

plication was rejected, it was advised, the subcommittee reports, that since it "is already a generally distinguished university in the Nation, with a high concentration of faculty talent, it would be inappropriate to use limited Health Science Advancement Award funds to further strengthen the departments of anatomy, physiology, and pathology in the medical school, and biological science departments of the school of the humanities and science in your institution. It was felt that support from this program would fail in its relative impact in stimulating excellence in biomedical training and research in the Nation, and for that reason the summary proposal was declined for further consideration.

"We trust," the NIH reply continued, "that your goal of strengthening the entire biological community at [name of institution deleted] may be realized, but we cannot support your application at this time."

Asserting that the procedures employed in starting the HSAA program were "irresponsible, unscientific, and contrary to the best interests of the academic community and the Government," the subcommittee report declares, "It is incomprehensible that NIH should be 'fumbling around,' as one of its own officials expressed it, when awarding substantial amounts of public money without first formulating a mature and defensible plan for a new program."

Contending that the HSAA program was brought into existence without proper legal authority (though this seems to be disputed by a ruling that the General Accounting Office furnished last June to the General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare), the Fountain report demands that NIH suspend further HSAA grants until legislative authorization is obtained.

The assault on the handling of the HSAA program is the most powerful in the subcommittee report, but other matters are also torn into with great force and great documentation from NIH's own files. For example, the report notes that last year NIH substituted a single cost-sharing grant, totaling \$22.6 million over 5 years, to encompass 41 grants and three contracts that had been awarded to the Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research. This comprehensive award was made as part of NIH's effort to disentangle itself from trying to administer a nationwide program of some 15,000 sep-

## NEWS IN BRIEF

● **VOYAGER PLANS UPSET:** The National Aeronautics and Space Administration last week gave up all hope of a 1973 Voyager mission to Mars when Congress failed to provide money specifically for this mission. House-Senate conferees on the space appropriations bill said NASA could seek its permission to take funds intended for other programs and "reprogram" them for Voyager. A NASA spokesman said, however, that a "1973 Voyager launch [for either an orbiter or lander mission] is definitely out." This means that the earliest Voyager-class mission to Mars would be at the 1975 launch opportunity. A Mars flyby mission with a Mariner spacecraft is planned for 1969. But a 1971 Mariner mission, to have included a probe of the Martian atmosphere, was an earlier victim of the budget-cutters. The chief reasons for denying funds for Voyager: Vietnam and the budget squeeze.

● **BRITISH BRAIN DRAIN:** Britain is faced with an accelerating emigration of young scientists, engineers, and technologists that constitutes a threat to its national interests, a special committee has reported to the British government. The report, entitled *Brain Drain*, stated that emigration nearly doubled between 1961, when 1900 engineers and 1300 scientists left Britain, and 1966 which saw 4200 engineers and 2000 scientists leave. Migration to North America quadrupled during that period. According to the report, most of the emigrants were in their late twenties and most were recent university graduates. The committee estimated that individual training had cost the nation between \$16,000 for a bachelor of science or engineering to \$45,000 for a Ph.D. in physics. To stem the drain of scientific manpower, the committee urged "the creation in this country of the sort of industrial and intellectual atmosphere which we believe to be the only effective solution to the brain drain." Specific recommendations advocated more challenging jobs in industry, higher pay, government financial incentives, and a better national appreciation of the role of the industrial scientist and engineer. The committee found that higher wages in the United States were only one of the incentives that attracted the talented young. Others included massive technical pro-

grams, such as space, and the higher status enjoyed by scientists in American society.

● **STUDENT DEMONSTRATIONS:** Recruiters from the Dow Chemical Company, a manufacturer of napalm, have been the target of demonstrations on several campuses throughout the nation in recent weeks. Students picketed Dow recruiters and staged a sit-in at the University of Illinois in Champaign; at the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, 71 persons were injured when police were called out to clear a sit-in staged against Dow interviewers. At Harvard, students held a Dow recruiter captive in a conference room for 9 hours. University of Minnesota students fasted in protest against Dow recruiters. At other colleges, students demonstrated against Navy recruiters and defense-connected university projects. Students imprisoned a Navy recruiter 4 hours in his car at Oberlin College in Ohio. Brooklyn College students also protested against Navy recruiters. Thirty students were arrested at Princeton University for blocking a campus military research center that is affiliated with the Institute for Defense Analyses. At the University of Michigan, the student newspaper urged the university to withdraw from a \$1.5-million classified counter insurgency project in Thailand.

● **AID FOR NEGRO COLLEGES:** Thirty colleges with predominantly Negro enrollments are eligible for \$1 million in matching funds from an incentive grant designed to stimulate their private fund raising efforts. Eligible colleges are members of the Cooperative College Development Program (CCDP), a project of the Phelps-Stokes Fund that is partially financed by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation. Sloan has allocated \$1 million to match contributions from the colleges' alumni on a dollar-for-dollar basis; contributions from within each college's state, \$1 for \$2. On that basis, each college is eligible for \$30,000. An additional \$100,000 is being reserved for incentive awards for the top four colleges in specific fund raising categories. A similar \$1 million grant was offered by the Sloan Foundation to CCDP members 2 years ago.