

NSF from DOD, then most of the difficulties he mentions would be eliminated. I hope he realizes that Congress makes the laws not to be subverted, but to be enforced."

Mansfield said he had "repeatedly" urged an "orderly, intelligent implementation" of his amendment, but complained that he had seen "little initiative or leadership from the Office of Sci-

ence and Technology. Instead of seizing upon a real opportunity to help reduce the inordinate dependence of our scientists on the Defense Department, we have heard only silence . . . only requests for abolition [of the amendment]."

Obviously irked, Mansfield hinted that he may take a close look at the nation's science policy apparatus. He

said the "lack of leadership" in responding to his amendment "indicates clearly that we in Congress need to start asking very seriously about the state of public policy for science in this country. What is it? Who is forming it? Who is minding the store?" Mansfield said he hopes "to have time to look into these questions in the not too distant future."—PHILIP M. BOFFEY

DuBridge Reviews Major Science Policy Issues, Defends Administration Actions on Basic Research

Presidential science adviser Lee A. DuBridge last week invited representatives of the Washington science press to a session which evolved into a defense by DuBridge of Administration policies and of his own role.

The meeting combined the features of an informal, after-office-hours "backgrounder" and a press conference, and it afforded DuBridge an opportunity to express his views—although not in great depth—on major problems in federal science.

The session was the first of its kind, but DuBridge has been generally more accessible to the science press than his predecessors, particularly when specific issues involving his office have come up.

New Relationships

The first part of the hour-and-a-half meeting was devoted to a description by DuBridge and several aides of the operation of the Office of Science and Technology (OST). OST continues to provide staff support for the President's Science Advisory Committee (PSAC) and the Federal Council on Science and Technology (whose members are chief research officials in government science agencies) and to furnish studies and perform liaison jobs directly for the White House. DuBridge said that, in addition, OST is working out relationships with the new advisory councils lodged in the Executive Office, including the Council on Environmental Quality which, he said, has asked OST to keep tabs on the technological aspects of environmental problems. One thing DuBridge noted in passing is that about as many of PSAC's panels deal with defense technology as with civilian technology.

The discussion then shifted to the "budget squeeze," and DuBridge indi-

cated his own concern, as he has on other occasions, about basic research. He said that the average 20 percent annual rate of growth in R&D funds in the early 1960's has declined in recent years—until this year there will be an absolute decline in the development budget and, because of factors such as inflation, a decline for the first time in the volume of basic research. DuBridge noted that "Inflation hits basic research harder," in part because "salaries of scientists go up faster than general wage rates." He estimated that the effect would be a 10 to 15 percent decrease in work in basic science.

DuBridge and his deputy director of OST, Hubert Heffner, stressed the point that the Administration had sought to give basic science special treatment, despite a very tight budget situation, but that Congress last year cut the Administration budget request of \$1.57 billion for basic research to \$1.47 billion. He said there are signs that the pattern is being repeated again this year.

This was a theme hit particularly hard by Heffner, who said he had urged DuBridge to meet with the press because university critics of the Administration and of DuBridge were misinformed about the situation and about President Nixon's intentions.

Because nearly a score of reporters were present, queries tended to come at random and there was no possibility of hot pursuit in following up questions, but the OST argument contained these main points.

A leveling off of the R & D budget was inevitable. The Administration has sought to ease the effect on research, but Congress thwarted the attempt with its action on the budget and then seriously complicated the situation with the Mansfield Amendment. (DuBridge's comments on the amendment generally

followed the line he took in his remarks on Capitol Hill [see above].)

To questions about cuts in federal support for graduate students and post-doctoral fellows, DuBridge replied that, with employment down in the aerospace industry and demand for faculty in higher education "leveled off," a "large number of highly trained people are out of jobs." He said that the OST is involved in manpower studies that will enable policy makers to "predict needs for technical manpower in a reasonable way."

To questions about a national science policy DuBridge gave very general answers, indicating mainly that he felt it should be possible to decide what kind of technology to promote—defense, space, environmental—by developing the tools of cost-benefit analysis, but that basic science should be supported separately. It is impossible to know which fields in basic science will produce important results, and so it is necessary to maintain a strong science base.

Comment on Reorganization

He said his office is working on a policy statement on science which he hopes the President will eventually accept.

Asked about a reorganization of science policy machinery along lines of the Cabinet-level agency often suggested, DuBridge said OST was not working on reorganization plans "very intensely." Structure, he observed, is now the province of the new White House Office of Management and the Budget, but he gave the clear impression that he thought money, not structure, was the main problem.

Earlier he had wryly observed that, when some people say we need better science policy, what they really want is more money.

As for money and the future, DuBridge admitted "it is evident that fiscal '72 is going to be a very tight budget situation."—JOHN WALSH