

and the possible perils of offending their grant-giving American friends, the dons manifested their displeasure by blocking an honorary degree for Hailsham.

After their victory they issued a statement, explaining, "We believe Lord Hailsham's view is incorrect and impolite to the Americans who pay for so much research in Britain. It evades tackling the main issue of the need for adequate finance from the government for education and research in the interests of the community as a whole."

The controversy has been marked by a mixture of good and bad marksmanship, as far as the real issues are concerned. Whether lured or self-propelled, the British are coming in fairly large numbers, and Hailsham did not hurt anything but precious sensibilities when he brought this courteously disregarded fact out into the open. But he would be hard put to defend his theory that the westward flow reflects nothing so much as the inadequacy of American scientific education. Scientists, like other people, tend to flock to money and opportunity, both of which are abundant here and in relatively short supply there.

Moreover, it is extremely unlikely that the flow of American support for British research will be responsive to Hailsham's petulant remarks. The federal agencies and foundations that finance science abroad do so for a variety of reasons, but principally because they feel there is good work to be had in foreign laboratories. The main countervailing force to the eastward flow of funds—at least as far as the federal government is concerned—is the American balance of payments problem. The administration is deeply worried about this matter, and it has asked federal agencies—including those that finance foreign research—to look into cost-cutting possibilities. The outcome may be a reduction of American support for foreign scientists, but that has nothing to do with Hailsham's rocking the boat.—D.S.G.

### **Moscow Embassy: Officer Named To Fill Science Liaison Post**

The State Department has tentatively assigned a Foreign Service Officer to serve as a scientific representative at the American Embassy in Moscow. At other major American embassies, the function is usually assigned to a science attaché, who is generally a senior sci-

entist. But the Soviets, for reasons that are not clear, have not been receptive to the presence of a full-fledged science attaché at our Moscow Embassy.

The Russians have a "scientific counselor" at their Washington Embassy, but his role appears to be very much along the lines of most science attachés in Washington, and differs from the American concept of the job. While other nations regard the science attaché as a collecting point for scientific publications and general information about scientific activities, the State Department is seeking to use our science attachés as a means for bringing scientific advice into the mainstream of foreign policy formulation. It has not always worked out too well but that is the goal.

Present plans call for assigning the Moscow post to Glenn Schweitzer, a 1953 West Point graduate who joined the Foreign Service in 1956 after resigning from the Army. Schweitzer, who is currently assigned to the science and technology office of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, served at the American embassy in Belgrade in 1957. He subsequently studied nuclear engineering at the California Institute of Technology and the Argonne National Laboratories.

His function in Moscow, according to the State Department, will include assisting American scientists in exchange arrangements with their Soviet colleagues. It is expected that he will take up the post late in the summer.

—D.S.G.

### **Civil Defense: Congress Refuses Funds To Complete Shelter Survey and Stocking Program This Year**

Congress generally does not give civil defense the openhanded treatment it accords other aspects of defense, and last week civil defense suffered another rebuff on Capitol Hill when the House rejected an administration request for \$61.9 million to complete a program of stocking fallout shelters.

The action attracted little notice in the press, since the money for civil defense was part of a mixed bag of measures in a \$1 billion supplemental appropriations bill and attention was diverted by a floor battle over a \$450 million item for the so-called emergency public works bill, which was approved by the Appropriations Committee's deficiencies subcommittee, knocked out by the full committee, and restored

by a 228 to 184 House roll-call vote.

The \$61.9 million asked by the administration was to be used to pay the cost of the last 25 percent of the work of marking and stocking shelter space already existing in buildings and in caves, mines, and other underground structures around the country. In federal bookkeeping terms, the money was to be a supplement to the \$111 million appropriated in the last session of Congress for civil defense for the current fiscal year, which ends 30 June.

In rejecting the civil defense item the House followed the recommendations of the Appropriations deficiencies subcommittee, whose chairman is Representative Albert Thomas (D.-Tex.), a very influential member of the House, who has been a resolute skeptic in regard to civil defense.

Thomas's stand on civil defense is of strategic importance to the program because the Texan is also chairman of the Appropriations independent offices subcommittee which oversees regular appropriations for civil defense.

It was the Thomas subcommittee which in March of 1962, in the ebb of the Berlin crisis of the previous summer, killed proposals for a "shelter incentive" program and thus effectively set Congressional policy against a major program of new shelter construction.

Thomas and his colleagues have generally gone along with a federal-state-local cooperative program to identify, mark, and stock shelters in existing structures, and Congress, in fiscal years 1962 and 1963, appropriated a total of \$175 million for the effort. The program, according to official estimates, would result finally in the stocking of some 70 million shelter spaces with austere rations for about 2 weeks and basic medical, sanitation, and radiological kits.

In testimony at hearings on the supplemental appropriation before the Thomas subcommittee last month, Stuart L. Pittman, the assistant secretary of defense who directs the civil defense program, argued that failure to provide the funds would not only interrupt completion of the shelter survey, disrupt the flow of supplies to shelters at a critical time, and cut back delivery and production schedules, but would also prejudice the whole civil defense effort, since building owners and local governments would be left uncertain about the federal government's intentions and a hard-won spirit of cooperation would be undermined.

Thomas and his colleagues, in rejecting the request, noted that most of the supplies are still in the pipeline rather than in the shelters; civil defense officials estimated recently that stocks for 5 million persons are in the shelters and that stocking is continuing at the rate of stocks for 3 to 5 million persons a month.

In floor debate Thomas expressed misgivings about the dangers of time and pilferage when he pointed out that many of the shelters are in private buildings and (he suggested) unprotected. In "a matter of a few weeks or a few months," said Thomas, "... the material may deteriorate. We must have a lot of souvenir hunters in this country. I am one too. We just took the position to look, wait, and see what happens for a while."

The supplemental bill now must be acted upon by the Senate, and should the Senate restore money for civil defense, as it might, the matter would go to a House-Senate conference for a resolution of differences. The House conferees would be headed by Thomas, who responded, when one Congressman urged that, in such a conference, the committee give favorable consideration to continuation of the stocking program, by saying, in typical Thomas style, "we will give careful, prayerful consideration."

Thomas last week announced that he planned to retire from the House when this Congress ends in 1964. The tall and angular representative from Houston has had three cancer operations in recent years, and though he seems to have lost none of his vigor or virtuosity on the floor or in committee, the announcement is not regarded as one of those retirement trial balloons that Congressmen frequently release in the hope that they will be shot down.

Thomas's retirement could alter the prospects for civil defense in some degree, but the Texan's influence over civil defense is probably due no more to his prestige and position than to the fact that he is certain where Congress is uncertain and thus helps Congress to make up its mind.

Except during "highs" of crisis anxiety, public opinion—as expressed in congressional polls—has generally run against a major federal shelter program, and only a few members of Congress, notably Representative Chet Holifield (D.-Calif.) have consistently championed shelter construction on a major scale.

The Kennedy administration has favored shelter construction programs of varying sizes and has asked for them, without at any time engaging in a pitched battle to get them.

The proposed budget for fiscal 1964 calls for a \$300 million civil defense budget, as compared with \$111 million appropriated so far for 1963. Some \$175 million of these requested funds would be earmarked for assistance to schools, hospitals, and other nonprofit institutions in incorporating fallout shelters in new and existing buildings. Authorization hearings on this program and on other new proposals for civil defense are expected to be held in May before a subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee.

The administration regards its proposals as a middle course between a massive shelter program and a relapse into the drift of recent years. In testimony before the Thomas subcommittee, Pittman provided a revealing comment on the reasons for the administration's choice of a program.

"Over the last year," said Pittman, "we have learned something of the characteristics of a peacetime America which impose limits on civil defense demands. Given today's conditions, I believe that more can be accomplished by understanding these limitations, and developing civil defense programs designed to exploit every opportunity within these limits, than by programming for objectives which can be accomplished only through basic changes in peacetime public attitudes and psychology."

This is an interesting statement of the kind of political realism that appears to underlie much of the administration's congressional strategy, but, given the present feelings of Congress on economy and civil defense and the past performance of the administration, it may well amount to a waiver on an expanded civil defense program.

—JOHN WALSH

#### **Faculty Pay: Salary-Charging Practices on Federal Grants Is Subject of A.C.E. Panel's Advice**

Government sponsorship of research raises a number of questions of duty, honor, and cost accounting for the universities, including the question of policy in applying federal funds to the salaries of regular faculty engaged in research.

Universities and federal agencies agree that faculty should be compensated on the basis of actual effort on the supported research, but the practices followed in some universities have, in recent years, been questioned in Congress, where a critical interest in the management of federal research funds has been on the rise.

In what appears to be an effort not only to advise on procedure but also to warn of the congressional temper, a committee of the American Council on Education, the leading national organization of institutions of higher learning and education organizations, has published for council members a series of "Recommendations on Faculty Salaries Charged to Government Contracts."

Concern over salary policy also has prompted action within the Executive branch. The basic research panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee is known to be interested specifically in the problem and to have developed some draft proposals. The question of salaries is also to be a part of a broad study of federal-university interaction to be launched this spring by the National Science Foundation.

The stimulus for the A.C.E. proposals can be traced to activities such as those of the House Government Operations Committee's intergovernmental relations subcommittee, which has the operations of the National Institutes of Health in its purview and has found fault with the administration of grants and awards at NIH.

In a report published in 1961, the subcommittee, which is chaired by Representative L. H. Fountain (D.-N.C.), recommended, among other things, that "The President establish a uniform policy with respect to acceptable salary practices in the use of Federal research funds applicable to all Federal agencies making grants to educational and other research institutions.

"The committee supports the principle of compensating the participants in Government-supported research in accordance with the regular salary schedules of their institutions, and is concerned by reports that some institutions are using Federal funds to pay higher than regular salaries. Since this is a matter of concern to many Federal agencies, the committee feels it should be dealt with on a Government-wide basis."

The Fountain subcommittee recommendations were viewed as amounting to a congressional ultimatum and one

(Continued on page 325)