

CONSORTIUM of SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

1755 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, N.W., SUITE 300, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 • [202] 234-5703

TO: COSSA Members, Affiliates, Contributors and Friends

FROM: Roberta Balstad Miller, Executive Director

COSSA LEGISLATIVE REPORT

May 21, 1982

This Week ...

House Narrowly Passes Altered NSF Authorization
More on Peer Review
Budget Amendment to Protect Education

* * *

House Narrowly Passes Altered NSF Authorization

The House authorization for the National Science Foundation, which restores the social and behavioral research budgets to their FY 1980 level, was narrowly passed on Wednesday, May 19, 1982. The final authorization contains \$10 million less for Science and Engineering Education than the original bill.

The NSF authorization proposed by the House Science and Technology Committee was initially amended on the floor of the House by Congressman Larry Winn (R-KS). The Winn Amendment, which restored the administration's budget for NSF, was unexpectedly passed by a narrow vote of 194-191. This action would have erased the \$17.6 million increase for the Foundation's social and behavioral science programs, an increase that was passed with bipartisan support in the Science and Technology Committee.

However, the Winn Amendment was subsequently replaced by a substitute amendment introduced by Congressman Peter Peyser (D-NY). Peyser's amendment restored the Committee authorization in its entirety except that it provided that \$20 million rather than \$30 million be added to the administration's request for Science and Engineering Education. The Peyser Amendment passed by 203 to 188 votes.

NSF Authorization (continued)

In the end, the social and behavioral science research programs had their authorization increase of \$17.6 million restored by the Peyser Amendment. But despite bipartisan support in committee, this increase would have been lost had the Peyser Amendment not passed. The fact that only a modified Committee bill passed and then only after a narrow defeat in favor of the administration's original budget illustrates that each step of the legislative process is important. It also illustrates how necessary it is for social scientists to be involved at each level. Congressional staff think the Winn Amendment originally passed because Congressmen felt this would be an easy way to cut spending and because many felt that no one was watching them on this issue. Congressional staff also indicated that it was because social and behavioral scientists were lobbying so heavily in favor of the Committee bill -- as evidenced by support for social and behavioral science in the debate on the floor -- that the Peyser Amendment contained a provision to restore the \$17.6 million increase for social and behavioral science research programs.

The next House action on the NSF authorization will be to prepare a compromise bill in conference with the Senate. This will not take place until after the Senate passes its authorization for NSF.

At this point, it would be very helpful in terms of maintaining Congressional support if social scientists would write to their Congressman either thanking him or her for support on the Peyser Amendment or asking why the Congressman opposed the Amendment. We need to let Members of Congress know that their constituents are concerned about the issue of research support, particularly social science research support. A list of Congressmen's votes on the Peyser Amendment is enclosed as attachment 1. An "Aye" vote is a vote in support of increased funding for the social and behavioral sciences and science education.

In addition, letters of thanks and support should also be sent to the Chairman of the authorizing Subcommittee, Congressman Doug Walgren (D-PA), and the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee, Congresswoman Margaret Heckler (R-MA). Both spoke out strongly in defense of the Committee bill. Letters should also be sent to Congressman Peter Peyser and others who spoke out in favor of social science research.

All letters to Congressmen should be addressed:

House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

NSF Authorization (continued)

A significant aspect of the debate over this NSF bill was, once again, the strong support given to the social and behavioral science research programs of the Foundation. Excerpts from the debate follow.

Congressman Doug Walgren (D-PA)

"...we have not increased the President's requested level for research and related activities. Rather, we have only shifted some moneys within OMB's overall research recommendation to bring the behavioral, economic and information sciences to levels equivalent to their fiscal year 1980 levels. The President's science adviser, Dr. Keyworth, has publicly stated several times that it was a mistake to reduce the behavioral and social science research as was done at the outset of the Reagan administration. It is time that this mistake be corrected and these programs restored to at least the level of effort before these cuts were made. A careful review of the national interest leads to the inescapable conclusion that the social and behavioral sciences have as much, if not more, to contribute to our Nation's future well-being."

Congresswoman Margaret Heckler (R-MA)

"...we must continue to support research in the social and behavioral sciences, such as research on education, learning, and cognitive development. Moreover, social and behavioral science research, in such areas as human factors in productivity, the economic implications of changing population patterns, the location of public service and commercial facilities and survey research all contribute to an improved U.S. economic productivity and competitiveness and also improves the confidence and capability of our industrial and business base in the United States."

Congressman Robert Traxler (D-MI)

"...I think the authorizing committee in this instance has done an outstanding job and a fine piece of work, and I strongly support their efforts--most especially as it relates to the authorizing language relative to the social sciences."

Congressman Harold Hollenbeck (R-NJ)

"...The administration in recognizing the importance of basic research has restored much of that, requesting \$1,052.3 million for NSF's research and related activities. The committee has wisely maintained that level, only making a number of internal adjustments to restore balance to programs in the social, economic, behavioral, and information sciences, as well as women and minority and international programs."

Congressman Steny Hoyer (D-MD)

"...Last year I stood before this body urging my colleagues to resist a proposed budget cut of 75 percent for the social and behavioral sciences at the National Science Foundation, and I am extremely grateful that these drastic reductions did not occur...

"Mr. Chairman, in 1980, \$55 million was authorized for social and behavioral sciences. In 1981, this was cut to \$40 million; in 1982, to \$29 million, and \$30 million in 1983. We are talking of a reduction of \$25 million since 1980, so the amount we are asking for here amounts to a 40 percent decrease from 1980 funding levels for these critical areas of science...

"In conclusion, I urge my colleagues to uphold the distribution of funds within the research and related activities category as proposed in the House authorization. This would restore to 1980 levels the portion of the National Science Foundation's biological, behavioral and social science (BBS) directorate that funds behavioral and social science."

Congressman Jim Dunn (R-MI)

"...The broad impact of NSF science, engineering, and social science research and education programs in our economy and strategic interest is great in comparison to this relatively small part of the budget...

"This funding is well in line with the administration's view that long-term, high-risk research and resultant training are proper goals for Government expenditure. This is reflected by the increase in requested funds for NSF within the President's fiscal year 1983 budget. Nevertheless, I cannot agree with the administration's low figures for behavioral and social science research and for science and engineering education. Nor can I agree to minority substitutes which replenish these directorates by draining funds for all research activities."

Congressman Howard Wolpe (D-MI)

"...I want to particularly endorse the committee recommendation with respect to funding levels for research in the social and behavioral sciences.

"Our society is faced with massive changes in its social, economic, and political environments. On the economic side, we are attempting to fashion policies designed to restore our lagging rate of productivity growth, restrict the inflation that has dominated our national consciousness for most of the past decade, and encourage a new burst of innovation and energy. On the social side, we are faced with massive demographic changes--in the number and proportion of elderly people, in average family size, in patterns of family formation and dissolution--as well as with a set of serious problems relating to shifts in urban and regional locations. And on the political side, a significant reallocation of fiscal responsibility from the Federal Government to State and local governments is under active discussion.

Congressman Wolpe (continued)

"Achieving a better base of information and understanding for these and other problems is an important national priority. These problems are an important national priority. These problems are in the forefront of concerns in the social and behavioral sciences, and they can be better understood if we devote more resources to research in the social and behavioral programs.

"Members of this body understand that investments in knowledge have fully as much pay off as investments in the physical capital of factory buildings and machines, and that investments in knowledge about the functioning of the economy and society, which is what social and behavioral scientists study, have fully as much payoff as investments in knowledge about the physical and biological universe.

"I therefore urge my fellow Members of the House to support the Peyser substitute..."

Congressman Larry Winn, Jr. (R-KS)

"Most of the majority are really just playing games. I do not think they are going to fool the 194 people who voted in favor of my amendment a half hour ago.

"Certainly it was a close vote. But I think the fact that this week we are going to consider the rule on the budget -- everybody has that on their mind. Even the chairman of the full committee said that he wanted as much as anybody else to balance the budget. So we know what is going on. They are just playing games over there..."

"My colleagues can look at the figures that have been handed out. The committee bill places a lot emphasis on the behavioral and social sciences. Mine emphasizes the math and physical sciences.

"We have been hearing all about the problems of gym teachers teaching science and math. That is not the real problem. They just cannot take losing a vote. They do not want many people in this Chamber to have the opportunity to vote for this budget and support a balanced budget for this Nation.

"Let me reiterate what I said in the original amendment that I proposed, that this is still 7.7 percent over the 1982 budget. The National Science Foundation is not going down the drain. All of these tears are unnecessary.

"I urge adoption of my amendment."

All quotations are taken from the Congressional Record, May 19, 1982.

More on Peer Review

Last week, the COSSA Legislative Report reported that new reviewers, selected in the Director's Office, be used to review unsolicited proposals at the National Institute of Education. These reviewers would be used in place of the peer reviewers selected for their research expertise by NIE staff. A list of the new reviewers has now been prepared by David Florio of the American Education Research Association (AERA) and is available through the COSSA office.

On a related issue, the Washington Post reported this week on the use of political criteria in the selection of proposal reviewers in the Department of Agriculture (see attachment 2).

Budget Amendment to Protect Education

The budget will be the focus of discussions in the House this week. Three of the major budget bills are the Budget Committee Bill (the Jones Bill), the Aspin Substitute, and the Latta/Michel/Stenholm bill. The Latta/Michel/Stenholm bill would freeze spending at FY 1982 levels. Of the three, the Aspin Substitute provides the largest amount of funding for Function 250, Science and Technology. Debate on the budget is scheduled to begin on Tuesday, May 25.

Representative Paul Simon (D-IL) will introduce an education amendment to the Budget Committee Bill and to the Aspin Substitute. This amendment will restore funding for Function 500, Education. This is expected to be the first of the amendments to the Budget that will be debated by the full House. Support is needed to protect education from possible budget trade-offs later in the budget negotiations.

NSF VOTE

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD -- HOUSE

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 203, noes 188, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 84]

AYES—203

- | | | |
|-----------------|--------------|---------------|
| Addabbo | Dwyer | Lehman |
| Akaka | Dymally | Long (LA) |
| Albosta | Early | Lowry (WA) |
| Alexander | Eckart | Luken |
| Anderson | Edgar | Markey |
| Andrews | Edwards (AL) | Matsui |
| Annunzio | Edwards (CA) | Mavroules |
| Anthony | Ertel | Mazzoli |
| Aspin | Evans (GA) | McCurdy |
| Bailey (PA) | Evans (IA) | McHugh |
| Barnard | Evans (IN) | Mica |
| Barnes | Fary | Mikulski |
| Bedell | Faxcell | Miller (CA) |
| Bellenson | Fazio | Mineta |
| Benedict | Ferraro | Minish |
| Benjamin | Filippo | Mitchell (MD) |
| Bevill | Florio | Moakley |
| Biaggi | Foley | Moffett |
| Bingham | Ford (MI) | Mollohan |
| Blanchard | Ford (TN) | Mottl |
| Boggs | Fowler | Murphy |
| Boland | Frank | Neal |
| Bolling | Fuqua | Nelson |
| Boner | Garcia | Nichols |
| Bonior | Gejdenson | Nowak |
| Bonker | Gephardt | Oakar |
| Bouquard | Gibbons | Oberstar |
| Breaux | Gingrich | Obey |
| Brinkley | Glickman | Ottinger |
| Brooks | Gonzales | Panetta |
| Brown (CA) | Gore | Patterson |
| Burton, Phillip | Green | Pease |
| Chappell | Guarini | Pepper |
| Chisholm | Hill, Ralph | Perkins |
| Clay | Hamilton | Peyster |
| Clinger | Hance | Pickle |
| Coebo | Harkin | Price |
| Coleman | Hatcher | Rahall |
| Collins (IL) | Hawkins | Rangel |
| Conte | Heckler | Ratchford |
| Conyers | Heftel | Reuss |
| Coyne, William | Hertel | Richmond |
| Crockett | Holland | Rinaldo |
| D'Amours | Hollenbeck | Rodino |
| de la Garza | Howard | Roe |
| Dellums | Hutto | Rosenthal |
| DeNardis | Jeffords | Rostenkowski |
| Derrick | Jenkins | Roybal |
| Dicks | Jones (OK) | Russo |
| Dingell | Kastenmeier | Sabo |
| Donnelly | Kennelly | Savage |
| Dorgan | Kildee | Scheuer |
| Dowdy | Kogovack | Schneider |
| Downey | LaFalce | Schroeder |
| Duncan | Lantos | Schumer |
| Dunn | Leach | Sefberling |

- Shannon
- Sharp
- Simon
- Skelton
- Smith (IA)
- Solars
- St Germain
- Stark
- Stokes
- Stuntion
- Studds

- Swift
- Synar
- Tauke
- Traxler
- Udall
- Vento
- Wohlsamer
- Walgren
- Washington
- Waxman
- Weber (OH)
- Wells

- White
- Williams (MT)
- Wilson
- Wirth
- Wolpe
- Wright
- Wyden
- Yates
- Yatron
- Young (MO)
- Zablocki

NOES—188

- Applegate
- Archer
- Bailey (MO)
- Beard
- Bennett
- Bereuter
- Bethune
- Billey
- Brodhead
- Broomfield
- Brown (CO)
- Broyhill
- Butler
- Byron
- Campbell
- Carman
- Carney
- Chapple
- Cheney
- Clausen
- Coats
- Collins (TX)
- Conable
- Corcoran
- Coughlin
- Coyne, James
- Craig
- Crane, Daniel
- Daniel, Dan
- Daniel, R. W.
- Dannemeyer
- Daschle
- Daub
- Davis
- Derwinski
- Dickinson
- Dorman
- Dyson
- Edwards (OK)
- Emerson
- Emery
- English
- Erlenborn
- Evans (DE)
- Fenwick
- Fiedler
- Fields
- Findley
- Fithian
- Forsythe
- Foundation
- Frenzel
- Gilman
- Goodling
- Gradison
- Gramm
- Gregg
- Gunderson
- Hagedorn
- Hall (OH)
- Hall, Sam
- Hammerschmidt
- Hansen (ID)

- Hartnett
- Hefner
- Hendon
- Hightower
- Hill
- Hillis
- Holt
- Hopkins
- Horton
- Huckaby
- Hughes
- Hunter
- Hyde
- Ireland
- Jeffries
- Jehnston
- Jones (NC)
- Jones (TN)
- Kasten
- Kemp
- Kindness
- Kramer
- Lagomarsino
- Latta
- Leath
- LeBoutillier
- Lee
- Lent
- Levitas
- Lewis
- Livingston
- Loeffler
- Lott
- Lowery (CA)
- Lujan
- Lungren
- Madigan
- Marienne
- Marriott
- Martin (IL)
- Martin (NY)
- McClory
- McCloskey
- McCollum
- McDade
- McDonald
- McEwen
- McGrath
- McKinney
- Michel
- Miller (OH)
- Mitchell (NY)
- Mollinari
- Montgomery
- Moore
- Moorhead
- Morrison
- Myers
- Napier
- Natcher
- Nelligan
- O'Brien
- Oxley

- Parris
- Pashayan
- Patman
- Paul
- Petri
- Porter
- Pritchard
- Pursell
- Quillen
- Raisback
- Regula
- Rhodes
- Rittler
- Roberts (KS)
- Roberts (SD)
- Robinson
- Roemer
- Rose
- Roth
- Roukema
- Rousselot
- Rudd
- Santini
- Sawyer
- Schulze
- Sensenbrenner
- Shaw
- Shelby
- Shumway
- Shuster
- Siljander
- Skeen
- Smith (AL)
- Smith (NE)
- Smith (NJ)
- Smith (OR)
- Stowe
- Snyder
- Solomon
- Spence
- Stangeland
- Stanton
- Stenholm
- Stump
- Tauzin
- Taylor
- Vander Jagt
- Walker
- Wampler
- Watkins
- Weber (MN)
- Whitehurst
- Whitley
- Whittaker
- Whitten
- Williams (OH)
- Winn
- Wolf
- Worthy
- Wythe
- Young (AK)
- Young (FL)

□ 1556

The Clerk announced the following pairs:
On this vote: - - -

Mr. Zeferetti for, with Mr. Thomas against.

Mr. Leland for, with Mr. Dreier against.
Mr. Gray for, with Mr. Phillip M. Crane against.

Mr. Dixon for, with Mr. Burgener against.
Mr. McCLORY changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Total # of Republicans who voted aye
Total # of Rep who were recorded

NOT VOTING—41

- Atkinson
- AuCoin
- Badham
- Bafalis
- Bowen
- Brown (OH)
- Burgener
- Burton, John
- Courter
- Crane, Phillip
- Deckard
- Dixon
- Dougherty
- Dreier

- Erdahl
- Fish
- Foglietta
- Frost
- Gaydos
- Ginn
- Goldwater
- Gray
- Grisham
- Hansen (UT)
- Hoyer
- Hubbard
- Jacobs
- Leland

- Long (MD)
- Lundine
- Marks
- Martin (NC)
- Mattox
- Murtha
- Rogers
- Smith (PA)
- Stanton
- Thomas
- Trible
- Weaver
- Zeferetti

USDA Runs Loyalty Checks On Experts in Advisory Roles

By Philip J. Hilts
Washington Post Staff Writer

The Agriculture Department has started a system of political loyalty checks on some scientists, apparently the first time such checks have been imposed on government peer review panels since the 1950s.

Scientists must routinely pass political checks as well as FBI security checks before holding policy-making jobs in Agriculture, but a bitter controversy broke out when the department extended those political loyalty checks early this year to university scientists who make no policy decisions but only provide expert advice on the scientific quality of grant applications.

In my opinion, scientists should be checked for philosophical compatibility with the administration's views, said James Handley, special assistant to Agriculture Secretary John R. Block.

"We like to believe we have a more conservative philosophy than the last administration. . . . We would like to appoint people who share our political views," Handley said.

Two former directors of the research program in question, called the Competitive Grants Program, have condemned the political loyalty checks as "absurd" and said they may "utterly destroy" the grant program when scientists discover that politics is being mixed with science.

Dr. Larry Schrader of the University of Wisconsin, who ran the Competitive Grants Program last year, said that no such political checks were run until this year. When he found out about the checks this year,

he said, "I was mad as a wet hen. Many people have worked their butts off to keep this program credible. . . ."

The program will disburse about \$16 million in agricultural research grants. There are about 800 applicants for the money, and the applications are reviewed by about 80 university scientists chosen for their specialized knowledge in different branches of agricultural research.

Similar panels exist at the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health. Officials at both those agencies expressed surprise and dismay at the political checks carried out at Agriculture.

They said no such political checks exist in their agencies. Security checks are done, the officials said, but appointments are not held up while they are conducted, nor are most officials even aware that they take place.

At USDA, the names of scientists nominated for review panels are passed to the FBI for security checks, and to Block's office for political checks. The checks this year delayed by some months the start of grant application reviews.

Special assistant Handley said he did not know if anyone had been prevented from sitting on a review panel because of the checks, but officials closer to the review panels said that probably no one was excluded for political or security reasons.

Handley said he believes that the FBI check for "security and background" is required by the Federal Advisory Commission Act. Officials in NSF and NIH said that that is not necessarily the case; the act itself does not explicitly call for such investigations.

Handley said USDA picks peer reviewers "first and foremost" by their scientific credentials. But he said it is possible that many of the reviewers are picked because they are part of a "good old boy network" in science, and many others, including Agriculture's own scientists, could do the job of reviewing grants for scientific merit.

Where two scientists might have equal credentials, he said, "and you find one of those people shares your philosophical viewpoint, and one is very much opposed to you . . . our job is to appoint those people with our" political views.

Former director Schrader said that if the checks were established as policy, it would "utterly destroy" the credibility of the program among scientists, and scientists would soon refuse to be part of it.

Dr. Joe Key, who headed the program in its first two years and now is at the University of Georgia, said such political checks are "absurd" and either naive on the part of department officials or a conscious attempt to undermine the program.

Everett Mendelsohn, historian of science at Harvard University, said that political loyalty checks have not been used on science panels since the 1950s. Both NIH and NSF had them then, he said, not to check for loyalty to a party or ideal but to check for evidence of communist sympathy.

Without complete freedom from politics in science, "we don't get reliable knowledge, we obtain knowledge that is biased and faulty from the beginning," Mendelsohn said.