

the total would have reached \$1.1 billion. The current backlog of applications totals \$460 million; meanwhile the moratorium on new applications is still in effect, and CFA does not know when it will be lifted.

This year the college housing program has been affected by the administration's attempts to reduce the effect of government loan programs on the

size of the budget deficit—always a topic popular with the Republican opposition. In fiscal 1967 the administration will not provide the usual \$300 million in college housing loans by the customary method of having CFA borrow the money from the Treasury. Instead, the money will come from the sale to private investors of \$820 million worth of "participation certificates" in

college housing bonds held by the government. (At the end of December almost \$2 billion worth of such bonds was in the government's portfolio.) The proceeds from the certificate sales, less the \$300 million to be used for loans and the interest to be paid on the certificates, will result in a net gain to the Treasury of about half a billion dollars.

Research Policy: Trumpets on Capitol Hill

One of the more entertaining sideshows in science-government affairs is reflected in a series of documents issuing from the Research and Technical Programs Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee, chaired by Representative Henry S. Reuss (D-Wis.).

In recent months, Reuss has become the frequent articulator of two theses: (i) the volume and structure of federal support for academic research has had a harmful effect on teaching, (ii), to improve this country's balance of payments, reductions should be made in federal expenditures for research abroad. Both are arguable theses, and Reuss has plenty of respectable company in holding them.

Following an exchange of letters with Budget Director Charles L. Schultze, Reuss issued two press releases, bearing the headings, "Reforms to Be Made in Federal Research Programs Affecting Teaching Following Reuss Subcommittee Recommendation," and "Budget Bureau to Tighten Controls on Federal Foreign Research Spending Following Reuss Subcommittee Recommendations."

Now what Schultze wrote about research and teaching was: "I cannot disagree with the objective of 'balancing' research and teaching needs, but such balance is exceedingly difficult to measure objectively. Moreover, I am not sure how effectively the problem can be dealt with at the level of central decision-making . . . [It] is primarily the responsibility of university administrators to apply restraints on the nonteaching activities of their professional staffs. But having said this, I must agree that the Federal Government should explore further the impact of research support upon the teaching function, even though the present evidence seems to indicate that Federal support of academic research has generally been beneficial to the universities." Schultze said that the matter would be referred for study to the Federal Inter-agency Committee on Education and the Committee on Academic Science and Technology, committees whose roles and whereabouts mystify some of the capital's most knowledgeable administrative cartographers.

Taking up another of the Congressman's points—that fellows, trainees, and research assistants should be involved in teaching—Schultze wrote, "I note, however, that agencies have liberalized their fellowship and traineeship programs to permit and encourage teaching In any event, I take it that you are not suggesting that the Federal Government should impose upon the universities

a requirement that fellows and trainees must teach as a condition of support."

On support of research abroad, the Budget Director wrote: "We recognize that there may be a need to re-emphasize and reinforce the limitations which have already been imposed. We agree with the committee that it might prove beneficial, in this context, to reiterate the objectives of the balance of payments program, with specific reference to research activities. . . . We would emphasize . . . that the Bureau of the Budget believes strongly . . . that Government expenditures affecting the balance of payments must be held to the minimum consistent with the national interest. On balance, we believe that our efforts to apply this principle to scientific activities . . . constitute a reasonable approach in terms of the relative magnitude of this aspect of the overall balance of payments problem."

Just last week the Congressman issued another announcement, bearing the heading: "Reuss Hails National Science Foundation Agreement to Curtail Fellowships for Study Outside U.S., Following House Research Subcommittee Recommendation." This referred to a letter Reuss wrote last April to NSF Director Leland J. Haworth expressing concern about the dollar drain caused by NSF fellows studying abroad.

In his reply Haworth stated that, while 53 percent of NSF postdoctoral fellows study abroad, only a small portion of all NSF fellows and trainees leave these shores for study—currently 220 out of a total 8275. The amounts involved, Haworth wrote, probably total \$1.5 million a year. Haworth also noted that applicants now submit "detailed and specific justification" for studying abroad, and he added that NSF "has already established limited conditions for study abroad, such as instructions to panelists to consider the appropriateness of the foreign instruction for scientific study. . . ." But henceforth, he wrote, applicants wishing to go abroad will be required to state the benefits they expect from foreign study, and panels will be asked to determine whether comparable benefits might be obtained in the U.S. These changes he described as "more stringent guidelines" aimed at "reducing foreign tenure to a minimum."

In his press release Reuss stated that "Haworth's initiative" is "most encouraging and praiseworthy." All of which suggests that, though it is difficult to change government policy, it is easy to employ a mimeograph machine to suggest that it has been changed.—D.S.G.