

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 HDS requested that the \$5-million appropriation be rescinded, explaining that it was "not necessary."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.**