

Ranger. The conservatives were weightily represented by all of President Ford's top economic team. On hand were Arthur F. Burns, chairman of the Federal Reserve Board; William E. Simon, Secretary of the Treasury and the chairman of the newly created Economic Policy Board, which is designed to orchestrate federal efforts to fight inflation; William Seidman, presidential aide and new economic coordinator; Roy L. Ash, director of the Office of Management and Budget; and

Roger Greenspan, chairman of the CEA. Also attending and speaking as a panelist was Professor Friedman. It is not irrelevant, of course, that the conservatives are "in" and the liberals are "out."

The only direct disagreement which surfaced at the summit was on the question of if and when to resort to a system of wage and price controls. Conservatives lean to the view that controls require a huge bureaucracy to administer them, fight symptoms not

causes, and actually prolong inflation. Liberals argue that, despite their disadvantages, wage and price controls are the only equitable and effective method to employ after inflation has taken hold. A minority of the liberals appeared to be in favor of controls immediately.

It is interesting that the only detailed recommendations agreed on by the economists were in a list of 22 "structural" reforms that covered a wide range of federal rate-setting, regulatory, or protectionist measures. There seems

Briefing

NIH Cliques Assailed on Training Grants

A lawsuit seeking to reform cliquish and allegedly discriminatory practices in the award of training grants by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) appears to be making headway. In late August, a district court judge ordered NIH to turn over information on the backgrounds of the scientists who award the grants and information on both successful and unsuccessful applications to the Association of Women in Science (AWIS) which is bringing the suit.

The suit seeks to halt the entire NIH training grant program—which has been revamped several times by the Administration and by Congress in recent years—until NIH produces court-approved regulations for processing applications. To help build its case, the AWIS went to court to seek the following from NIH:

► The curriculum vitae of those who sit on awards committees, which AWIS will use to determine what, if any, common ties exist between the committee members and successful applicants,

► enough information from grant applications themselves to show whether the successful applicants actually followed NIH rules.

According to NIH, in fiscal 1973, when the training grants program was still healthy, training grant awards of all kinds totaled \$139 million and supported approximately 16,400 people. Since then, the administration has tried to reduce the program repeatedly. Congress, in response, has just passed a law known as the National Research

Act which would expand the program in fiscal 1975 to an authorization of \$205 million (*Science*, 2 August 1974).

Gladys Kessler, who is Washington counsel for AWIS on the case, explains that eventually, she hopes to demonstrate a pattern of cliquish and ingrown behavior among successful grant applicants and committee members. How many of those regularly funded by a particular committee have members of their academic department sitting on the committee? Do people from institutions other than those represented on a committee tend not to be awarded grants by it? Among other things, the suit seeks to prove that the current practices discriminate against women training grant applicants.—D.S.

New Look for Public Works Committee

The House Public Works Committee has taken a step toward divesting itself of its old pork barrel image with the establishment of a science advisory panel whose job is to help the committee make decisions along the lines of a national public works investment policy.

Committee chairman John A. Blatnik (D-Minn.), who is retiring from Congress this year, has been thinking seriously about the role of public works in population distribution and regional development since he went to the Mexican-American AAAS meeting in 1972 and talked with people such as Roger Revelle, who heads the Harvard Center for Population Studies. Last year the committee asked Richard Royce, a Flor-

ida-based environment and energy consultant who used to head the staff of the Senate Public Works Committee, to help put together an advisory group of scientists and social scientists. Officially established last spring, the panel has been divided into four task groups. They have been drafting policy papers on (i) population distribution, applying the ecological concept of "carrying capacity" to metropolitan and regional development; (ii) the potential for planning and service delivery within state, substate, and regional governing units; (iii) the role of transportation in population distribution and regional economic development; and (iv) values, assumptions, and implications of alternative federal public works policies. Some of the work will be presented in testimony for committee hearings on a national public works investment policy which were begun last fall and are scheduled to continue for 2 days later this fall.

The establishment of such a panel is an unusual step for a congressional committee, but it is very much in line with other efforts within Congress—such as those by the new Office of Technology Assessment—to bring some long-range thinking into the legislative process and institutionalize communication between lawmakers and scientists and academics. The panel evidently fills a need felt by scientists as well as the committee. A staff member says the staff was amazed at the eagerness of those invited to participate.

Among the 19-member group are Ralph Widner, whose Academy for Contemporary Problems is contributing some of its study findings to the committee, and David Freeman of the Ford Foundation's Energy Policy Project. —C.H.