

## Senate Would Link Mansfield Amendment, NSF Budget Boost

The Senate last week passed a \$19 billion military procurement authorization bill which carries unchanged the so-called Mansfield amendment barring Department of Defense (DOD) support of university research not directly related to DOD's military mission. The Senate, in a new companion amendment, also went on record as favoring what would amount to a \$100 million increase in the budget of the National Science Foundation (NSF) to compensate for the restrictions on DOD research funding.

Since the latter action came in the form of a "sense-of-the-Congress" amendment, no immediate \$100 million bonanza is in store for NSF. The military procurement bill now goes to a House-Senate conference for resolution of differences between House and Senate versions. The House bill contains no form of either of the amendments affecting research, and there have been indications that the House Armed Services Committee may be hostile to the Mansfield amendment. Any increase in NSF funding would be left to the House and Senate authorization and appropriations committees with jurisdiction over NSF.

The new amendment, contained in Section 207 of the Senate Bill, was sponsored by Senator Thomas J. McIntyre (D-N.H.). It passed the Senate on 28 August by 68 to 0 in a vote that linked the Mansfield and McIntyre amendments. The McIntyre amendment reads as follows:

Sec. 207. It is in the sense of the Congress that—

(1) an increase in Government support of basic scientific research is necessary to preserve and strengthen the sound technological base essential both to protection of the national security and the solution of unmet domestic needs;

(2) a larger share of such support should be provided hereafter through the National Science Foundation;

(3) to the extent that funds are not otherwise available to provide for such increased support during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1971, they should be provided from funds which have been or are programmed for other Federal programs for such fiscal year; and

(4) in implementation of and in a manner consistent with these precepts the Director of the Office of Management and Budget should, in the preparation of the Federal budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1971, provide for not less than a 20 per centum increase in the amount of funds to be made available to the National Science Foundation over the amount made available to such Foundation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971.

(The budget requested for NSF for fiscal 1971 is \$513 million; thus the 20 percent increase proposed in the amendment would amount to about \$100 million.)

McIntyre, author of the amendment, is chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee subcommittee on research and development which scrutinized the DOD R & D budget last year and is credited with guiding the Senate to making cuts of \$1 billion from the \$8.2 billion requested.

After observing the effects of the Mansfield amendment, McIntyre said that he and his subcommittee "could not rationally quarrel with the section's basic thrust" and recommended reenactment of the amendment, but he obviously developed some misgivings about how it was being applied.

In his remarks on the floor McIntyre put it this way. "The mere reenactment of [the Mansfield Amendment] however, might well be productive of more problems than it solved. Ever since its passage, the section has been subjected to conflicting interpretations. Moreover, its reenactment by itself will not make available additional research funds for domestic oriented agencies."

By tying his own amendment to the Mansfield amendment (Section 204 in the Senate bill) and by discussing both measures in detail during floor debate, McIntyre was obviously seeking to build the legislative record which influences how a law is administered.

To this end he said, for example, "Judging from remarks on the floor during the past year, it is clear that [the Mansfield amendment] was intended by its supporters not merely to weed out nondefense research projects in the Department's budget, but to correct what they regard as a serious structural imbalance in Government support of basic research in the United States. It was their hope that the new section would produce large scale reductions in Department of Defense research programs and that these reductions would be offset by corresponding increases in the research of the National Science Foundation and domestic mission agencies."

McIntyre pointed out that DOD funding of academic research has declined from \$247 million in fiscal 1969 to \$215.6 million in 1971, which, when inflation and the use of increasingly costly technology is taken into account, represents a reduction of research effort of about 25 percent.

In addition, domestic agencies have cut back research severely and, says McIntyre, "The academic community was saddled with most of the final burden. Agencies could reduce their inhouse research efforts only minimally if efficient utilization of their facilities was to be maintained. And since too few dollars were available at the National Science Foundation to pick up the resulting "dropouts," many academic investigators have found themselves cut off from the research support necessary if their investigations are to go on."

The bill is expected to go to conference in the week of 21 September or even earlier. Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird has been publicly critical of the Mansfield amendment and appears to have communicated his misgivings to at least some House members. How this will influence the give and take of the conferees is impossible to predict.

The 68 to 0 vote indicates that there is some sympathy in the Senate for the plight of academic research. The breadth of the support is indicated by the fact that senators Strom Thurmond (R-N.C.) and Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) spoke in behalf of the amendments during the floor debate. Senator Mansfield backed the move for a dual amendment but did not take a conspicuous role.

McIntyre obviously hopes that the final bill will carry both amendments and that the conference report will clarify the legislators' intent in passing the Mansfield amendment. Whatever the outcome, the incident marks the emergence of McIntyre as a well-informed friend of academic research.—JOHN WALSH