The frequent occurrence of mud deposits around the advancing margins of modern deltas and the very infrequent occurrence of ancient shales considered to be deltaic suggests that some or many ancient deltas may not have been recognized. The characteristics found in the sediments around the margin of the Mississippi and other great deltas should prove helpful in recognizing such deposits among rock formations. Similarly, the various types of calcareous deposits found on the shelves and banks of the world are providing means for determining the conditions under which the limestones now on the continents were deposited.

In concluding, it should be emphasized that the study of recent sediments can at best provide some useful clues which help us to interpret the past. The thoroughgoing field examination of stratigraphic relationships will still be the most important method available to the geologist.

References and Notes

1. Among the books published as a result of these studies are P. D. Trask, *The Origin and Environment of Source Sediments of Petroleum* (Gulf, Houston, Texas, 1932); ———, Ed., *Recent Marine Sediments, a Symposium* (Am. Assoc. Petrol. Geologists, Tulsa, Okla., 1939).
2. Among the results published to date are F. P. Shepard and D. G. Moore, *Soc. Econ. Paleontol. and Mineral. Spec. Publ. No. 3* (1955), pp. 78–96; P. C. Scruton, *Bull. Am. Assoc. Petrol. Geologists* 40, 2864 (1956); R. H. Parker, *ibid.* 40, 295 (1956); F. B. Phleger, *Cushman Foundation for Foraminiferal Research* (1956), vol. 7, part 4, pp. 106–151; F. P. Shepard, *Bull. Am. Assoc. Petrol. Geologists* 40, 2537 (1956).
3. Tj. H. van Andel and H. Postma, *Reports of the Orinoco Shelf Expedition* (1954), vol. 1; D. J. G. Nota, *Reports of the Orinoco Shelf Expedition* (1958), vol. 2; G. W. Koldewijn, *Reports of the Orinoco Shelf Expedition* (1958), vol. 3.
4. K. O. Emery, J. I. Tracey, Jr., H. S. Ladd, *U.S. Geol. Survey Profess. Paper No. 260-A* (1954).
5. K. O. Emery and S. C. Rittenberg, *Bull. Am. Assoc. Petrol. Geologists* 36, 735 (1952); W. L. Orr, K. O. Emery, J. R. Grady, *ibid.* 42, 925 (1958).
6. N. M. Strakhov *et al.*, *The Formation of Sediments in Recent Basins* (Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., Moscow, 1954).
7. *Geol. Rundschau* 47, 24 (1958).
8. B. Kullenberg, *Svenska Hydrograf.-Biol. Komm. Skrifter, Ny Ser. Biol.* 1, 1 (1947).
9. Illustrated in H. S. Ladd, *Science* 129, 69 (1959), Fig. 4.
10. The term *scuba* is coined from the words "self-contained underwater breathing apparatus."
11. J. Y. Cousteau, *National Geographic* 113, 373 (1958).
12. N. W. Bass, *Bull. Am. Assoc. Petrol. Geologists* 18, 1313 (1934).
13. R. H. Nanz, Jr., *ibid.* 38, 96 (1954); J. R. Curray, *J. Geol.* 64, 117 (1956).
14. E. D. McKee, *J. Geol.* 47, 64 (1939).
15. M. A. Beal and F. P. Shepard, *J. Sediment. Petrol.* 26, 49 (1956).
16. P. H. Kuenen and C. I. Migliorini, *J. Geol.* 58, 91 (1950).
17. K. Terzaghi, *Proc. Texas Conf. on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering, 8th Conf.* (1956).
18. D. B. Ericson, M. Ewing, B. C. Heezen, G. Wollin, *Geol. Soc. Am. Spec. Paper No. 62* (1955).
19. Other features such as "fluting" and "involute structures," found in ancient sandstones, which are supposed to be of turbidity-current origin, have not yet been recognized in the sea-floor sediments.
20. Silt is usually defined by geologists as sedimentary rock in which the grains range from 1/16 to 1/256 millimeter in diameter; clay, as that composed of finer particles, including colloidal material.
21. F. P. Shepard, *Bull. Geol. Soc. Am.* 66, 1489 (1955).
22. L. P. Smirnow, in *Habitat of Oil, a Symposium* (Am. Assoc. Petrol. Geologists, Tulsa, Okla., 1958), p. 982; a compilation from many sources.
23. K. M. Strøm, in *Recent Marine Sediments* (Am. Assoc. Petrol. Geologists, Tulsa, Okla., 1939), p. 356.
24. P. H. Kuenen, *The Snellius Expedition* (1942), vol. 5, part 3, p. 28.
25. C. O. Dunbar and J. Rodgers, *Principles of Stratigraphy* (Wiley, New York, 1957), p. 205.
26. L. R. David, *Geol. Soc. Am. Spec. Paper No. 43* (1943).
27. N. D. Newell, *Bull. Am. Museum Natl. Hist.* 109 (1956).
28. K. O. Emery, J. I. Tracey, Jr., H. S. Ladd, *U.S. Geol. Survey Profess. Paper No. 260-A* (1954)
29. C. O. Dunbar and J. Rodgers, *Principles of Stratigraphy* (Wiley, New York, 1957), p. 274.
30. M. N. Bramlette, *Bull. Geol. Soc. Am.* 69, 121 (1958).
31. L. V. Illing, *Bull. Am. Assoc. Petrol. Geologists* 38, 1 (1954).
32. ———, *ibid.* 38, 35 (1954).
33. H. R. Gould and R. H. Stewart, *Soc. Econ. Paleontol. and Mineral. Spec. Publ. No. 3* (1956), p. 2.
34. P. H. Kuenen, *J. Geol.* 61, 363 (1953).
35. M. Ewing, D. B. Ericson, B. C. Heezen, in *Habitat of Oil, a Symposium* (Am. Assoc. Petrol. Geologists, Tulsa, Okla., 1958), Fig. 27.
36. M. L. Natland and P. H. Kuenen, *Soc. Econ. Paleontol. and Mineral. Spec. Publ. No. 2* (1951), p. 76.
37. O. Renz, R. Lakeman, E. Van der Meulen, *Bull. Am. Assoc. Petrol. Geologists* 39, 2053 (1955).
38. K. Terzaghi, *Proc. Texas Conf. on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering, 8th Conf.* (1956).
39. B. C. Heezen and M. Ewing, *Am. J. Sci.* 250, 849 (1952).
40. M. N Bramlette and W. H. Bradley, *U.S. Geol. Survey Profess. Paper No. 196* (1942), part 1.

News of Science

Commission To Study Proposed Department of Science Asked

Disregarding the recommendations of administration spokesmen, a Senate committee has called for a Hoover-type commission to study the problems connected with the establishment of a Department of Science and Technology. In its report, the Committee on Government Operations, chaired by Hubert Humphrey (D-Minn.), also pointed out that such a commission is an "essential first step" if the Congress is eventually to gain access to the information it needs to legislate on scientific matters. The committee report, which is unusually pointed in its criticism of administration practices, represents a new move in a growing conflict between Congress and the Executive over access to scientific information.

Behind the Senate move is the fact that the Congress has no legal access to information and individuals in such executive agencies as the Science Advisory Committee and the Federal Council for Science and Technology. These agencies, which are staffed by many of the leading scientists and engineers of the country, enjoy "executive privilege" and do not have to respond to congressional calls for testimony. On a number of occasions, officials of these executive agencies—for example, James Killian, former presidential science adviser—have refused to testify. This practice has so angered many members of Congress that they have seized on the Department of Science bill as a means of solving their problem. If a Department of Science is created, its officials, like those of the other federal departments, will have ample reason, because of the legal and fiscal set-up, to be responsive to Congress, which controls the purse strings.

The idea of establishing a commission to study proposals for a Department of Science came up early in congressional hearings on a bill (S. 676) to create such a department. The suggestion was first advanced by spokesmen for the Engineers Joint Council and was later summed up by Wallace Brode, Science Advisor to the Secretary of State and retiring president of the AAAS Brode said, "Two major decisions are required, one as to whether a Department of Science should be formed, and,

second, as to the composition of such a Department. A Commission of governmental and nongovernmental experts in science and nonscience areas, similar to a Hoover Commission . . . , might consider these problems, and especially the second phase."

This proposal, which had the support of almost all of the witnesses at the hearings (even that of some who were opposed to establishment of a Department of Science) was taken up by the Senate committee and drafted into a bill. Those who did not support the proposal were the witnesses for the administration who had been opposed to the Department of Science bill. The principal administration spokesmen were Alan T. Waterman, director of the National Science Foundation, and William F. Finan, assistant director for management and organization at the Bureau of the Budget. Waterman suggested that such a commission would be premature in view of the fact that insufficient time has passed to allow full evaluation of new government agencies such as the Federal Council for Science and Technology. He said that there should be a trial period of 1 or 2 years for assessment of the work of such agencies before any study preliminary to setting up a new department is made. The Budget Bureau's spokesman offered two main points in support of his opposition. First, he stated that any new department should be established around an appropriate "major purpose." "Science and technology," he said, "cannot be said to constitute a major purpose of Government." The second objection was based on the Bureau's belief that setting up a commission would be a waste of time and money because the case for a new department would prove to be untenable.

These views did not sit well with the committee. "The inevitable conclusion," the committee report states, "was reached that it is the desire of the present administration to continue to center within the Executive Office of the President all control over civilian science operations." The report ended with a recommendation that a Department of Science Commission, as called for in the committee bill, be established.

The chances that such a commission will be established are much better than they normally would be, according to observers, because of the supplemental issue of congressional access to Executive information and personnel. If Senator Humphrey, who is known for his zeal, succeeds in alerting his fellow members to the issue, the bill calling for a Department of Science Commission may be approved by both House and Senate before the 86th Congress adjourns next year.

Radiation Study Delayed

A government study on radiation protection, described as "well under way" on 3 April, has yet to be completed. Authorities working on the study, which is designed to determine how the government can best be organized to monitor fallout, have set no date for its completion. Participating in the study, which President Eisenhower ordered, are three top governmental officials—John A. McCone, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission; Arthur Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and Maurice Stans, director of the Budget Bureau.

One of the principal issues to be decided is whether the major responsibility for radiation protection should continue to be exercised by the Atomic Energy Commission or be transferred to the Public Health Service, a unit of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. When the study is completed, Stans, who is directing it, will submit recommendations to the President for organizing the governmental activities for radiological protection.

New AAAS Newsletter

The first issue of a new AAAS bulletin, titled *Science Education News,* was distributed last month to members of the scientific community. Publication of the six-page bulletin, which is to be issued quarterly, is an activity of the Science Teaching Improvement Program conducted by the association with the support of the Carnegie Corporation.

Charlotte Colton of Washington, formerly associated with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, in the capacity of science editor, has been appointed editor of the newsletter. She will be assisted by an advisory board of contributing editors, representative of various scientific societies. It is the present plan of the advisory board to devote each quarterly issue to a special phase of science education. This first issue, however, is more general in nature and includes editorial statements written by the contributing editors on the needs in science education and the reasons why their respective societies are involved in extensive education programs. The fall issue probably will be devoted to teacher-education programs. Other topics suggested for later issues are the use of moving pictures and television, curriculum studies, and visiting-lectureship programs. In addition to key articles on a particular theme, each issue will contain brief announcements and notices on science education.

Immortals of Science

Final selection of the world's 25 "Immortals of Science," whose names will be permanently inscribed on the Science Wall of Honor at the University of Bridgeport, has been announced by James H. Halsey, president of the university. The names of the 25 scientists selected will be permanently inscribed on the limestone walls of the university's $1,400,000 Charles A. Dana Hall of Science, now under construction. The building will be completed in January of 1960.

Selected as "Immortals of Science" and listed in chronological order are: Hippocrates, 460–357 B.C.; Aristotle, 384–322 B.C.; Euclid, 330–275 B.C.; Archimedes, 287–212 B.C.; Leonardo da Vinci, A.D. 1452–1519; Nicolaus Copernicus, 1473–1543; Galileo Galilei, 1564–1642; Johannes Kepler, 1571–1630; Sir William Harvey, 1578–1657; René Descartes, 1596–1650; Robert Boyle, 1627–1691; Sir Isaac Newton, 1642–1727; Joseph Priestley, 1733–1804; Antoine Laurent Lavoisier, 1743–1794; Karl Friedrich Gauss, 1777–1855; and Michael Faraday, 1791–1867.

Also, Charles R. Darwin, 1809–1882; Gregor J. Mendel, 1822–1884; Louis Pasteur, 1822–1895; James C. Maxwell, 1831–1879; Robert Koch, 1843–1910; Wilhelm K. Roentgen, 1845–1923; Max K. E. L. Planck, 1858–1947; Marja Sklodowska Curie, 1867–1934; and Lord Ernest Rutherford, 1871–1937.

Newton polled the most votes in the world-wide election; he was followed closely by Pasteur. Galilei, Darwin, M. Curie, Archimedes, Copernicus, Faraday, Mendel, and Aristotle complete the list of the ten scientists who received the most ballots.

The rules for making nominations for the Science Wall of Honor specified that recognition in all instances would be limited to accomplishments in the fields of natural science—not in philosophy, history, or the social sciences. The scientist must have made a fundamental discov-