erican Federation for Clinical Research (AFCR). Congress has traditionally upped the president's request, but this year, in view of the deficit-cutting frenzy, that can't be taken for granted.

Although Congress may change many of the numbers, and the figures for the Department of Energy and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration have not yet been released or leaked, the NSF and NIH requests provide a clear indication of some of the new administration's basic research priorities.

At NSF, some of the highlights include:

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Selected Categories	1993 Appropriated	1993 Rev. (including supplemental)	1994 Request	Percent Change (93 rev.-94)
Research and Related Activities				
Biological Science	271	292	312	7
Computer and Info. Science	215	263	296	12.6
Engineering	261	317	323	8.8
Geosciences	402	421	448	6.5
Mathematical and Physical Sci.	620	660	718	8.8
Social, Behavioral, Economic Sci.	90	99	107	8.0
Education and Human Resources	482	488	556	14.1
U.S. Polar Research	49	51	55	7.8
Academic Research Facilities	50	55	55	0
Total NSF *	**2734**	**2940**	**3180**	**8.2**

* Totals include selected categories and other, nonresearch programs not listed

■ **Research grants.** NSF intends to increase the number of grants it awards next year by 1200 to a total of 22,300. But Massey told Congress last week that NSF intended to place first priority on increasing the size of the grants now awarded—$50,000, on average—rather than putting all the increase into new grants.

■ **Computing and networks.** A $44 million increase would boost NSF's High-Performance Computing and Communications program to $305 million, to continue work on what is intended to lead to Vice President Al Gore's pet plan to create a national data superhighway.

■ **Ecological data analysis.** NSF's budget request includes $6.5 million for new environmental research, including $1 million to start the National Center for Ecological Synthesis and Analysis. NSF planned to start the center this year, but Congress failed to appropriate the funds.

At NIH officials will not comment on most specifics until the request is publicly released. But some broad outlines are already clear:

■ **Strategic plan.** Outgoing NIH Director Bernadine Healy's strategic plan is still not out, but some of its impact is already being felt. The 1994 NIH request is divided into three areas—Critical Technologies, Intellectual Capital, and Critical Health Needs—that are directly taken from the plan. Although Healy's fundamental message—NIH needs more money, and the plan is supposed to explain why—was apparently missed, the rhetoric, at least, seems to have caught on. Of the three areas, Critical Technologies does best, with a 3.7% proposed increase.

■ **Women's and minority health.** Most of the 23% ($45 million) increase for the NIH Director's Office is earmarked for special congressionally mandated programs in these two areas, including a massive series of clinical trials and studies that will look at diseases and disease prevention in some 160,000 women over the next 15 years.

■ **Breast cancer.** The National Cancer Institute appears to get a relatively healthy 8.1% ($181 million) increase, but all of that and more can be accounted for by the proposed transfer of a $200 million breast cancer program from the Army to NIH.

■ **Human Genome Project.** Most of the requested 23% ($29 million) increase for NIH's Center for Human Genome Research would go to setting up an intramural genome research program to be headed by Francis Collins, the center's new director.

Both these budget requests could use some championing from on high in the months to come, but acting directors will be running both NSF and NIH during the budget dealing this fall. Massey will be gone next week and Healy has said she will return to the Cleveland Clinic by the end of June. NSF is at least favored by the White House for its role in Clinton's technology policy, but NIH will need all the friends it can get.

–Christopher Anderson

DEFENSE R&D

The Greening of the National Labs

The big three weapons laboratories—Los Alamos, Livermore, and Sandia—could face dramatic changes in the way they do business if a proposal made by Representative George Brown (D–CA) is enacted. Brown, chairman of the House Science Committee, introduced a bill last week that would "consolidate" nuclear weapons R&D from several labs (without saying at which sites or how). Brown also wants to shift the focus of the labs' work more toward civilian projects, and the bill would involve the White House more directly in managing their research agenda.

The Brown bill (HR 1432), which has won the backing of Representatives Marilyn Lloyd (D–TN), Tim Valentine (D–NC), Rick Boucher (D–VA), and Ron Wyden (R–OR), asks the secretary of energy to make a comprehensive study of current lab activities and submit a plan to "redirect one or more of these labs to civilian missions" by 31 March 1994. Brown and other members of Congress had considered turning one of the nuclear weapons centers into a "green lab," that is, dedicating it to R&D on environmental technology. That idea seems to have been set aside in favor of a more general formula that would be administered by a new Federal Laboratory Mission Evaluation and Coordination Committee, reporting to the president's science adviser. This watchdog panel, according to the bill, would seek to improve "the efficiency and effectiveness" of all the federal laboratories and ensure that "between 10% and 20%" of their budgets "are devoted to collaborative efforts with industry and state and local governments."

Administratively, the bill would also create some new positions at the Department of Energy (DOE), including an undersecretary for science and technology who would manage the labs.

A counterpart to this legislation (S473) has already been introduced on the other side of the Capitol by Senators Bennett Johnston (D–LA), Jeff Bingaman (D–NM), and Pete Domenici (R–NM). Staffers who helped draft both bills say the Senate version is more "expansive," giving the labs a vague mandate to develop new projects with industry, but it doesn't call for consolidation of nuclear weapons work. Both bills seek to encourage sharing of government research with private industry, but, as one House staffer notes, the House version also aims to install a system to evaluate the success or failure of these efforts by setting up the coordinating committee.

Authors of both the House and Senate bills claim that their version has the support of the Clinton Administration. Although DOE Secretary Hazel O'Leary has not endorsed either bill, she testified this week that she "strongly supports the goals" of both. Staffers for both Brown and Johnston expect to have final bills ready for a floor vote in each chamber in a matter of weeks.

–Eliot Marshall