

and encourage their participation on peer review committees. This may be Waxman's compromise to appease industry on his stance concerning the Small Business Innovation Research Act. Waxman has asked that NIH be exempted from the "set-aside" for small businesses (*Science*, 26 March, p. 1598).

The authorization legislation would put into statute a requirement that NIH establish a process for responding to tips about scientific fraud and violations of patient's rights during experimentation. NIH officials say that such a mechanism is already in place.

The bill would establish an assistant director for prevention at NIH and in each of the 11 institutes. The proposal is somewhat similar to a recent suggestion by the Health and Human Services Department (HHS) that an office of preventive health applications research be set up at the departmental level.

The bill also directs HHS to fund a study by the Institute of Medicine or another group on the effects of commercialization on biomedical research.—**Marjorie Sun**

Animal Lovers Might Monitor Labs

According to a small item in the President's proposed fiscal year 1983 budget, local animal lovers would replace federal inspectors who now monitor the welfare of animals, including those used in university research. This example of "new federalism," however, has met with strong protest from the biomedical community and humane societies.

The Administration's budget virtually eliminates the Agriculture Department's animal inspection program, slashing it from \$4.9 million to \$1.5 million. The budget document says that enforcement would be turned over to "states, industry groups, humane societies, and individuals." USDA inspectors currently oversee 1200 research labs, zoos, breeders, and companies that transport animals.

But there is a problem in the President's plan to transfer oversight responsibility to the state and local level. Under current federal statute, only Ag-

riculture Department inspectors have the right to enter animal facilities. If the federal inspection program is phased out, Congress would then need to pass legislation that designates this authority to states; otherwise, animal welfare would go unmonitored.

The Humane Society of the United States calls the cut "an unprecedented assault on animal protection." The society and members of the biomedical community fear that the elimination of federal inspections will lead to a crazy quilt of state and local legislation. They cite the fact that only two states, Pennsylvania and Tennessee, currently license research laboratories. This is evidence, they contend, that states are not that interested in spending money in animal protection. "The best way to achieve uniformity in



inspection standards is on a national level," says Andrew Ramon, director of laboratory animal welfare at the Humane Society.

Scientists are worried that laymen from activist animal welfare groups could police their laboratories. All federal inspectors are veterinarians. Humane societies "have a point of view, but not necessarily the expertise or resources" to judge laboratory conditions, says a spokeswoman for the Association of American Medical Colleges.

Ramon concedes that local groups do not now have the knowledge or money to set up an inspection program, but he adds that expertise eventually could be developed if the budget is cut. He emphasized that the society still strongly prefers that the federal program be restored.

The budget of the inspection service was to be discussed at appropriations hearings in late March.

—**Marjorie Sun**

Yale Refuses to Accept NSF Grant

In a move believed to be without direct precedent, Yale University has declined to accept a \$30,000 grant awarded by the National Science Foundation (NSF) to a mathematics professor at the university. Yale officials said they could not accept the grant because the professor, Serge Lang, has refused to file detailed reports on how he spends his professional time (*Science*, 15 January, p. 274). These so-called effort reports are required by federal regulations, known as Circular A-21, as proof that grant money is spent on legitimate activities.

Lang's refusal to sign effort reports put Yale authorities in a difficult position. Because the university is legally responsible for grants awarded to Yale researchers, it must ensure that the researchers comply with the A-21 regulations. Failure to do so could prompt the federal government to deny the grant money, and the university itself would be out of pocket.

Lang has long been a dogged critic of the A-21 rules, and he says he refuses to sign effort reports because they represent unwarranted bureaucratic intrusion into academic research. His antipathy toward the regulations is shared by, among others, Yale president A. Bartlett Giamatti, who has spoken out against them on several occasions. Lang's actions thus received some sympathy within the Yale administration, but in the end Yale officials had no choice but to refuse the grant unless Lang agreed to sign effort reports. It took a full 6 weeks for Yale officials to decide not to accept the grant after NSF had approved it.

For his part, Lang says he feels no resentment toward the university administration, although he admits that it was not the outcome he had originally expected. "I thought that everybody would back down, right down the line," he says.—**Colin Norman**