sponsible for the tradition, reported very early, that they were Hurons. However, archeologists have been pointing out for more than half a century that their artifacts—their pottery, at least—were far more closely related to those found on both sides of the upper St. Lawrence and on the town sites of the Onondaga Indians of central New York. These pottery styles are quite different from those of the Huron proper, whose homeland was between Lake Simcoe and Georgian Bay; however, Hurons, Onondagas, and the people of Hochelaga and "Canada" —the region around Quebec—all spoke dialects of the Iroquoian language.

One of the many stories told in the 17th century to account for the disappearance of the Hochelagans before Champlain's arrival in 1603 says that they were attacked and scattered by the Hurons proper, and that some sought refuge among the New York Iroquois and others settled among their conquerors in Huronia. This may account for the tradition that "Hurons" had occupied Hochelaga, as well as the circumstantial evidence that Hochelagans and Onondagas were similar. Canadian archeologists are only just beginning to piece together the evidence and to look for more.

Historians who do not understand or accept archeological evidence have perpetuated the "Huron Hochelaga" tradition. So have the popular histories. So have Chambers of Commerce and convention bureaus. And so has the AAAS.

P. SCHUYLER MILLER
Pennsylvania Archaeologist,
4805 Centre Avenue, Pittsburgh

The Pharmacist as Drug Consultant

With great pains not to detract from Lasagna's excellent discussion ("Problems of drug development," 24 July, p. 362) I would like to add one point concerning the physician's continuing education in regard to drugs: physicians do not use the nearby professional pharmacist, in whom they could find an up-to-date and, more important, a dispassionate adviser on pharmaceuticals. Manufacturers' representatives doubtless serve a purpose to the physician, but the same purpose (the maximum gain in information on drugs) could be better met by the unbiased pharmacist.

To be objective, I must admit that some pharmacists are not enthusiastic about practicing their profession to the extent of serving as drug consultants to the medical profession. There are many reasons for this, and a not insignificant one is the all too common disparagement by the physician of the pharmacist's education. But the objectives of that segment of the pharmaceutical profession devoted to education include the education of pharmacists as drug consultants to the medical profession. The interested physician can find, by one or a few phone calls, a capable professional pharmacist willing and able to provide intelligent counsel on drugs. However, the practicing physician often accepts the information of the detail man, who is not as objective in pharmaceutical matters as the pharmacist. The case rests that there is a vast untapped source of information available to the physician which will obviate some of the problems of continuing education for the medical practitioner.

J. C. KELLETT, JR.
School of Pharmacy, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Training Grants

Abelson's editorial (5 June, p. 1181) regarding the present predoctoral and postdoctoral fellowship programs places considerable emphasis on the pitfalls of the program without mentioning its merits and offers as a solution to the problems an alternative that would probably not be free of other difficulties. According to the editorial, the method of dispensing training grant funds directly to a senior principal investigator, rather than to institutions and thence to the trainee, fosters a channelled, restrictive training program and stifles the initiative of the trainee. While this may be true of some programs supported by training grant funds, it is not fair to say this is the general finding. In many, and perhaps most, cases pre- and postdoctoral fellows apply for research training in hopes of becoming competent in a particular research area being studied by one or a group of senior investigators. I am particularly familiar with this, as I recently finished training in such a program and have now joined in the responsibility for its management. It would be very difficult for the senior investigators under whose responsibility the fellow will work to supervise his training in any area other than that in which the investigators themselves are competent. This necessarily means that the problems that the fellow will be occupied with are problems familiar to the senior investigator. This allows the senior investigator to make helpful suggestions, avoid unnecessary errors for the fellow, increase the speed of learning of involved techniques, and so forth. Allowing the fellow complete freedom in his choice of problems, especially when he is beginning his training, often leads to an unhappy stage of floundering. While the bright and able fellow is often able to occupy himself profitably, by and large the newcomer has difficulty in getting into a profitable line of research. Besides being a most efficient method of training individuals in a chosen discipline which is of particular interest to the grantors, this is probably also the most efficient way of developing scientific maturity in young men. During the first year the fellow usually stays within certain guide lines, but the next years often find the more competent individuals picking up on their own. In many institutions this development is eagerly sought by the principal investigators.

The suggestion in the editorial that training grant funds be awarded to institutions rather than to competent scientists working in a particular field could well lead to chaos. The administrators of the institutions would soon find themselves in a position of having to pass judgment as to which laboratories were desirable places to which to assign trainees. This would not avoid what the editorial in *Science* wishes to avoid. In many instances, local politics rather than scientific capability could well determine the course of events.

Perhaps a more workable solution to the problem raised in the editorial could be achieved by more rigorous efforts during the grantor's visits to project sites to ferret out undesirable situations. Perhaps trainees could be asked to appraise various parameters of the program. Attempts of this nature at least would get at the problem raised in the editorial without destroying structure that has been beneficial in the past or creating local administrative problems that could bring about defeat of much of the program.

CHARLES G. COCHRANE
Division of Experimental Pathology, Scripps Clinic and Research Foundation, La Jolla, California