

younger investigator, many of whom do not have established national reputations.

Fields such as neurophysiology, neuroanatomy, neuropathology, neurology, and others are more established fields with many investigators in physiology departments as well as departments of neurology with established reputations and records of productivity. Even younger investigators often have the advantage coming from well established laboratories and working with well-known investigators.

As you know, it is inevitable that when priorities are assigned to grants, the established individuals with a proven record of productivity, and the individuals in an environment known to be productive will be assigned higher priority for projects of similar value.

When eye research projects compete with projects in more established areas for research funds, the greater previous development of the neurological fields discriminates against eye research and the developing eye researchers, and by preventing newer investigators and centers from developing tends to suppress vision research and keep it in the same underdeveloped state as in the past.

There is also less opportunity for the young investigator to work "on someone else's grant" in an established laboratory until he becomes sufficiently sophisticated to compete well.

By denying funds to the investigators, the difficulty of attracting younger men into their field which so badly needs new talent and expanded research activity becomes intense.

This is especially severe as the young clinician-investigator is faced on the one hand with considerable financial remuneration from practice alone and on the other hand with great uncertainty over whether, if he pursues an academic career, the funds his research needs may be abruptly terminated, and the many years of preliminary research effort may be wasted.

This competition is much more serious in our specialty in which relatively high incomes are compatible with a reasonable amount of leisure and makes the present great uncertainty over an academic career more than many dedicated investigators can bear.

There is a need, therefore, to provide opportunities for security in ophthalmic research so that an adequate body of researchers can be recruited and that work in the less established ophthalmic field cannot be discriminated against by the priority system.

The formation of a few large research centers helps this condition, but does not aid in the development of the many smaller, but excellent research departments which, in many instances, can make outstanding contributions.

These problems are not abstract problems, and the development of younger individuals, though important, is no more of a problem than that of maintaining the competent and established personnel in a situation of productivity in this field.

In my own laboratory, for example, an outstanding scientist and microbiologist was working with me and doing excellent research in the diagnosis and treatment of infectious eye diseases.

This man, a Ph.D. in microbiology, depended for his productive life on research funds. A senior scientist, approaching the age of 50 years, was faced with a situation in which it was difficult for a new, young department to guarantee his salary if some difficulty developed in the funding of a research grant.