

place in a single agency all those Federal activities related to description, prediction, attempts to develop capabilities of modifying the environment . . . and those activities concerned with managing and developing resources of the ocean."

In 1968, the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources prepared a mammoth, 200-page report (SN: 1/18, p. 62) recommending a much more active future course for the country's oceanic endeavors—including a new agency.

The result is H.R. 13247. There have been such bills before, but this one differs in that it may have a chance.

One indication that NOAA's time may at last have come is the authorship of the bill. It was introduced by every single member—from both parties—of the 21-man oceanography subcommittee of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The subcommittee is devoting the month of October to hearings on the bill.

**So excited is** the private sector, in fact, that the National Oceanography Association, a private organization of industry and education officials, has published a press kit which supports the bill, but includes a pointed disclaimer that the new agency would be anything like the much-referred-to "wet NASA". The space program, says the Association's executive director Richard N. Rigby Jr., is "an all-Federal effort with a single objective requiring development of a new technology." By comparison, an oceanic program run by NOAA "will have a private investment larger than governmental outlays, will have multiple objectives . . . and will require improvement of old methods as well as new technological breakthroughs."

The star witness at the House hearings is likely to be Presidential Science Adviser Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, scheduled to appear on Oct. 21. He will represent the first on-the-record expression of the Administration's view of H.R. 13247.

In July, he said that "it is quite possible that an independent agency for oceanographic science and technology might be a good idea." But the problems of putting the idea into practice are at least enough to keep his support from being a foregone conclusion.

Nevertheless, the bill's supporters are not as gloomy as they have been in past efforts. "Generally I'm optimistic," says Thomas Clingan, counsel for the subcommittee. "I think that it has a good chance, barring any strong opposition from the White House. I'm encouraged by the fact that there has been no such statement." His committee,

which would get to oversee NOAA, is naturally more enthusiastic than are the Commerce and Interior committees, reluctant to see their constituent agencies lose a blooming plum.

Clingan's boss, subcommittee chair-

## RESEARCH FUNDING

### Dismay over foundations

Tax-exempt foundations in some instances have become tax havens for unscrupulous wealth. As a consequence, they have been included, to their despair, in a pending tax reform bill, passed by the House and now under examination by the Senate Finance Committee.

Scientists who depend on foundation support for their research fear that the Congress is in the process of throwing the baby out with the bath water.

"We should try to eliminate the disease and not the patient," Dr. Jonas Salk told the Senate Finance Committee, holding hearings this week.

Dr. Salk, whose research leading to the development of a polio vaccine was totally funded by foundations, feels that the foundation is as important to research as Government. "Foundations," he says, "can afford to be more concerned with the long-range future and Government, of necessity, is more concerned with the present and short-range future."

In another area, the funds for research in pollution and transportation control are currently largely supplied by foundation funds, according to Dr. J. R. Killian, chairman of the board of trustees of Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He contends that if the funds don't come from foundations, they won't be supplied at all.

**But the public** outcry against foundation abuses have produced the legislation which, if passed, could apparently inhibit foundations' support of research.

The reform act is unselective. It is equally harsh to all foundations.

The proposed 7.5 percent tax on foundations' net income, it has been estimated, would reduce foundation support of research projects by \$100 million per year. Added to reductions in Federal spending, such as the recently announced cuts in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare budget and the decreased research funds of the National Institutes of Health (SN: 9/20, p. 236), a severe shortage of research funds is a likely consequence.

Julius A. Stratton, chairman of the board of the Ford Foundation, spoke for both researchers and foundation heads when he stated, "We have found

man Alton Lennon (D-N.C.), believes that the bill may well pass the full House by the end of the calendar year. An identical bill has been introduced in the Senate, but hearings may not take place until spring. □

in the areas of science an alarming increase of organizations with financial problems."

And Dr. Killian, speaking of MIT's plight, pointed out that 80 percent of its building funds and 100 percent of its endowment are from private giving. "We have already begun to feel the effect of this proposed legislation," he says, "in decreased giving to MIT." Donors, he says, are afraid to contribute money and property they assumed to be tax-exempt which they may later have to pay taxes on.

## NEWS BRIEFS

### Defense, Draft, NSF

The military procurement authorization bill was the subject of lengthy and acrimonious debate in the Senate through the summer (SN: 8/16, p. 128). But the House passed its version of the bill last week under a stringent debate limitation that allowed members 45 seconds each speaking time.

The House bill grants \$21.35 billion, \$1 billion more than the Senate allowed. Of this, about \$7.5 billion will go for research and development.

The Senate bill had cut research money for offensive chemical and biological weapons (SN: 7/19, p. 47); the House required only periodic reports on CBW spending. The two versions must now be reconciled in conference.

**President Nixon** last week changed Selective Service procedures so that graduate students who are called up will be able to postpone induction until the end of the school year in which they were called. Previously they had been able to postpone induction only until the end of the semester.

**The House** this week passed a bill authorizing \$474.3 million in expenditures for the National Science Foundation—\$3.3 million less than the House Science and Astronautics Committee had recommended and nearly \$13 million less than requested by the Administration. Also approved by the same 384-to-5 voice vote was a provision requiring a college to deny grants to students found guilty by the college of rioting or convicted in a court of participating in or inciting a campus disturbance. □