

served and sometimes poorly served but in any case it was accidental and incident to their basic missions.

These were problems which our department, as well as this Committee of Science and Astronautics in the House, were becoming aware of more or less simultaneously.

We took this problem to the committee, both in camera and in open hearing—not with any answers but with the nature of the problem to be discussed and analyzed. Out of this process emerged the concept of expanding the capability of the National Science Foundation to deal in international scientific relationships, not with any specific domestic mission in mind but with the purpose of serving national policy.

The mere fact of the open hearings, testimony on the part of the Department of State, the mission agencies as well as the National Science Foundation, has served to make it quite clear that United States policy favours the liberal use of relationships in the scientific field internationally as a part of United States national policy, and in turn United States foreign policy.

This combination of circumstances—specific language of the NSF act—and the opportunity to create a consensus of attitude on the part of the executive branch and on the part of Congress—the most effective way of expressing national policy—has worked very well.

As you know, we speak often of the separation of powers, the balance of powers, in the United States. In our system this occasionally results in very well publicized conflicts. But those are the exceptions. Much more customary and typical for a practising bureaucrat in the executive branch is the constructive partnership relationship with people who share concern in the same problem. And out of this process of exchange of views does come about, as Mr. Mosher was saying, usually an accommodation and it makes very good sense, among other reasons, because you can thus bring your objective to fruition.

This has been our experience in the evolution of national science policy in so far as it affects our foreign affairs in the United States. Later on I will be able to go into more detail on this.

Congressman Daddario: Mr. Chairman, last night I had an opportunity to talk to Mr. Drury and as we discussed these meetings a very important aspect of this relationship came up. I would just like to touch on it for a

moment, because it has in a sense come to fruition since the last time we met.

This is the extreme importance that our committee feels to attract to us as much advisory capability as we can from the private sector. This has developed over the course of time with the National Academy of Science, the National Academy of Engineering, with research organizations both public and private, and with individuals who have the competence to discuss a specific subject with us. Of most recent date there is developing a strong advisory relationship with the learned societies in our country such as the American Chemical Society, the American Biological Society, various engineering groups. These societies for years felt as though they had no reason or opportunity or place in the legislative process. This has radically changed and there has been tremendous interest. In numerous places we now find public service committees being formed. The most recent one which has been productive has been the American Chemical Society committee on the environment, delivering to us a study which is entitled "A Cleaner Environment". This is a formidable study which puts in catalogue form a whole series of steps which can presently be taken about our environment. It spells out areas where research is necessary and gives us the kind of advice which certainly will strengthen the legislative process.

The initiative that has been taken in this regard from the learned societies, I believe, will be of formidable help to the Congress in the time ahead. Beyond giving us expert advice, it also helps us to develop a relationship with the private sector for the building up of public opinion by important opinion-makers on matters affecting our environment, which certainly will stimulate the legislative process.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: Perhaps, just before we adjourn, I could comment very briefly on what you have just said, Congressman Daddario.

As a committee we also felt that there was a need for getting more advice from the private sector and the so-called learned societies in Canada. We realized during the course of our hearings that our own scientific community was rather widely dispersed throughout the country, and at some stage we counted approximately 60 different national associations which had some kind of interest and