

tion was withdrawn, and the PHS position was weakened still further by infighting within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare over the water-pollution programs. In the House-Senate conference on their differing appropriations bills, the House had its way: there will be no funds for an Environmental Health Center this year.

The Public Health Service is in temporary retreat. It has not quite decided whether to fight once more for the Washington location or to give in and propose another site when the budget for fiscal year 1965 goes before Congress next January. Presidential opposition, however, like House displeasure and senatorial support, is mutable. By next January, a variety of new bargains could be struck; there is no telling where the Environmental Health Center will finally land.

The other major scientific facility up for grabs this year—the space agency's proposal for a \$50-million electronics research center—has been delayed, but unlike the Environmental Health Center, not deleted. Like the PHS to Washington, NASA felt magnetically attracted to the Boston area, on the grounds, it claimed, that Boston's manpower pool was brimful of electronics talent—and on the grounds, according to critics, that the agency was trying to cozy up to the state's new Senator, Ted Kennedy.

Reviewing the proposal with the attentive eye it cast this year on all details of NASA's \$5.7-billion budget request, the House Committee on Science and Astronautics discovered that "the specific site had not been selected; the coordination with other Federal agencies had not been properly effected; preliminary planning . . . had not been in accordance with good management practice; and the need for the Center was not conclusively proven."

A major part (\$3.9 million) of the \$5 million NASA requested for initial site acquisition was authorized by the committee, but temporarily frozen. No part of the funds may be expended until NASA brings to the space committees of both House and Senate a detailed study of "the geographic location of, the need for, and the nature of" the proposed electronics research center. If NASA hears no complaints from either of the committees within 45 days after submitting the report, the freeze will be off and work will be authorized to begin. But since the report is not expected to be submitted until January, and the

money will still have to be appropriated, the electronics center is not likely to get speedily under way.

NASA officials, who have just selected the committee that will canvas the country's resources to discover whether (or more, in the manner of such committees, discover that) an electronics center is needed, and where it ought to be, are tight-lipped about whether their report will be a hymn to Boston or not. After the space program's trials in Congress, however, and with the growing popularity in Washington of the "share the scientific wealth" slogans emanating from the vast lands between the East and West Coasts, it would not be a surprise to find NASA serenading Congress to a slightly different tune.—ELINOR LANGER

Krebiozen: No Clinical Test, Says National Cancer Institute

The National Cancer Institute announced last week that it would not sponsor a clinical trial of Krebiozen. The decision was based primarily on the negative recommendation of a 24-man committee of cancer experts, appointed last August to review case records of 504 patients treated with the drug.

"On the basis of the data reviewed and objective criteria employed to assess antitumor response," the committee reported, "it is [our] . . . unanimous opinion that Krebiozen is ineffective as an antitumor agent. In a very small number of patients, tumor regressions of varying degrees were seen during Krebiozen treatment. The validity of the majority of these is open to question for several different reasons. It is the opinion of the Committee that the nature, degree, and number of effects noted are what one might expect in any large random sample of cancer patients."

Contributing to the decision not to test Krebiozen, according to NCI director Kenneth Endicott, was the recent work of chemists of the Food and Drug Administration in identifying Krebiozen as creatine (*Science*, 13 September). Creatine is a normal component of the human body, concerned primarily with muscle contraction. The analysis overturns the theory on which Krebiozen is based—that the drug is a tissue hormone which inhibits the multiplication of cancer cells. Since the theory has

been invalidated, Endicott told a press conference last week, since review of the records failed to establish evidence that Krebiozen is effective in man, and since the drug has not been shown to possess "consistently strong" anticancer activity in experimental animals, "there is no justification for a clinical trial, and from a scientific standpoint we regard the case closed."

Even the monumental weight of the government's scientific evaluation, however, will not still the controversy. Krebiozen's sponsors (Andrew Ivy and Stevan Durovic, see scientific and procedural flaws in the NCI report, and will try their best to keep the charges and countercharges flowing. There is still a resolution pending before Congress directing the Cancer Institute to conduct a clinical test, although the congressional front has been quiet of late and shows no sign of bursting into action. The only real chance for an end to the controversy—one that by being definitive legally would also be definitive scientifically—would be criminal prosecution of Ivy and Durovic by the Food and Drug Administration. But FDA officials, although they have hinted publicly for months that a criminal case was imminent, concede privately that they are not anxious to tangle with a man of Ivy's stature in court—not as long as there is even a shred of scientific dispute between them. The government is not usually allowed to appeal in criminal cases, and an adverse decision would put the defendants permanently out of FDA's reach.—E.L.

Announcements

Amherst College has established a laboratory for **nuclear and atomic physics** for undergraduate study and research. The primary areas of study will be nuclear transformations and characteristics of alpha and beta particles and gamma rays. Bruce Benson, professor of physics at the college, is head of the laboratory.

Papers are being solicited for presentation at the winter meeting of the **Society of Rheology**, 3–4 February in Claremont, California. The papers will also be published in the society's *Transactions*. Deadline for receipt of abstracts: 10 December. (T. L. Smith, Stanford Research Institute, Menlo Park, Calif.)