which have been extremely useful in guiding the evolving science policy in the United States.

Some of the issues which his subcommittee has addressed include: Scientific-Technical Advice for Congress—Needs and Sources; Geographical Distribution of Federal Research and Development funds; Basic Research and National Goals; Government, Science, and Public Policy; The Junior College and Education in the Sciences; Institutional Grants Program; Environmental Quality; and Technology Assessment.

It has always been heartening to me to observe the bipartisan nature of our deliberations within the committee on questions of science policy. Our committee members have approached the issues not as Democrats or Republicans, but as conscientious legislators looking for solutions in the best interest of society.

I want to point out that the contributions of Mr. Fulton and Mr. Mosher, the Republican members of our group here today, have been invaluable to the progress of the committee in dealing with the issues facing it.

In the United States Congress we have seen a distinct change in the emphasis on and interest in scientific research. Our budget for the space program is declining. Competent political leaders have moved from questions of science policy to other issues which they consider more immediately relevant. But our own committee has retained an abiding belief in the importance of science, and we think that its impact on the future will be even greater than in the past. Recent events, however, have shown that change is necessary in our governmental institutions, both administrative and legislative.

The United States policy for the support of science has, to use a good American colloquialism, "grown like Topsy". In a very real sense it has developed like our economy. Our support of science has had many of the attributes of a free market economy.

The users of advanced technology and research, such as the Department of Defence and the Atomic Energy Commission, have had a major role in determining the resources invested by our country in basic science, but now we must adapt to changing priorities and new demands of society. To do this effectively, we must also change our institutions and procedures.

The science, Research and Development Subcommittee is leading the way in its critical study of the need to reform our institutions for the support of our sciences. It has performed a thorough study of the generation and use of technical information for the Congress. Hearings on proposed methods of centralizing our federal science activities showed there was no overwhelming desire for radical change within the scientific establishment.

However, I am not sure that this answer is the same one which we will get a year from now. Therefore, we plan to have a comprehensive set of hearings to determine the form which changes in our institutions should take.

We hope to determine how science can develop a constituency to prevent violent fluctuations in funding and program emphasis. It is these fluctuations which are so destructive to the progress of science.

We must ask the questions: (1) Is a national policy for science desirable? (2) If so, what form should it take?

The activities of your committee since its establishment in 1968 have been truly impressive. The volume of testimony received during your hearings on science policy has been exceeded only by its quality.

(The chairman mentioned then that in his youth he could not lift together all the volumes of your hearings. I do not see how I could, either.)

Your visit to Washington in May of last year demonstrates a keen desire to be apprised of all information relative to your studies. Your planned report should in itself be of great value in sorting out valid solutions to the many questions which have been posed.

I am confident that we can use these two days of meetings to explore in ways valuable to both groups the important science policy questions which we share.

I should now like to ask the chairman of our subcommittee on science, research and development, Mr. Daddario, to identify some of those areas which he thinks would have special emphasis, and to pinpoint the issues for us all.

Congressman Daddario: Mr. Chairman, I had felt that Chairman Miller's views ought to be brought before you, because he had given considerable thought to your report and our relationship. I think it is a significnat one which certainly pervades the chairman's remarks as read to you by Mr. Symington.

I do not believe that there is any need for us to go over again all the ground which we covered when we met in Washington then, as