after he had first raised the sickle cell issue, provided funds far above the level anyone in the Administration had requested. Congress authorized $25 million for fiscal year (FY) 1973, $40 million for FY 1974 and $50 million for FY 1975. Whether those sums will actually be spent in toto is uncertain.

In July, HEW announced that it had awarded $9 million worth of grants and contracts for sickle cell studies. With the preexisting $1 million added in, the current federal total comes to $10 million for FY 1972. Instead of five comprehensive centers, there are ten, with Howard receiving the largest single grant, $829,505. Thirty-four research contracts were let, 27 of them new and 7 extended from the previous year. Screening and education clinics are being set up in 19 communities, where the clinics will be administered by the Health Services and Mental Health Administration.

Rudolph Jackson is now the full-time coordinator of the program, supplanting Ringler, who, with other responsibilities at the NHLI, was devoting only part of his time to it. Jackson, a black hematologist and oncologist, was recruited from St. Jude's Hospital in Memphis. (After a racial encounter between blacks and whites at the NHLI last year, institute Director Theodore Cooper promised to name a black to the top spot in the sickle cell program.)

Jackson considers educating the public the priority item of the program, and lists screening of the black population, genetic counseling, and referral of patients for treatment as its other important features. One of his primary concerns, which is shared by virtually every physician who had been involved in any controlled screening program, is the problem raised by identifying someone as a carrier of sickle cell trait. "We've heard of all sorts of things happening to trait carriers," he says, noting that at least one airline stewardess was grounded after her company found she carried sickle cell trait, that persons have allegedly been denied jobs because they are carriers, and that school children reputedly have been told they cannot participate in sports

The New Federalism in Science: More Fingers in the Pie

President Nixon's concept of a "new federalism" in science won a measure of grassroots support last week from an unusual colloquy of representatives of local, state, and federal government, as well as industry and academia. A leading feature of the new federalism—and one warmly endorsed in a report by the group—would be to give states and cities a voice as to how the federal government spends its largesse on research and development for domestic problems. At the same time, however, the report underscored a caveat seemingly already understood by the White House: Local and state governments are going to need a great deal of help from the federal government in learning how to work with industries, universities, and Washington's own science policy machinery before legislatures and city councils can effectively apply new technology to traffic jams, solid waste disposal, and the myriad other nightmares of modern urban life.

The 33-page report is the product of a 3-day conference at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, last June that was funded partly by the National Science Foundation (NSF) and partly by the Pennsylvania state government. More precisely, the report is the handiwork of a preselected resolutions committee populated by a bipartisan sprinkling of congressmen, state legislators, one governor (Russell W. Peterson of Delaware), and such scientific luminaries as Detlev Bronk, the former president of Rockefeller University and the National Academy of Sciences.

The assemblage billed itself as an "action conference," and the action it proposed fell into seven broad categories. Briefly summarized, the committee recommended inclusion of scientists familiar with state and local problems on such science policy councils as the President's Science Advisory Committee and the National Science Board; additional funding for an NSF program that helps states and cities set up their own science advisory apparatus; joint state and federal funding for demonstration projects in applied R & D for local problems in five states; a similarly funded trial run for "technology utilization programs" in ten states; government encouragement for universities to provide technical consultation to cities and states; use of federal laboratories for applied R & D projects designed by state and local authorities; and vigorous backing for the above-mentioned measures by such pan-governmental agencies as the National League of Cities and the United States Conference of Mayors.

The sincerity of the Harrisburg manifesto is hardly to be questioned, although its spontaneity might be. It turns out that all these recommendations go hand-in-glove with the views and advice expressed last May in a report by a special committee of the Federal Council for Science and Technology. The FCST committee was headed by M. Frank Hersman, who directs an NSF program for helping states and cities set up science advisory machinery. Hersman's committee provided the rationale behind President Nixon's call for a "new partnership" with states and cities in the President's technology message last March. And it was Hersman's office that helped pave the way, and pay for, the Harrisburg meeting, which kindly ratified the FCST report.

It's common practice, of course, for a federal agency to plant the seeds of new science policy and then to cultivate them as best it can. And in this case, the problems at hand would seem no less genuine for all the bureaucratic horticulture surrounding them. The FCST report is only one of several in the past 2 years bearing similar conclusions: That state and local governments are, for the most part, simply not yet equipped to manage new technologies, and that the federal government has done far too little to solicit advice from these levels of government in planning new R & D for domestic problems.

It is true that nearly every state and a handful of cities have science advisers of one form or another. But the FCST report questions their ability to influence policy, and bluntly concludes that "state and local governments stand, with respect to the utilization of science and technology, roughly where the federal government did in 1940."—ROBERT GILLETTE