

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

JUNE 6, 1975

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT
(Washington, D. C.)

REMARKS OF THE VICE PRESIDENT
AT THE WHITE HOUSE SCIENCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ROOM 1318, DIRKSEN SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

10:00 A.M. EDT

Chairman Kennedy, Chairman Moss, Chairman Tunney, and distinguished members of the three committees. I would just like to say that I am most grateful to you, Senator, for the invitation to be here at this discussion, and I am greatly honored that the President directed me to come.

I have spent a great deal of my life in the executive side of government, both in Washington and at the local level, and have always enjoyed and profited from close relations and close exchange of views in preparation of legislation with the Legislative Branch of government. So I feel very strongly and am very delighted at the opportunity of being with this.

I would like to congratulate the members of this group for having kept alive and kept this whole concept very much before the American people and before the Administration.

I think it is the activities of these committees which have brought into sharp focus for the new President, President Ford, this question of revitalizing, re-establishing, the Science Adviser in the White House.

The President asked me to look into the subject for him and make a recommendation when I was confirmed, and I set up a relatively small informal group of representative scientists around the country and public administrators to try and review what happened and to see how this could be most effectively integrated into the top policy-making at the Executive Branch level, which is like you said, Senator Tunney, and how does this relate to the President and how can it be kept on the basis where the Adviser and the President are in close confidence which is maintained between them, and there is background that will support the effort.

I have prepared a statement just so it would be available for the record, and I can just skim through some of it. But I think already a group has spoken, and your opening remarks in the committee really set the stage.

There is no question that we have tremendous problems. But science and technology make it possible for us to translate those problems into opportunities. The larger the problems, the more important science and

MORE

technology is because it can provide the keys and the new concepts and new ideas to the solutions of the problems.

As I think you expressed, and I think this whole group does, we live in one of the most exciting moments in the whole world. We will see emerge from this, if you support the tremendous capabilities that this country has, almost unique capabilities, in the field of science and technology, the application of that to the solutions, not only of our own problems but problems throughout the world. So to me this is a very exciting moment.

When I left the Governorship of one of the 50 States and set up a committee on critical shortages, one of the first things I did was commission a study on the role of science and technology in the future of our country.

Hans Moore's report really goes in depth into these questions we are talking about and the importance of this to the future of our country and our ability of a future society to meet people's problems and to create a very positive solution. It does involve the concept of growth.

There has been considerable discussion of growth and the question, are we running out of our resources and, therefore, do we now have to stop, slow down, have a no-growth period; or is it possible to have growth and at the same time restore and preserve our environment.

Again, science and technology, it seems to me, make possible the happy marriage of growth and the preservation and re-establishment of our environment. It is only through science and technology that that would be possible.

We have another panel that was working on the subject of raw materials, their role in relation to jobs because of new industrial activities and job employment, and so forth.

I must say that with the exception of three or four raw materials, this country has the potential, the capabilities, of either developing synthetic substitutes or new sources by new means. There is no question, for instance, as to the kind of exciting things; the shortage of gas that exists today and the tremendous resource of coal we have, the questions of ecology and the protection of our ecology in developing these resources.

The potential of developing new sites, that is in the ground, going down and putting off an explosion, setting the coal underground on fire and then taking off the gas and liquifying it for transport, is a tremendously exciting possibility. This has never been experimented with yet on a test basis to know what the cost would be. But these are problems.

The same thing is true of shale oil. We have more oil in shale in this country, twice as much, as in the entire Mediterranean Basin where the Arab oil supply

is. It is in the shale.

If you take the shale and extract the oil, you get what looks like talcum powder and you would have to keep it from blowing all over the United States. But again, it is possible to drill down, set off an explosion, set on fire, the oil becomes gas, you take off the gas and condense it when it comes up; and we don't know what the costs are. But these are just little insights into the tremendous possibilities that exist.

So this group made its studies, and I made a recommendation to the President, and the President called, as was already referred to by Senator Moss, to discuss with the leaders the fact that he came to the conclusion that he wanted to re-establish a Science Adviser to the President.

MORE

Of course, as everyone knows, this office has been closed by the previous President and the head of the National Science Foundation has been made the Adviser. He has a full-time job, and the relationship you were talking about just doesn't exist, and I don't think that is a solution and I don't think the scientific community feels it is. I know none of you do. The President is convinced himself that he doesn't either. So he wants to move.

Maybe I could just briefly run through the questions which really are before us and before the President and before the committee that relate to this. As I say, I put these all in a paper which I think, rather than read, that I will hit some of the high spots and then go to questions, because it is easier, perhaps, to develop this through questions.

The arguments are obvious, so I don't think I need to go through those. As far as the functions, there is a formidable array of policy problems to be understood and resolved to which science and technology can make a contribution.

Since the quality and nature of those policy issues before the President will differ from year to year, both the function and the organization of the scientific capability available to the President should be flexible enough to deal with each situation and set of issues as they may emerge.

The following is the range of functions on which there is considerable public consensus. These functions should not be cased in statutory concrete but should be allowed to grow or decline as the President may require, as relationships with the departments and agencies of government develop, and as emerging national programs, policies and issues may make desirable and useful:

To respond on scientific and technical matters to requests from the President with respect to issues that are before him for decision, or new initiatives.

To help the President resolve conflicting advice involving scientific matters that come to the President from departments, agencies or the Congress.

I think you want to remember that since the original office was formed, which was under President Truman, there are now in each department assistant secretaries for science who have very substantial budgets and which help in the function of the departments of the government.

Of course, the Defense Department has a large scientific operation. There are many government laboratories weathered by funds with some of the outstanding scientists in the country; and then, of course, the whole space thing with its laboratory. So there is a tremendous network.

But I think perhaps one of the most important

MORE

recommendations which the President has embraced is that there should be the right of the Science Adviser to organize ad hoc panels of consultants to assist in the collection and evaluation of relevant data with respect to particular technical and scientific issues.

This, it seems to me, can be one of the most important and useful things because he can tap, either from government or private life, through the Adviser, the best brains in the country on any range of subjects and put them together in three months or four months, whatever it is, in a panel, in whatever steps necessary, so they can collect and bring together on specific problems that knowledge.

I think this really has got to be a key. If you try and bring in a huge organization of the government on a full-time basis, it is very difficult to get the best people to leave their particular specialties in public or private institutions, and it is very difficult to hold them, particularly in terms of salaries. So this ad hoc approach I think is a very important, integral part of the concept.

There are really three ways this can be approached. It could be a panel of scientists -- it could be three -- it could be an office; or it can be an Adviser.

Our concern with the panel of, say, three was that there are so many important fields of science today that if you take and limit it to three, then those who are not included are going to feel left out.

If you have an office and a director, then the problem is you have to staff the office; and then there is always, if I know government bureaucracy, the result is a very great jealousy between those in government who want to do the job and calling on people outside the government who like to do it themselves, and who have the large staffs and feel that they have the capability and competence and, therefore, why call in the people from the outside.

So the President came to the conclusion that perhaps the best way to do it was to have an Adviser to the President who would have the opportunity as needed to appoint up to, say, five assistants who could represent special fields -- that would change, perhaps, as the interest and the border of areas happens to come into focus -- a small office that would be able to evaluate and study material as it came in and present it to him; and that they would have the funds sufficient to call on the ad hoc groups and meet expenses.

Of the basic objectives which we felt this could accomplish, the membership of such panels would be drawn from the special competence available in the private and public sectors, including universities, the National Academies, industry, and government laboratories.

I have been, through this, trying to provide the President with early warning of either opportunities or problems, and this is important.

MORE

There are a tremendous number of opportunities that we are not grasping because they haven't been called to the attention of particularly the President, let's say, who has the capacity and power, with the cooperation of Congress, to actually get something started and get it started early. As you say, lead time is very important. Your brother moved on that, and the results have been tremendous.

To identify and report on any gaps in scientific research and technological development in the public or private sectors that merit attention. I think that is a very important one.

To consult with the President on the appointments of various scientific and technical officials in the Federal agencies.

To stay in contact with the professional staffs of the Federal departments and agencies, and of State and local governments, as well as with private sector organizations involved in science and technology.

To be available for participation in broad reviews of policies and programs of the departments and agencies having technical responsibilities, and thus to assist in the formulation of national policy on technical and scientific matters. This is not meant to imply or confer, however, power or control over the scientific and technical budgets or programs of such departments and agencies.

This is a very important point because if this isn't clear, and this function goes beyond Adviser, it could be very much resented by those scientists who are already in the government and who have responsibility. We felt that was important. That would be one of the bases that would be recommended.

To assist, where mutually appropriate, the Domestic Council, the National Security Council, and the Office of Management and Budget in reviewing department and agency programs that have technical and scientific content.

To have a modest capacity to initiate analyses and studies in support of the ad hoc panels. These analyses and studies would be performed in universities, private industry or federally support institutions.

It mentions alternative organizations, how to attract our best people, covering the full range of scientific areas that are there, and the qualifications of the Science Adviser.

It has obviously got to be a person of national standing; a person who has the confidence of the President. He or she should be a scientist, engineer, or medical person of proven scientific or technical capability, have some public service or administration, and should preferably be a member of one of the National Academies of Science or Engineering or the Institute of Medicine.

The President has in mind a budget for the first year of, say, \$1 million, \$1.5 million, to see how this works out and what the demands are and what the opportunities are. He wants it to be a statutory structure.

There was discussion, and it wasn't conclusive at the meeting, I think, that he prefers the idea of having the Adviser approved by the Senate. But he would like the Adviser not have to testify before committees on the activities of other departments and agencies, because if he does, he may come in conflict with the other departments and agencies, cause friction within the government, and he would be less free to give personal advice to the President. Then, if the President wants him to make statements on specific issues, that would be the President's choice.

The last thing, which was mentioned already, was an annual report to the President, and given by the President to the Congress.

I think that is a quick, rough outline. I am delighted, and again I want to express my admiration to this group and my thanks to you, Senator, for inviting me here and say that I share very strongly your feeling that we are all going to do better by closer cooperation between Congress and the Executive in the formulation of policy so that we develop legislation that reflects the best thinking of the co-equal bodies of government, and that we can then be effective in representing the best interest of the people.

I am honored to be here. I appreciate it. I would be delighted to discuss this with you.

END (AT 10:20 A.M. EDT)