director of the Smithsonian's Museum of Natural History, to director of the Marine Sciences Research Center of the State University of New York at Stony Brook.

Erratum: In the report, "Tritiated digoxin binding to (Na⁺ + K⁺)-activated adenosine triphosphatase: possible allosteric site" by Arnold Schwartz *et al.* (p. 323, 19 Apr.), the opening parentheses of line 6, column 3, has been omitted. The line should read "(Na⁺ + K⁺)-activated adenosine triphosphatase. . . ." The last line of paragraph 1 should read "K⁺-dependent phosphatase reaction (6)" and not ". . . phosphate reaction. . . ."