isting programs for assistance"), but then, neither is it designed for the near-bankrupt. The intention is to work with less-than-first-rank institutions that are demonstrably on the way up, and to add to their present momentum through grants that will supplement their own development efforts. The down-and-out and those with nothing to show but ambition are not invited to apply.

For the institutions that fall into the aspiring middle class, NSF is currently planning ten to 15 five-year grants, generally not in excess of $5 million per institution. The eligibility requirements are stiff, but they are combined with wide-ranging flexibility on the use of the money.

Those who seek the grants must not only spell out what they have been doing to help themselves but must provide assurances that, once NSF drops out of the financial picture, they will have the resources to carry on. And, while NSF does not set forth specific goals to be achieved with its money, it wants to know "specifically, what will have been upgraded?" with the aid of the grant.

Outside of that, though, NSF is wide-open to proposals for using the money for anything from janitorial services to equipment and salaries. Significantly, undergraduate institutions are invited to apply, along with graduate schools, and proposals can be for strengthening single departments, a group of related departments, or the entire science program of an institution or for establishing new departments.

In any case, NSF realizes that its difficulties with Project Mohole and the now happily resolved financial irregularities of one of its grantees, the American Institute of Biological Sciences, has given it something of a reputation to live down on Capitol Hill. Both incidents were trivial compared to the bloopers that regularly turn up in the space- and defense-related research fields, but Congress clearly expects a higher order of competence and purity when it comes to higher education and fundamental research, and, in working out the science development program, NSF would rather go slow than go wrong.

Still to be worked out is the advisory apparatus for deciding who gets the grants. Since the program involves a venture into the political jungle of the hungry have-nots, a respected and disinterested advisory body is NSF's best protection against possible attacks by the losers. A number of possibilities are now under consideration, including the establishment of a new panel, or of a panel composed of members drawn from existing NSF advisory groups.

Although the House last year forbade NSF to undertake new programs, thus blocking plans that probably would have had the science development program now under way, it is apparent that NSF is proceeding with the informal blessings of its congressional appropriations subcommittees. The committees are yet to make public their verdicts on the budget, but NSF says that it has $3 million to devote to the program this year and expects to have $25 million for the coming fiscal year.

Various interpretations have been offered of last year's harsh treatment, but whatever accounts for it, it appears that Leland Haworth, who became NSF director last summer, has worked out a good relationship with the legislators who control NSF's financial fortunes.—D. S. GREENBERG

Daddario Committee: Hearings To Be Held on Overhead Support and Geographical Distribution

Now that the House Science and Astronautics Committee has completed its annual task of reviewing the space program, it plans to resume its inquiry into the general problems of science and government.

Under the chairmanship of Emilio Q. Daddario (D–Conn.) the committee's subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development has staked out two troublesome problems for hearings starting 5 May: (i) geographical distribution of federal research and development grants and contracts, and (ii) indirect costs and overhead for basic research grants and contracts. The hearings, which are expected to last about 5 days, will concentrate on testimony from representatives of federal agencies. Later hearings will bring in other witnesses.

The subcommittee has also announced the appointment of a Research Management Advisory Panel "which will act as a special task group for the committee in pointing the way to improve research management." The members are:

James B. Fisk, president, Bell Telephone Laboratories, Inc.

James M. Gavin, president, Arthur D. Little, Inc.

Samuel Lenher, vice president, E. I. duPont de Nemours & Company.

Wilfred J. McNeil, president, Grace Line, Inc.

Don Price, dean, Graduate School of Public Administration, Harvard.

C. Guy Suits, vice president and director of research, General Electric Corporation.

Jerome B. Wiesner, former White House science adviser, dean of science, M.I.T.

Michael Michaelis, formerly of the White House Office of Science and Technology and now Washington representative of Arthur D. Little, Inc., will serve as executive director.

Meanwhile, the Daddario committee's running mate in the field of congressional investigations of science, the Elliott committee (or the House Select Committee on Government Research), is proceeding with its ambitious studies of ten areas of federal involvement in research-related matters (*Science*, 14 Feb. 1964). No date has been set for additional hearings, but it is likely that some will be held before the committee's mandate comes up for renewal in December. For both Daddario's and Elliott's committees these are critical months. Eventually there is going to be some congressional sorting out of jurisdiction over government research programs, and the committee that can show the best stuff will be in a good position to claim the prize when the Elliott committee's renewal is before the House. Needless to say, there is no love lost between the two groups.

—D.S.G.

California: Junior Colleges Are the Key to State's Own Version of an Open Door Policy

One of the less obvious reasons why California's system of public higher education has been a pacesetter is that California is further along than most other states toward solving one of the touchiest problems of expansion—selective admissions.

In many state systems—in the Midwestern and Border states, for example—the question of whom to admit and whom to exclude from which public institutions of higher education is a difficult and politically volatile issue.

A familiar pattern followed by many states was to differentiate institutions by function. A university was estab-