Consequently NBS believes that a study of bureau missions and operations by Congress would serve only to strengthen its hand in bidding for practically static federal science funds. Certainly a study along the lines of the recent Daddario report on NSF, which has won high praise from most scientists, would help to publicize the bureau's need for more funds to support its varied activities. Committee investigations of science agencies, though often looked upon with trepidation by many scientists, often result in a firm alliance between committee and agency that redounds to the benefit of both parties.

Physicist demand at peak

As our national economy and our inflation surge forward, pressures on all job markets continue to increase, and nowhere is this more evident than in the current demand for physicists.

"Reports on recruiting activities at colleges and universities indicate that the demand for physicists generally has intensified this year, particularly for those with graduate degrees," says Arthur M. Ross, head of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. A PHYSICS TODAY survey of its own recruitment ads indicates a 30% increase over the past two years, and the Deutsche & Shea engineer/scientist demand index was at an all-time high for the first quarter of this year.

Over the long run the outlook is for continued "very rapid growth in the employment of physicists through

the mid-1970's," says the 1966–67 *Occupational Outlook Handbook* published by the Labor Department. While the number of physicists seeking employment will rise rapidly during the late 1960's and early 1970's, the "demand for physicists is expected to be greater than the number of new graduates available for employment. Thus, graduates with advanced degrees and well qualified graduates with the bachelor's degree should have very good employment opportunities in physics to the mid-1970's."

A complete report on physics manpower, education and support is now being prepared by Susanne Ellis at AIP and will be issued in the fall.

NSF legislative hearings

Congressional cooks are preparing a new National Science Foundation broth from old reliable science-community recipes spiced with national-interest innovations. And generally scientists inside and outside government favor the NSF revision proposed by Congressman Emilio Q. Daddario in his HR 13696 (see PHYSICS TODAY, March, page 56). Their main apprehension concerns the bill's emphasis on applied research; their principal difference of opinion is among themselves and concerns the role of the National Science Board.

Extensions of NSF activities in the social and applied sciences, engineering, international affairs and information functions have the support, with minor reservations, of scientists who testified at recent hearings on the bill. Whenever strong issue was taken with certain features of the bill (applied research, annual science report) Daddario (D.–Conn.) was often solicitous to alter the bill's wording or interpretation to accommodate the objections of scientists. For example, when various witnesses have expressed doubts about the feasibility of having the board render an annual report on US science, Daddario has said that he would not expect a complete evaluation and report each year on every science discipline. He would expect the board to be selective, to report areas that appear most significant or where the greatest gaps and needs exist.

ERIC A. WALKER

Fear applied research. Though the congressman has done much to assuage the fears of scientists concerning extended NSF support for applied research, misgivings linger that applied research will drive out support for basic research. On this score Daddario says, "I would like to put on the record that the committee supports the concept that applied activity would not come to the point where it would overcome and obscure the important work in basic research. So you ought not to be so fearful about the fact that this word 'applied' begins to creep into the legislation." These comments notwithstanding, National Academy of Sciences chief Frederick Seitz testified that "one of the greatest fears expressed by the scientific community is that NSF eventually will be transformed into an agency that is so involved in applied missions . . . that support of basic scientific research will be limited to a starvation level. Should this occur, and *I believe the danger is far from remote,* we could easily pay a heavy price by sacrificing positions of leadership in important fields of science. . . . I am concerned that support of applied research at academic institutions may be the thin wedge that could ultimately result in pressures to support mission-oriented work at the expense of basic research."

Board vs director. With regard to another important issue, the respective roles of the National Science Board and the NSF director, Daddario would perhaps be happy to oblige the scientists provided he could find consensus among them. But he encounters only a house divided. The