

Wildlife was supposed to notify interested parties of the study group's impending arrival at each site, but a "communications breakdown" snarled that plan, Sloan said.

Eugene Buie bristles at the suggestion that his agency influenced the study's outcome. "We didn't control this study. We only did what we were asked." He says he suspects much of the criticism directed toward it is nothing more than an attempt by "certain state fish and game people," conservation groups, and the Interior Department to "deliberately try to discredit the study because it doesn't agree with every little bit of nonsense they've been putting out."

Conservationists have their own conspiracy theory, which has it that Whitten somehow rigged the study. The fact that his staff aides made a number of phone calls around federal agencies

last year to keep tabs on its progress, and then quit calling in December, suggests to some that he was satisfied with its outcome before anyone else knew what it said. Some close observers of the study's travails say such allegations are unfair to the CEQ, however.

Actually, the study's difficulties appear to have arisen from several sources, none of them fixers. Several early and critical administrative decisions of the CEQ in planning the study seem, in hindsight, to have been ill advised. Relations between the academy and Little, once the two were selected, probably could have been more clearly spelled out. Moreover, a quick reading of the summary volume suggests unseemly haste in writing and editing, and possibly in thinking.

There is also something to be learned from the backgrounds of Little team members. The study was directed by

John M. Wilkinson, an economist formerly with the Bureau of Reclamation, one of the four agencies whose projects were studied. Two others were former, long-time employees of the Agriculture Department. None of this suggests that they were incapable of criticizing their old employers, for indeed they did, although not on fundamental points. What is more than possible, however, is that the A. D. Little group shared philosophies and perceptions of good water resource management that made it impossible for them to deliver the "fresh appraisal" of stream channelization they had promised.

"It will take extensive reworking to make this a useful document," one CEQ staff member said. In the meantime, the debate over stream channelization is likely to remain as muddy as ever.—ROBERT GILLETTE

Higher Education Bill: Busing Provision a Cuckoo in the Nest

For more than a year Congress has struggled to reach agreement on a higher education bill that would extend existing federal programs and provide a new form of aid for students and, for the first time, a program of "institutional" aid for universities and colleges. Last week, a House-Senate conference finally produced an \$18.5 billion omnibus education authorization bill, but the conference measure generated more acrimony than accord and, as this was written, the prospects of final passage were highly uncertain.

Advocates of the bill argue that its institutional aid features make it the most significant piece of higher education legislation since the Land Grant College Act of the 1860's. But the sense of new beginnings has been blurred in the legislative process, which has been rather like the progress of a leaking ocean liner through dangerous shoals, with officers arguing over the charts, the crew near mutiny, and the passengers about ready to rush the lifeboats.

The major obstacle has been provi-

sions to regulate federal funds for school busing to achieve racial balance in local school districts. If this seems an exotic feature in a higher education bill, it is. Antibusing amendments were added to the bill during House debate last November, along with the contents of a bill providing \$1.5 billion over 2 years to assist school districts with desegregation problems. (This bill had earlier been rejected by the House.) The Senate enacted a more lenient antibusing amendment, and disagreement on the touchy issue led to a delay in action on the bill until this year.

Even before the busing issue was inflicted on the higher education bill, however, the new institutional aid and scholarship provisions had caused divisions in Congress (*Science*, 26 March 1971), and the conference compromise—particularly in the case of institutional aid—by no means resolved all differences.

In one sense, the problems of the higher education bill are a legacy of the strategy developed for the consensus politics of the early and middle 1960's.

At issue is an omnibus bill, which means the bill contains a variety of measures that should appeal to a variety of constituencies. The theory is that, by providing something for everybody, everybody will want something avidly enough to vote for the whole package. Those who added the desegregation-aid and busing amendments presumably thought that the higher education provisions of the bill had enough appeal to carry the controversial amendments. In the mid-1960's, the omnibus approach in education legislation worked reasonably well with authorizing legislation, less well with appropriations. This time, it seems to be working rather badly.

Part of the uncertainty and confusion which greeted the conference action on the measure arose because the bill is so large and complex that details of the compromise on crucial issues—the "language," as it is referred to on Capitol Hill—were not available, even through the weekend following the conference finale at dawn on Wednesday, 17 May. Besides the controversial sections mentioned earlier, the bill contains a score of titles that include extension and modification of major laws such as the National Defense Education Act, the Higher Education Act of 1965, and the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. In addition, there are several brand-new provisions, including a proposal for a potentially important National Institute of Education (NIE). The NIE is modeled on the National Insti-

tutes of Health and is designed to support research and development in education at every level and to carry on a small program of in-house research.

A prohibition against discrimination on the basis of sex in higher education programs or activities receiving federal funds is also part of the bill. Other new provisions include an authorization for grants to colleges and universities to develop ethnic studies curriculum materials and a title known as the Occupational Education Act, which is aimed at strengthening vocational education and giving it greater status at the post-secondary level.

Although neither the bill nor the conference report on the bill was available when this was written, it was possible through conversations with legislators and congressional staff members to establish the formula agreed on for the key institutional aid provision.

The higher education community seems to have convinced Congress that inflationary pressures, new demands on universities and colleges, and loss of federal research funds have put both private and public institutions in serious need of federal help. The education lobby, however, has so far failed to make a case for the program of direct grants to institutions, which it generally prefers. The result was a compromise on a complex three-way formula, with 90 percent of the funds going to institutions on the basis of federal aid received by their students. Half of this would be distributed to institutions in the form of cost of education allowances for financially needy students receiving federal basic education opportunity grants. If sufficient funds are appropriated, schools with up to 1000 students would get grants of \$500 per recipient, with the amount declining according to the size of enrollment, so that big schools would get only \$100 per recipient in excess of 100. Senator Claiborne Pell (D-R.I.), chairman of the Senate education subcommittee, is the originator of this approach. The other 45 percent of available funds would be distributed according to the aggregate amount of federal equal opportunity grants, work study funds, and federal loan funds received by each school's students. Again, there would be a bias in favor of small institutions. Representative Albert Quie (R-Minn.) is primarily identified with the measure.

The remaining 10 percent of available money would be paid on a per capita basis, according to the number of graduate students at an institution.

The amount mentioned in the bill would be \$200 per graduate student. Representative Edith Green (D-Ore.), who heads the House subcommittee which handles higher education legislation, sponsored the capitation formula and is displeased with the compromise on institutional aid and with other aspects of the conference measure. Mrs. Green has declined to sign the conference report and is expected to use her influence inside and outside Congress against the bill. She is likely to back an extension of existing legislation, most of which expires with the current fiscal year on 30 June, and to counsel

another attempt in the next Congress.

Most observers feel that the greatest difficulty in mustering a majority in favor of the present bill arises out of the busing provisions. Opposition comes, on the one hand, from those who would throw the full federal weight against busing and, on the other hand, from civil rights advocates who oppose any limits to busing. The bill now calls for delays—of up to 19 months or until appeals are exhausted—of court orders requiring busing to achieve school desegregation.

The Senate is thought likely to pass the bill more readily than the House,

Technology Assessment Hits Snags

The bill to establish an Office of Technology Assessment (OTA), which breezed through the House on 8 February, has become mired down in the Senate and faces an attempt by an obscure congressional committee to gain control of the proposed office. OTA would make long-range studies of issues such as the SST for Congress and would be funded at \$5 million for its first 2 years.

While George Wallace and Terry Sanford were battling out a Presidential primary in North Carolina last month, a Senate veteran, B. Everett Jordan (D-N.C.) who is chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration where the bill now resides, suffered an unexpected setback. Jordan lost in the popular vote by 4 percent to an energetic challenger, Nick Galifianakis (D-N.C.) and faces a runoff contest on 3 June. Jordan's presence is essential to get the bill out of committee and to the floor, and while he had been in favor of speedy action back in March, his new situation could, so to speak, make voter assessment take precedence over technology assessment.

A second jinx on the bill is a dispute which is materializing as to who will control the OTA, that is, on the makeup of its governing board. According to custom, those members of Congress who have been instrumental in originating and passing a measure can expect to have a role in overseeing the resulting office or agency. Hence, friends of the OTA in the House Committee of Science and Astronautics, and in the Senate, who have nourished the concept of OTA during its 7-year gestation in various committees, were expecting to sit on the board.

But others seem to be interested in this board, too. When the bill came to the House floor in February, a representative not hitherto identified with the measure, Jack Brooks (D-Tex.) proposed changing the board's makeup. Instead of a part-Congressional, part-public board, Brooks proposed one composed of five senators and five representatives; three of each would be Democrats and two of each would be Republicans. The House readily assented, and this is the current format for the OTA board.

However, it just so happens that Brooks is chairman of an obscure Joint Committee on Congressional Operations (JCCO), made up of five senators and five representatives; three of each are Democrats and two of each are Republicans. The JCCO has little power, almost zero visibility, and both Brooks and the alternate chairman from the Senate side, Lee Metcalf (D-Mont.), are up for reelection this year. Metcalf and Brooks are reportedly suggesting that the JCCO be metamorphosed into the Board of OTA. While the move would certainly enhance JCCO's stature, it would effectively exclude all the long-term proponents of technology assessment in both the House and Senate, none of whom sit on the committee. Should the suggestion come to a fight either in Jordan's committee or on the Senate floor later, the bill could be tabled this session.—D.S.

NEWS & NOTES

● NEW NUCLEAR STORAGE

PLAN: The Atomic Energy Commission has announced plans to build a series of concrete bunkers above ground for the storage of radioactive wastes, a move which indicates that the agency expects it to take considerably longer than originally anticipated to find a permanent underground storage site. Plans to use an abandoned salt mine in Lyons, Kansas, were stymied last year by political opposition and the discovery that the site was not as safe as had been thought. The AEC has since broadened its search for geological formations appropriate to contain the wastes. The new facility, whose location has not yet been determined, would cost \$100 million and would be ready by the end of the decade. Aboveground storage modules would require constant surveillance, but AEC Chairman James Schlesinger says they could be used "for centuries, if necessary."

● DEMOGRAPHY UNIT THREATENED:

The nation's only graduate department in population studies, the department of demography at the University of California at Berkeley, may be closed next month as a result of state budget cutbacks. The university's decision not to fill any of its professorial vacancies, including three in the demography department, leaves the department with no senior faculty except its chairman, Judith Blake Davis. The department has 30 graduate students, one third of them foreign. In the 5 years of its existence it has gained an international reputation, particularly for its work in the demography of Latin America.

● WIGNER RECEIVES EINSTEIN

AWARD: Eugene Paul Wigner, a principal mover in the application of physics to atomic energy, was presented the Albert Einstein Award on 27 April for his contributions to the natural sciences. The Hungarian-born physicist was an early instigator of the World War II Manhattan Project. He has been associated with Princeton University since 1930 and is presently professor emeritus of mathematical physics. He received the Enrico Fermi Award in 1958 and shared the Nobel Prize for physics in 1963. The Einstein award, comprising \$5000 and a gold medal, is awarded by the Lewis & Rosa Strauss Memorial Fund.

since the House had voted more severe restrictions on busing than those in the conference measure. The House had taken the unusual step of twice instructing its conferees to stand fast on provisions that, among other things, prohibited the use of any federal funds for busing and forbade federal officials to encourage local officials to use local funds for busing.

An important factor for congressional action, of course, is the White House attitude, which would presumably influence Republican rank and file in Congress. The Administration has consistently opposed proposals for direct institutional aid, but seems prepared to accept, if without enthusiasm, the bill's formula, which stresses cost of education allowances. The Administration appears anxious to see the desegregation aid measures enacted, and word at the beginning of the week was that, at a minimum, no veto was in the offing.

The higher education lobby has exhibited slow reflexes in responding to conference actions. This can be attributed, in part, to the inaccessibility of details and to problems of reaching consensus in the higher education community, which is a somewhat volatile conglomerate. But the sluggishness also owes something to disappointment over the institutional aid and busing features and to other potential difficulties in the bill. As one experienced association staff member put it, "I've never seen a bill so snakebitten in so many ways."

Among the possible booby traps is the prohibition on sex discrimination, which applies to both faculty and students. University officials worry that, in a relatively short time, they may be required to establish equality in representation of sexes among both groups across the board in graduate education, for example, which they say would be very difficult to accomplish.

Similar disquiet is felt about the implications of a proviso requiring the creation of postsecondary education commissions in each state to make studies of postsecondary education and to provide for state planning. There is apprehension in some public universities and colleges that this would require establishment of state boards of higher education that could impose their decisions through control of federal funds. The conference modified the provision to stress the voluntary nature of the commissions and their planning functions, but the misgivings linger on.

As is usual in Congress, neither the conference report nor the record of floor debate will fully reveal the factors that created the state of affairs prevailing at the beginning of the week. The higher education bill is a "Christmas tree" bill, laden with odd legislative ornaments, in part because the Senate, with limited manpower compared to the House, prefers to deal with larger legislative packages. The Senate has a single education subcommittee, while the House has three. The Senate preference was accentuated this year because Pell faces a tough campaign for reelection and made it known he would have time to deal with only one bill.

Whatever its wisdom, the grafting of busing and desegregation measures on the education bill must be seen in the perspective of a Congress trying to deal with busing, the hottest political issue of recent years. In an election year, probably a majority of congressmen were anxious to bring it under control without going to either extreme. When the proverbially conservative House Rules Committee sent the education bill to the floor of the House under a rule that invited the adding of the antibusing amendment, the ingredients were complete.

To be charitable, one can always say in these cases that everything that has been done to the education bill probably looked like a good idea at the time, at least to somebody. But this was hardly the best atmosphere in which to make a fundamental change in the relation between the federal government and institutions of higher education. Which ever way the vote goes, it is unfortunate for higher education that the bill evolved in a year when the accent was on the last syllable of omnibus.

—JOHN WALSH

APPOINTMENTS

Steven Muller, former vice president, Cornell University, and provost, Johns Hopkins University, to president, Johns Hopkins University. . . . **Henry J. Duel**, executive vice president, Southeastern University, to president of the university. . . . **John G. Truxal**, academic vice president, Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, to dean, College of Engineering, State University of New York,