COPY

July 17th, 1964

Dear Jim:

Many thanks for the material you sent me.

The point I wanted to make in the talk we had at lunch was that the Senate Appropriations Committee Report covering fiscal 1964 funds to NIH contained this statement:

> "The committee recognizes that a sizable body of fundamental research information is now permitting selection of certain problems for intensive and extensive exploitation, such as chemical and virus causation of cancer. To move ahead expeditiously in such areas will require resources not now in existance, particularly moderately large-scale facilities with special air handling for work with hazardous viruses and chemicals. Industrial-type facilities and operations, including applied and developmental research capabilities, will be required for full exploitation of research leads. The creation of this capability will necessitate long-term commitments to those who are able and willing to undertake this type of research. All moneys allocated in this contractual program shall be spent only after review and approval by the National Cancer Advisory Council."

In actuality, the Council is not provided with any opportunity to review and approve the contracts, nor has the Council been asked to review and approve contract grants since I have been on the Council the last two years. This is in direct conflict with the expressed direction of the Senate report and with the remarks of Congressman Fogarty on the House floor September 26th of last year, at the time the House accepted the Conference Report:

> "The second point I wanted to mention is that it is my understanding that research contracts, of which the National Cancer Institute finances a great many, are not cleared through the same channels of advisory groups as are grant applications. After discussing this with several people with considerable professional competence in this field, I am of the opinion that the same procedure should be employed for both."

According to Public Law 655, enacted by the 80th Congress, incorporating the National Cancer and Heart Institutes under Title IV, the functions of the Council are "to review applications from any university, hospital, laboratory, or other institution or agency, whether public or private, or from individuals, for grants-in-aid for research projects relating to cancer, and certify to the Surgeon General its approval of grants-in-aid in the cases of such projects which show promise of making valuable contributions to human knowledge with respect to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of cancer."

The Council members'information is totally inadequate unless they do have the opportunity to review and approve contracts, especially as the contract program is such a large part of the total effort.

As you noticed, no up-dated list of contracts wasprovided for review and approval either at the March or the June meetings of the Council, nor has the Council been given the opportunity to review and approve contract grants during the last two years. I think this goes contrary to the expressed wish and understanding of the Congress about the duties of the Council and makes it impossible for the Council to have a comprehensive view of what the total research picture is in this field.

With many thanks and all best wishes,

Yours,

Dr. James Shannon, Director
National Institutes of Health
Bethesda 14, Maryland