NEWS IN BRIEF

● **MICHIGAN POLLUTERS ON NOTICE**: Michigan Governor William G. Milliken has signed a law permitting any resident to file suit to protect the air, water, and other natural resources from being polluted by industry, state agencies, or individual citizens. The circuit courts will be able to direct government units to tighten pollution standards, as well as grant injunctions and impose conditions to stop pollution. The law will become effective on 1 October.

● **SACCHARIN LABELED SAFE**: A special panel of the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council has concluded that "on the basis of available information, the present and projected usage of saccharin in the United States does not pose a hazard." The NAS-NRC study was requested by the Food and Drug Administration after a University of Wisconsin researcher found that saccharin injected into the bladders of rats caused cancer. The panel recommended that further studies be conducted to confirm the findings of safety and to extend the evidence over longer periods of exposure.

● **GOVERNOR'S SCIENCE COUNCIL**: John E. Mock, director of the Georgia Science and Technology Commission, has been elected chairman of the newly created National Governors' Council on Science and Technology at its first meeting late in July. The Council will report to the National Governors' Conference on means of applying science and technology to social and economic problems at the state level.

● **STATE R&D**: State agencies spent $136 million in fiscal year 1967 and $159 million in fiscal year 1968 for research, development, and supporting plant, according to a National Science Foundation survey. The survey, to be published fully later this year, showed that the funds were provided about equally by state and federal agencies. Expenditures included: 40 percent for R&D in health care; 25 percent for natural resources; 15 percent for highways; 10 percent for education; 2 percent for agriculture; 2 percent for police and corrections; and 1 percent for public welfare. There has been an average annual 20-percent increase since 1964.

brought in to pick up the pieces. Observers say that the AID research effort made modest gains. But as a result of the furor Congress had clamped a $6 million dollar a year ceiling on research funds for the central office and, perhaps even more serious, a cadre of competent AID research administrators had been dispersed through the agency so that the research effort lacked a "critical mass." In the academic community there was a lingering coolness toward research on development problems and some cynicism about AID's intentions ever to mount a serious research program. Nevertheless, research in AID seemed to be making a recovery when the agency's overall budget began to shrink, in part as a result of the Vietnam war funds squeeze.

Despite AID's declining budget a somewhat more hopeful chapter for research opened with the creation of a separate Technical Assistance Bureau and the appointment a year ago by President Nixon of Joel Bernstein to head the bureau with the title of assistant administrator.

Within the bureau is a new office of science and technology which in many respects represents a revival of the central research office. Director of the new office is Glenn E. Schweitzer, a foreign service officer with a master's degree from Caltech who was the first U.S. scientific attaché in Moscow, from 1963 to 1966.

The new office of science and technology has a broad commission but a limited budget. Its job is to help bring to bear the resources of the scientific community—both in and out of government—upon the problems of development, and it is obviously expected to provide a major point of AID contact with the universities. Schweitzer's office is supposed to operate not only with its own funds but to work with the agency's regional bureaus and specialized offices which have their own research funds to maximize AID research and development work in fields such as nutrition, health, and education.

A budget document describes one particular concern of the office of science and technology this way.

> Among the areas of science that are not a responsibility of other AID offices and are of particular relevance to economic development are chemistry, biology, hydrology, meteorology, geology, and oceanography. The areas of high investment in many countries which could benefit from applied research and more effective use of modern technology include power generation and distribution, transportation and communications and the building industry.

To accomplish its mission the new office seems to be counting heavily on AID's relationship with the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) and the National Academy of Engineering (NAE). For a number of years NAS has been involved with AID international programs mostly in arranging meetings with foreign scientists on scientific and technical subjects, but from now on AID wants to involve the academies more deeply in identifying opportunities and in planning projects. The academies' end of the program is handled through the office of the NAS foreign secretary Harrison Brown, who has himself been concerned with problems of development for a number of years.

The AID science office has an annual budget of about $1 million, of which perhaps $600,000 this year is earmarked for NAS-NAE projects. AID's total research budget is estimated at $50 million, a considerable portion of which goes to finance education and construction of educational and research facilities.

It is too early to judge the prospects for success of the science office's expanding activities, particularly since the impending reorganization of AID could seriously affect present arrangements. The expectation seems to be, however, that the reorganization would be likely to increase emphasis on research.

The case for research in a foreign aid program for developing countries has always been a strong one. By ignoring it AID has not added luster to its reputation. One of the embarrassing footnotes to U.S. foreign aid history, for example, is that the new strains of wheat and rice regarded as responsible in large part for the so-called "green revolution" were developed by private initiatives, mainly those of the Ford and Rockefeller foundations. Many people concerned with development problems both inside and outside government feel that research is increasingly important if the consequences of development—such as the effects of the use of fertilizers and pesticides on the environment—are to be anticipated and dealt with.

The Peterson task force has recognized these problems, but at another level the report represents a reaction