

be doing this," admitted committee member Paul Simon (D-IL), "But the reality is that we can't get the votes without the reservation."

Because he has continued to be unable to harvest the votes needed to secure passage of the Democratic reservation language, however, Byrd has yet to steer the resolutions to the floor for a vote. And there the situation hangs, in legislative limbo.

During a 24 March hearing, a plaintive Pell took Arms Control and Disarmament Agency director Kenneth L. Adelman to task for the Administration's failure to twist arms on the Hill to get the two treaties ratified. "It seemed to me very strange," Adelman responded, "that the Senate would be interested in ratifying treaties when they did not see the whole language involved." The Reagan Administration "had been saying for 6 years we need better verification for these treaties," he reminded Pell, while "the Soviets have been saying 'nyet' for 6 years."

For a brief moment in early April it looked as though the treaties might gain a new lease on life when President Reagan greeted as "encouraging" a Soviet offer to discuss new verification measures on the TTBT and PNET at the same time that additional and more restrictive limitations on nuclear testing were negotiated. Within a few days, however, the Administration reaffirmed its earlier position that Soviet agreement to CORTEX monitoring of the two older treaties was a precondition to opening up new talks on further restricting nuclear testing.

Another possible route around the TTBT verification roadblock was charted during Secretary of State George P. Shultz's recent talks in Moscow, when the superpowers tentatively agreed to explode nuclear weapons at each other's test sites to permit precise calibration of their seismic instruments. But the details of this unusual swap have yet to be worked out and the United States is still insisting that CORTEX is the key.

"It's not adequate, it's a first step," said outgoing assistant secretary of defense for international security policy Richard M. Perle, of the test exchange in a 19 April "Meet the Press" interview. "In order to get real verification of the present limit on nuclear testing, we need to be able to send teams to the Soviet Union, and they have to send teams to the United States, who will stand by and measure the yield of those tests when they take place. That's the American proposal," said Perle.

■ DAVID C. MORRISON

David Morrison is a reporter with National Journal.

Report Blasts Human Development Office

House committee sees grounds for researchers' complaints of politicization of grants process

THE House Committee on Government Operations has released a scorching report accusing the Office of Human Development Services (HDS) within the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) of "mismanagement" and of funding questionable research projects in defiance of the recommendations of peer reviewers. The report also criticizes HDS officials for failure to allocate funds provided by law, improper delays in promulgating regulations, and "misrepresenting" their activities to Congress.

The HDS, which funds social welfare services and research on programs for children, the elderly, the developmentally disabled, and American Indians, has the sort of functions that the Reagan Administration has consistently sought to curtail. The fiscal year 1987 research budget was \$41 million—less than half the FY 1980 level and \$12 million more than the President requested. The HDS was run until recently by Dorcas Hardy, a longtime associate of President Reagan who resigned last year to become the commissioner of Social Security.

The report is based on an investigation by the subcommittee on human resources chaired by Representative Ted Weiss (D-NY), which was prompted by numerous complaints from researchers about politicization of the grants process. Dissatisfaction with the HDS modus operandi has been simmering for some years, as evidenced by criticisms voiced in two previous reports, in 1983 and 1984, by the HHS Inspector General and the General Accounting Office.

The House committee report focuses in particular on the conduct of the coordinated discretionary grants program which handles most of the research funding. The grant process is as follows: researchers submit "preapplications." Following peer review, some applicants are asked to submit full applications. The full applications are submitted either to "competitive review"—involving further peer review—or "administrative review," which is done in-house and is directed at projects deemed to be of "unique interest" or "exceptional merit."

The subcommittee expressed concern

about "the inordinate number of grants that receive funding despite very low scores and ranking by the experts in the field. . . ." It seems that any proposal subjected to administrative review was virtually assured of funding, regardless of how it had been ranked in the preapplication process. Some were arbitrarily assigned a score of 99 (on a scale of 0–100) for the administrative review.

The highest ranked preapplications were often ignored—for example, in the FY 1984 child abuse grant category, 44% of those selected for administrative review and 22% of those selected for competitive review had not received high priority rankings and thus were selected "despite, not because of, the peer reviewers' recommendations."

The committee concluded that "apparently inferior programs that appeal to the HDS politically appointed administrators are funded." This is suggested by a listing of projects for FY 1985, which shows that 33% of the grants funded after competitive review were not among the highest ranked. The majority of these projects fell in areas of Administration concern, such as "management systems," and "strengthening families."

One of the outstanding examples of "out of order funding" was a grant to Childhelp USA, a California organization, for a study of why foster care placements fail. Despite low preapplication scores, it was assigned to competitive review and authorized to apply for \$36,000 for 1 year. Childhelp instead applied for \$300,000 over 3 years. The application was given scores of 13, 27, and 43 by the reviewers, who found it "very expensive" and not innovative. A second review was then conducted, with different reviewers, who accorded it scores in the 80s. The \$300,000 proposal was funded. No written justification was given for the unusual handling of the grant. The committee notes that the project director was a former HDS administrator under President Ford, and that Mrs. Reagan is a friend of Childhelp's founders and honorary chairman of the organization.

In testimony at committee hearings last

spring, HDS officials explained that projects were often selected for funding out of order in the interests of innovativeness, benefiting minority applicants, geographic distribution, or the prospect of major matching contributions from the private sector. The committee, however, found these claims to be "rarely supported by the facts."

The report says that the seemingly arbitrary practices at the HDS are discouraging people from applying for funds. Between FY 1982 and FY 1985 (after the big Administration-imposed budget drop), the number of applications fell by about 50%. It also says applicants are not informed of why their proposals are turned down, and peer reviewers are never told which grants are funded—as they usually are elsewhere in HHS.

The report also dwells on the HDS's alleged failure to carry out programs mandated by law. In a number of instances, it says, Hardy and her staff "sought to impose their imprimatur by delaying the implementation of programs that they did not support." They also withheld appropriated funds. For example, Congress in 1984 made available federal matching funds for the establishment by states of Children's Trust Funds for the prevention of child abuse. HDS requested that the \$5-million appropriation be rescinded, explaining that it was "not necessary." The committee branded official explanations as "incorrect." In another case, HDS terminated funding for 9 of 11 gerontology centers despite an explicit congressional directive to continue the funding. "As a result," says the report, "the national network of health and social services for elderly patients in long-term care, which had been developed for 5 years, was brought to a halt in most of the centers."

The committee's list of recommendations includes heavier reliance on the peer review process, abolition of the administrative review, and a reversal of the trend toward consolidation of programs. Noting Hardy's "bias against large grants, university applicants, and longitudinal research," the report says there should be a new effort to fund "major research and demonstration projects that can be replicated nationwide."

A dissent to the report, signed by most of the Republicans on the committee, says that the report "does not demonstrate that HDS has been mismanaged. . . ." They defend the assistant secretary's use of her discretionary authority to override peer evaluations, saying "The taxpayers would be poorly served by ceding the function to private citizens, no matter how 'expert' they might be."

The HDS had no comment on the report as of 20 April. ■ **CONSTANCE HOLDEN**

Briefing:

White Reelected Head of Engineering Academy

Robert M. White has been elected president of the National Academy of Engineering (NAE) for a second term of 4 years. White, a meteorologist and the first head of the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration, has used the NAE as a forum since 1983 to draw attention to the need for U.S. industry to become more competitive in the international marketplace.



Robert M. White. Beginning a second term at the National Academy of Engineering.

The NAE also reelected three members of its governing council: H. Norman Abramson, vice president of the Southwest Research Institute; Gerald P. Dinneen, vice president of Honeywell, Inc.; and Paul E. Gray, president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. A fourth member will be elected at the council meeting on 7 May. ■ **E.M.**

Goldberger to Head Princeton Institute

Marvin L. Goldberger, president of the California Institute of Technology, will leave the university this fall to become the new director of the Institute for Advanced Studies in Princeton, New Jersey. Goldberger, who will be 65 in October, has been at Caltech's helm since 1978.

On the national scene, Goldberger is known for his role as an advisor to the government on science and national security policy. He was a member of the President's

Science Advisory Committee in its heyday, from 1965 to 1969. Later, he served as chairman of the Committee on International Security and Arms Control at the National Academy of Sciences (1980–1986). A native of Chicago, Goldberger holds a B.S. from the Carnegie Institute of Technology and a Ph.D. in physics from the University of Chicago. He taught physics at Princeton University from 1957 to 1978, before going to Caltech.

Goldberger's interest in policy issues may have an impact on the Institute. But he refuses to speculate, saying, "I have no real plan" at this time. Goldberger speaks warmly of a "long and close association" with members of the Institute, dating back to Robert Oppenheimer's years as director.

Harry Woolf, an historian of science and the Institute's director since 1976, plans to take a sabbatical year at Churchill College, Cambridge, England. He will return to the Institute as a professor in 1989.

John Bahcall, a faculty member on the Institute's search committee, said the group did not expect to find as a replacement for Woolf "a brilliant academician who was also a distinguished administrator and who understood and could share the excitement of history, social science, math, and physics. . . . But we did." ■ **E.M.**

U.S.—U.S.S.R. Space Agreement Renewed

A formal agreement to cooperate in space activities was signed by U.S. Secretary of State George P. Shultz and Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze during Shultz's visit to Moscow last week. The agreement, which was negotiated late last year (*Science*, 28 November 1986, p. 1068), renews a U.S.—Soviet space agreement that was first signed in 1972. The United States declined to renew the pact in 1982 to protest the declaration of marshal law in Poland.

The renewed agreement identifies 16 areas of space science where cooperation would be useful, but does not commit the signatories to any dramatic joint ventures. Some Soviet scientists have, however, been urging a joint mission to return samples from the surface of Mars, a suggestion that is being studied by the U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The immediate impact of the new agreement is expected to be increased exchange of information and more coordination in the planning of national space projects. These activities have been occurring to some extent without a formal agreement, but they have been limited and ad hoc. ■ **C.N.**