

middle-income groups from a Republican President's drive to shift aid to the poor, familiar stereotypes begin to crumble. It is precisely the unfamiliarity of the proposed new programs which prompts Congress to proceed with caution. The explosion of college enrollments during the 1960's, the rising costs of higher education, and intensified pressures from underprivileged groups are major factors demanding new approaches to student aid. At the same time, the fiscal troubles of colleges and universities appear likely to project the federal government into a new role in higher education—subsidizing institu-

tions rather than special-purpose "categorical" programs. Funds to support institutions and funds to assure students of equal college opportunities share a characteristic that inevitably makes many legislators hesitant—there is no clear upper limit on the amounts required. The changes being contemplated are so basic and potentially so costly that a consensus on their precise character will take time to gel.

The Senate Education Subcommittee on 30 June reported a bill which, like the President's plan, would increase funds for students of low-income families but at a cost that may prove more

than the Administration considers feasible. The House Special Education Subcommittee has yet to make up its mind and choose from a variety of contending proposals, and agreement between the two Houses on a new law may well wait until the new year.

While education policy is treading water, education funds are increasing slightly in most categories. Because of carry-overs from earlier appropriations and different periods for which funds are made available, the bill itself does not exactly reflect changes in student aid. But the figures for grants are given by academic year in Table 1.

The bill also provided \$196.6 million for interest subsidies on guaranteed loans, an increase of \$53.4 million over fiscal 1971. This additional sum will make possible an increase of \$160 million in new subsidized loans. In addition to the \$293 million voted for NDEA direct loans, \$40 million in repayments will be available for use.

As expected, no funds were appropriated for new NDEA graduate fellowships (Title IV), although \$26.9 million was appropriated to continue stipends to students already awarded grants. The program is being discontinued largely because of the much publicized "surplus" of Ph.D.'s

Congress continued grants for construction of higher education facilities at the fiscal 1971 level of \$43 million despite the fact that the President opposed and the House voted to drop this item. They would have preferred to finance such construction entirely from loans, but the House compromised with the Senate appropriation of \$78 million.

Funds to strengthen "developing institutions" were increased \$18 million to a total of \$51.9 million. Most of the increase was proposed by the President after the House had already acted on the bill, in response to pressure for assistance to black colleges from the "black caucus" in the House.

Assistance for language training and area studies, which had been cut back to \$8 million last year, was raised to \$15.3 million for fiscal 1972. Funds for undergraduate instructional equipment were increased from \$7 million to \$12.5 million, despite the fact that neither the President's budget nor the original House bill provided any money for this program. Aid to land-grant colleges was retained at last year's \$10-million level, although the President would have abolished the program and the House voted to cut its funds in half.

The increases in funds for higher

McElroy Will Leave NSF

William D. McElroy, the director of the National Science Foundation since 1969, has decided to leave NSF early next year to become the chancellor of the University of California at San Diego. Despite the abruptness of his decision, which comes only 2 years into his 6-year term, McElroy insists that his impending departure does not reflect any disaffection with the Nixon Administration. Instead, he says, it was prompted only by an "unusually attractive" chance to return to academic life "which must be taken."

"As most of my friends know," he explained to *Science*, "when I came into this job I planned to stay only 2 or 3 years." He said he was first approached for the California job only 3 weeks ago. "Frankly, I hadn't expected to leave quite this fast, but this new opportunity came along, and it was just too good to pass up."

McElroy has been on leave from Johns Hopkins University, where he served as chairman of the biology department before his NSF appointment. He will replace William J. McGill, who left the San Diego campus in January 1970 to become president of Columbia University.

Two years ago, McElroy took the helm of NSF—an ostensibly non-political position—after President Nixon had vetoed the top candidate for the job, Franklin A. Long, on the grounds of Long's opposition to antiballistic missile systems and his generally liberal disarmament stance. Nixon sought to rectify that gaffe by withdrawing his veto and offering the job to Long again after the veto had become public knowledge. Long declined, and the President turned to McElroy—a diplomatic choice, in that McElroy was a registered Democrat and had worked actively in behalf of Scientists and Engineers for Johnson and Humphrey in 1964.

The same affiliations were expected to arouse some opposition to McElroy among such University of California regents as Governor Ronald Reagan, but to all appearances the appointment slipped by without controversy. The regents gave McElroy their unanimous approval during a meeting on 17 July at San Francisco, and on the same day President Nixon issued a brief statement from the Western White House accepting McElroy's resignation. The text of the resignation letter has not been released, however.

McElroy told *Science* that he will remain with the foundation until the first of February, and that he will depart with the feeling that "NSF is in pretty good shape from a management standpoint, that its budget is doing well, and that its Congressional relations are good."

He first revealed his intention to leave the NSF only last week, during a meeting of the National Science Board at Woods Hole, Massachusetts. The board is presumably now compiling a list of candidates for his replacement.—R.G.