suggested that it is imperative to get the politicking out of scientific budget-making. But why the effect of a single appropriation would not be to merely change the theater of operation from the relative openness of the Congress to the inner sanctums of the Administration is not immediately apparent. Those scientists who know about the HEW proposal and have commented on it to *Science* feel safer with Congress.

There is no question that the idea of a single NIH appropriation has a ring of order and simplicity that is appealing to many. The dean of the Harvard Medical School has suggested that the institutes become one. In a May address to the elite Association of American Physicians, which was reprinted in the 16 August *New England Journal of Medicine*, Robert H. Ebert said, "In my view, there should be one National Institute of Health, which would support on a permanent basis both basic biologic research and clinical research. I suspect that such a reorganization would create a far healthier research environment than we have now."

Some of Ebert's colleagues have said recently that they wish he had kept still. Ebert, for his part, is not surprised that some people, who are used to the categorical or disease-by-disease approach to biomedical research, find the idea of centralization discomfiting.

Ebert, who had no knowledge of the Administration's budgetary proposal until informed of it by *Science*, says—without endorsing or rejecting it—that he thinks it certainly worth consideration. "If there is to be appropriate planning for biomedical research, it can't be done well unless it is done with a single budget. One must come to grips with this as a general policy matter," he said, indicating that policy should be made apart from one's view of particular individuals in any Administration.

The Administration's proposal to consolidate the NIH budget is part of a broader effort to reorganize HEW and make it more manageable. Thus, in addition to diffusing pressures for expanded research budgets, the consolidation would provide what some HEW officials see as "administrative flexibility." That is, with fewer dollars earmarked by Congress for specific programs, there would be greater leeway for deciding where money is needed most.

Again, the idea has a certain appeal, especially in view of the existing feeling that red tape is needlessly confining. But, again, it comes down to a matter of *who* exercises the promised flexibility when people express feelings on the subject. There is no reason to believe that either NIH officials or members of Congress really want to place the authority in the office of the assistant secretary for health, which is where it would probably go. On the other hand, if the scientific community believed that *it* would be able to divide the pie according to its own priorities, its reaction would doubtless be more favorable.

The present situation raises more general issues. Does it really matter whether or not the NIH budget is consolidated? "Yes," says one man who is involved. "It matters, not because some of us have doubts about the decisions this present Administration would make, but because it represents a subtle nibbling away at the independence of the scientist from the politicians in power, whoever they are. Gradually, the NIH is being dismantled and its strength diminished. That matters, and we must not let it creep up on us."

At issue too is what the relationship between the Executive branch of the government and the Congress should be. To be sure, since the question of the single appropriation has yet to be openly debated, it is not possible to pin down various points of view. Nevertheless, at this stage, one senses that a good deal of existing opposition to the scheme is founded on a distrust of this Administration. The presumption, which may have little foundation in fact, is that, with some other administration, things would be different, safer, less threatening.

What emerges is a question of whether any administration should assume almost total control of biomedical budget-making or whether it is best to leave things in the hands of Congress, chaotic and subject to pressures though they be. As one former official put it, "The burden of proof should be on the Administration to prove that their change would be better for biomedical research, not just for administrators." But then, again, no one seems to be very satisfied with things as they are and it is difficult, to say the least, to find anyone who believes that, today, biomedical research is as healthy as it might be.

—BARBARA J. CULLITON

RECENT DEATHS

Armand R. Collett, 78; professor emeritus of chemistry, West Virginia University; 17 June.

Harold S. Diehl, 81; former dean of medical sciences, University of Minnesota; 27 June.

Henry E. Garrett, 79; professor emeritus of psychology, Columbia University; 26 June.

David M. Harrison, 71; professor emeritus of economics, Ohio State University; 17 June.

Roger A. Harvey, 63; chairman, radiology department, University of Illinois College of Medicine; 17 July.

Arthur G. Hills, 58; professor of medicine, Ohio State University; 18 June.

G. Dabney Kerr, 80; former chairman, radiology department, University of Iowa; 3 July.

Bernard Levy, 47; professor of pharmacology, University of Texas Medical Branch; 31 March.

Ralph E. Lincoln, 61; chief, Developmental Research Laboratory, Frederick Cancer Research Center; 25 May.

Aleksei A. Lyapunov, 61; head, cybernetics department, Mathematics Institute, Siberian Science Center; 23 June.

Friedrich F. Nord, 83; professor emeritus of chemistry, Fordham University; 12 July.

Maurice Pardé, 79; professor of hydrology, University of Grenoble; 14 June.

Robert L. Platzman, 54; professor of chemistry and physics, University of Chicago; 2 July.

James S. Rising, 70; professor emeritus of engineering graphics, Iowa State University; 9 June.

Neill A. Rosser, 57; professor of education, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; 5 June.

Bunyan Y. Tyner, 90; professor emeritus of education, Meredith College; 22 June.

Ernest H. Wiegand, 86; professor emeritus of food science and technology, Oregon State University; 30 April.

Erratum: In an article on radioactive waste spills at Hanford, Washington (*Science*, 24 August, p. 730), an estimate that waste storage tanks might remain serviceable for 500 years was erroneously attributed to Herbert M. Parker, then manager of the Hanford Laboratories. The estimate should have been attributed to R. E. Tomlinson, then manager of advance process development at Hanford, who, with Parker, contributed to a formal statement on waste disposal practices prepared for the congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in 1959.