

have a budget of more than \$2 billion a year if most activities of the National Institutes of Health were transferred to NIRAS as originally contemplated. Conceived as an ambitious and more broadly gauged successor to the National Science Foundation, NIRAS might be responsible for funding as much as 60 percent of all federally supported basic research. However, the subcommittee indicated that NIRAS perhaps should not absorb the contract research activities of NIH and should take from that agency only its institutional grant and training functions.

- An Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) should be established as an independent arm of the Congress to "assess the impacts, good and bad, of existing and developing technology." In September the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, of which the Daddario subcommittee is a part, approved a bill to establish the OTA and authorize a \$5 million appropriation for its first year's operations. With a view to ensuring the independence of the OTA, the bill would have this new agency operate under a board that would include a half-dozen members appointed by the President, as well as several senators and representatives.

No full-blown concept of just what a national science policy should be is available, but, from the summer hearings, the subcommittee distilled a number of "major principles" that might go into such a policy. Clearly, a cardinal principle is that "continuity, stability, and long-term support in pursuit of scientific goals" should be assured. Accordingly, the subcommittee is recommending that, pending the establishment of NIRAS, the National Science Foundation, which now funds 15 percent of all federally supported basic research, should begin funding a third of all such research.

One subcommittee witness, James R. Killian, Jr., science adviser to President Eisenhower and now chairman of the corporation at M.I.T., suggested that the search for a science policy was a search for a way to encourage the government to take a broader view in considering support of research. "Federal reductions and shifts in science support appear to have been taken without the integrative guidelines of a policy consensus," he said. "Each of these actions might have seemed reasonable within the context in which it was decided, but they are now having a [damaging] cumulative effect . . ."

Mansfield Amendment Not Yet Dead

The controversial Mansfield amendment—which for the past year has restricted the kind of research the Pentagon can support—may be down but it's apparently far from out. The amendment was so emasculated by a House-Senate conference committee in late September that Mansfield complained bitterly on the floor of the Senate about "a total abdication of congressional responsibility." But he vowed at the time that "the fight is far from ended," and the latest word from Mansfield's associates is that the majority leader will launch a major effort to have his amendment reinstated when the Congress reconvenes on 16 November, following the election recess. Mansfield has already lined up more than 35 senators to act as cosponsors of his amendment, and he is expected ultimately to gain support from many more.

The Mansfield amendment, prohibiting the Department of Defense (DOD) from supporting any research that does not have a "direct and apparent relationship to a specific military function or operation," was tacked onto the fiscal 1970 military authorization bill last year as part of a broad effort by antiwar senators to limit military expenditures. The amendment caused much consternation in the Defense Department, which warned that an overzealous interpretation of its restrictions might cripple defense research, and in the scientific community, which feared that the military financial spigot would be turned off at a time when other sources of support were also drying up.

Nevertheless, Mansfield, who viewed his amendment as a first step toward lessening the scientific community's dependence on military funding, was pleased enough with the first-year results to have the amendment reintroduced in the military authorization bill that will apply to fiscal 1971, the next fiscal year. The amendment sailed through the Senate with little trouble, winning passage along with other research amendments by a 68 to 0 vote. But then it was forwarded to a House-Senate conference committee and suffered what many observers regard as near death.

The conference committee was assigned the job of reconciling the House and Senate versions of the military authorization bill, and by the time the horse trading was over, the Senate conferees, in order to win approval of a modest restriction on ABM (antiballistic missile) expansion from their House colleagues, had been forced virtually to abandon the Mansfield amendment. The amendment was reworded so that it no longer says anything about requiring research to have a "direct and apparent relationship" to military functions. Instead, the amendment now simply says that the Defense Department can't finance any research "unless such project or study has, in the opinion of the Secretary of Defense, a *potential relationship* [italics added] to a military function or operation." The new wording, according to Mansfield, is worse than setting no guidelines at all, since "it affirmatively states that the Department of Defense will solely determine what research is beneficial to it."

Two other Senate attempts to curb and redirect military research were also watered down in the conference committee. One Senate amendment, which suggested—though in no sense required—that the budget of the National Science Foundation (NSF) should be boosted by 20 percent (roughly \$100 million) to compensate for the restrictions on DOD research funding imposed by the Mansfield amendment, was made so vague as to become almost meaningless. Another amendment which sought to impose restrictions on Pentagon support of "independent research and development" by industry was also weakened.

At this writing, Mansfield's precise tactics for the attempt to reinstate his amendment have not been worked out, but it is clear that an effort will be made to insert it into the military *appropriations* bill, either while the bill is still being considered by a Senate committee or when it reaches the floor for a vote. The amendment had previously been attached to the military *authorization* bill.—PHILIP M. BOFFEY