is likely that the PHS would use its authority to make sure that the regional health planning and community development envisaged in the report actually came about, and presumably it would make evidence of sound cooperative plans a condition for its grants. How the PHS can take over this responsibility is one of the questions left dangling in the commission report, for it already has a reputation of being one of the most overtaxed and least creative of Washington agencies. The commission took note of this problem in a rather genteel fashion and made some cursory recommendations for reform, but an extensive overhaul will be needed if the ideas of the commission are not to get mired down in an ineffective and unassertive bureaucracy.

Even if they did not directly affect American medicine by substituting federal for local control, however, the commission's proposals might have an enormous cumulative impact. If all the proposals were enacted into laws, you might have, for example, a young man going through undergraduate and medical school on federal scholarships, getting post-graduate government grants for clinical experiments as well as for academic research, and ending up at a federal heart center or diagnostic station on a government salary. He would be a new kind of doctor, not too likely to share many of the AMA's present views on the sanctity of medical free enterprise. The implications for each individual may not be too significant. But for the structure of medicine as a whole, the change may be as great as that which has accompanied the growing dependence of the research community on the federal government.

Although the commission report represents many months of patient and hard work on the part of commission members and staff, to a large extent it also appears to represent ideas already held by an influential group of men and women that centers, to a surprising degree, on Mary Lasker. Mrs. Lasker, widow of the wealthy advertising executive and now president of the Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation, which supports medical research, has long been adept at using her political influence to promote an increased role for the government in medical affairs. She was chiefly responsible for pushing the idea of a presidential commission on heart disease, cancer, and stroke from its inception in the Kennedy administration to its fruition under Johnson, and although she herself was not a member of the commission, several individuals who were are known to be either her personal friends or longtime associates. Among these are Florence Mahoney, co-chairman with Mrs. Lasker of the National Committee Against Mental Illness; David Sarnoff, head of RCA; Emerson Foote, president of the advertising firm of McCann-Erickson, and a former associate of Albert Lasker; and several of the medical members of the panel, including chairman DeBakey, Sidney Farber, Irving Wright, and Howard Rusk. Thus, it is not surprising that in a published interview which appeared in a medical affairs magazine several weeks before the issuance of the report, Mrs. Lasker is quoted as saying, "A great deal more should be done clinically to make sure that . . . research gets delivered. There should be more clinical research centers, for example, to deal with the problem of strokes. Dr. DeBakey and others have now given us leads indicating that many strokes can be prevented or cured. I think there should be at least 20 stroke centers around the country, including the VA hospitals, where work is now being done." The article reported that Mrs. Lasker "also advocates setting up cardiac centers in all community hospitals to speed research advances to the people who need them."

What now remains to be seen is whether the influence of the "Laskerites" in creating the commission and shaping its conclusions will extend also to persuading the President to seek its implementation. Johnson's intentions on this score are not yet clear, but his desire to hold the budgetary line and his recently announced desire to have a harmonious administration both work against the likelihood that he will initiate a giant health campaign that is not only costly but certain to be controversial. On the other hand, Johnson is thought to be in sympathy with the main lines of reasoning in the report, and it is thought likely that he will submit at least the more modest of its proposals to Congress, saving the others for some hoped-for moment when cutbacks in defense spending will provide more fiscal flexibility for domestic experimentation. Another possibility, thought by some government officials to be equally likely, is that he will draw up a splashy health package, perhaps fusing the commission recommendations with reports from two health task forces currently at work, and—as he did with his poverty program—permit the Congress to do the hatcheting that is routine on major new programs.

What congressional reaction will be is still too early to predict. The good shepherds of medical affairs—Lister Hill (D–Ala.) in the Senate and John Fogarty (D–R.I.) in the House—are almost certain to be favorably inclined, not only because of their enthusiastic support of nearly every advance in federal responsibility for medical problems but because of their long and fruitful associations with many of the members of the commission, as well as with Mrs. Lasker. It is equally certain, however, that cries of "socialism" will arise from other quarters, and the battle is likely to be a severe one. A hint of the controversy that may be forthcoming is to be found in the fact that Hugh Hussey, director of scientific activities for the American Medical Association, resigned from the commission last summer, reportedly on the ground that he foresaw a conflict of the commission's recommendations with AMA policy. The AMA has declined to make any official comment on the report until it becomes embodied in actual legislative proposals.—ELINOR LANGER

Erratum: Theodosius Dobzhansky, one of the winners of the 1964 National Medal of Science (11 Dec., p. 1445), was erroneously listed as professor at the California Institute of Technology. He is a professor at the Rockefeller Institute, in New York City.

Erratum: In the report "Saturation deficit of the mesophyll evaporating surfaces in a desert halophyte" by P. C. Whiteman and D. Koller (4 Dec., p. 1320), the heading to column 3 of Table 1 should read "Photosynthesis (10^{-2} mg CO_2 min^{-1} g^{-1} leaf dry wt.)."

Erratum: In the article "Man's first encounters with metallurgy" by T. A. Wertime (4 Dec., p. 1257) the interpretation of the kinds of shading used in Table 1 was printed in reverse order. The correct order is (i) Bronze. (ii) Smelting and closed mold casting of copper from ores. (iii) Melting and open mold casting of native copper. (iv) Hammering and annealing of native copper. The shading itself is correct. In Table 3, Tell Asmar was erroneously noted as being in Iran; it is located in Iraq.

Erratum: In T. H. Hamilton's reply to Dawdy's comment-report (20 Nov., p. 1075), the second sentence of paragraph 2) should have read: "That 'linear' line should be labeled $\log \gamma = 1.456$ . . ." instead of "$_{\gamma} = 0.1456$ . . . ."

Erratum: In the article "The hydrated electron" by E. J. Hart (2 Oct., p. 19), reaction 11 (column 1, page 20) was omitted. The ratio for the rates of reactions 9 and 10 was printed twice: correctly in place of reaction 11 and incorrectly in its proper place. The correct version follows:

The ratio for the rates of reactions 9 and 10,

$$k_{e^-_{aq}+H_2O_2}/k_{H+H_2O_2} = 500,$$

attests to the high reactivity of e^-_{aq} compared to H atoms in this reaction.

Among other reactions showing this difference in reactivity is the effect of metal ions such as Fe^{3+} and Cu^{++} on the hydrogen yield in irradiated solutions of methanol (*3*). Hydrogen formed by reaction

$$H + CH_3OH \rightarrow H_2 + \dot{C}H_2OH \qquad (11)$$

is decreased by the addition of Fe^{3+} or Cu^{++} because the reaction

$$e^-_{aq} + Fe^{3+} \rightarrow Fe^{++} \qquad (12)$$

interferes with H-atom-producing reaction 4.