

English's administrative performance, it is generally agreed that English had too clear a Shriver-Kennedy connection and that the Administration wanted its own man in charge of the agency which administers many of the big and politically visible community health programs.

Within HEW, criticism of Administration hiring and firing practices is somewhat muted these days because the Administration's latest choices are generally seen as strong ones.

The new HEW Secretary-designate, Elliott L. Richardson, is widely regarded as potentially the most effective HEW chief in years. Vernon E. Wilson, executive director of health affairs at the University of Missouri, who was picked to succeed English, and Bertram S. Brown, Yolles's former deputy at NIMH who will become his successor, are given high marks by former officials of HEW in the Johnson and Kennedy years who tend to be stern judges.

An earlier Nixon appointee, Charles C. Edwards, chosen to lead a rescue operation at the Food and Drug Administration, reportedly is achieving encouraging results at FDA, which in recent years has been a HEW disaster area.

Mixed feelings also describe the attitudes toward the campaign to evaluate programs and reduce delay and inefficiency in HEW operations by applying modern management practices. Spearheading this effort, which has solid Presidential support, is Deputy Undersecretary Frederick V. Malek, a West Point graduate, Vietnam veteran, and a man who made his million in business in his early thirties and has transferred his considerable energies and zeal for rational management to

HEW. So far, Malek and his men have not wrought a managerial revolution at HEW, but they have caused an undeniable impact and considerable anxiety.

One career administrator who is by and large sympathetic to the Malek campaign says that Malek has had teams in the field talking to grant recipients and to people getting services. "They are taking a hard look at how people manage programs and are seriously evaluating them. Any time you begin to look at how well an agency is administering programs, people get upset."

The immediate emphasis of Malek and Co. is to press forward on decentralization to make the point of decision closer to the point of service (*Science*, 10 April 1970). HEW officials acknowledge that there is suspicion both among the ranks of HEW staff and outside the agency that the campaign for better management covers an intention to "foul up substantive programs," as one official put it.

Morale at HEW probably suffers less from a fear of managerial Machiavellianism, however, than from uncertainty about Administration long-term aims. The changes in HEW and in the White House have revealed much more about style than about policy. And it would be fair to say that at HEW, the Nixon Administration is suffering not from a credibility gap but from a policy gap and a communications gap.

When President Nixon introduced Egeberg to the press last year, for example, the President spoke of a crisis in health care and of the urgency of meeting it, but so far the Administration initiatives have mainly taken the negative form of budget cuts.

In its rigorous evaluation of social programs, the Administration seems to be observing the principle proclaimed by the President's shaman for the social sector, Daniel P. Moynihan, that the sheer expenditure of dollars does not necessarily ensure the quality of social programs. But the Administration has so far, except in the welfare area, not unveiled any of its own alternatives.

Both Allen and Egeberg, the Administration's initial choices for operating heads of federal education and health establishments, have complained that they lacked access not only to the President but to key White House aides. In Congress, both Democrats and Republicans concerned with education and health issues have said that the White House has maintained such a low profile on these issues that it's difficult to know which aides are "staffing" them, let alone know which "project manager" is in charge.

The emphasis on better management in HEW is hardly misplaced, and there are strong arguments for a further restructuring of HEW, perhaps along the often suggested lines of further separation of health, education, and welfare functions with the three arms run by undersecretaries with augmented powers and bigger staffs. Finch found himself beset by successive crises over desegregation decisions, pesticides, cyclamates, and oral contraceptives, for example, and never really had time to learn about his department or to ponder fundamental problems and policies. No reorganization of the department or management magic, however, will banish the difficulties of administering HEW's social programs—which inevitably reflect unrest in the society.

—JOHN WALSH

Reshuffling the Bureaucracy: Nixon Proposes Pollution Ocean Agencies

Every President reshuffles the federal bureaucracy a bit, the reshuffling signifying new perceptions of certain national problems or opportunities, shifts in political priorities, and the rise and fall of certain agencies and

bureaucrats. Richard Nixon appears to be doing more reshuffling than most Presidents, and later this month he will submit to Congress plans to establish two new agencies—an independent Environmental Protection Administration

(EPA) and a National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA, pronounced "NOAH"), to be under the Department of Commerce.

These plans will take effect unless disapproved within 60 days by either the House or Senate. To judge from the initial reaction on Capitol Hill, neither plan is likely to be vetoed, although each could be modified to meet objections by key legislators. NOAA is intended to provide the new and greater emphasis on ocean science and technology which many members of Congress from coastal states have been calling for. EPA, in part an outgrowth

of widespread frustration at the slow progress of pollution-control programs, would take responsibility for all programs for the control of air and water pollution and solid wastes. Most of these programs are now in agencies or departments which are also responsible for promoting development activities that often cause pollution.

A number of departments would lose certain of their functions with the establishment of EPA and NOAA, but the one that would lose the most is the Department of the Interior. Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel has fought hard for the concept of establishing a Department of Natural Resources and Environment to be made up of all the major natural-resource agencies and pollution-control agencies. The reorganization plans run directly counter to this concept. And not only does Interior gain no new functions, it loses some of its most important existing ones. Interior's Federal Water Pollution Control Administration (FWPCA), its largest agency by far, would be lost to EPA; its Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and its anadromous fish and marine mining programs would be lost to NOAA and the Department of Commerce. Interior would still have such agencies as the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the National Park Service, the Geological Survey, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Fish and Wildlife Service—activities of a kind traditionally identified with the department. "All we'll have left will be Indians, buffaloes, and catfish," one disgruntled Interior employee was overheard to say.

The loss of the water-pollution control program is an especially heavy blow to Interior's aspirations to outgrow its past regional (Western) image and become a major department dealing with environmental problems of the most pressing importance. This blow might have been softened had the President decided to put NOAA in Interior rather than in Commerce; this he did not do, even though in the long view the arguments favoring Interior as the home for NOAA cannot be easily dismissed.

In sum, the President's adoption of the reorganization plans, whatever these plans' merits, gives rise inescapably to speculation that Secretary Hickel has lost whatever influence he may once have had with the President. In this connection, the secretary's letter of 6 May—the letter warning the President that the Administration was alienating the

nation's youth—is usually mentioned. According to one strategically placed Administration official, "Hickel's stock is very, very low" at the White House. Speculation that Hickel is on his way out was further encouraged last week when the White House snubbed him by not having him take part in the announcement of a proposal to cancel some of the oil leases in Santa Barbara Channel and establish a marine sanctuary there.

Another view, though it is one that seems of limited currency, holds that, although the establishment of EPA and NOAA would kill the secretary's dream of a department of natural resources *and environment*, Hickel still has a chance to persuade the President to seek legislation that would make Interior a more broadly based department of resources through the transfer to it of such agencies as the Forest Service (from the Department of Agriculture) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' civil works division. However, in Washington the conventional wisdom, which is not always wrong, holds that the Corps of Engineers, especially, is sacrosanct and untouchable. The corps administers a \$1-billion-a-year "pork barrel" full of dams, waterways, and other projects.

Crisis for the Corps?

(On the other hand, the corps, which is under mounting criticism from conservationists who accuse it of neglecting environmental considerations in its project planning, might be more vulnerable than many believe. In fact, Hickel, without objection from the White House, recently set the stage for what could turn out to be a crisis for the corps. He asked that work be suspended for 15 months on the Cross Florida Barge Canal—a \$185-million project on which the corps already has spent \$52 million—pending a study of the ecological, hydrological, and other problems raised by this controversial undertaking.)

If Hickel has lost out in the struggle to protect his bureaucratic dukedom, as it now appears, the reason may lie partly in his reputation of being an unreflective administrator who shoots from the hip. Hickel took office having the image of an Alaska businessman and politician hell-bent on economic development. He has managed, especially by the tough stance he has taken toward offshore oil polluters, partly to erase that image, although the environ-

mentalists still distrust him on some issues (he is suspected particularly of being determined to push through the trans-Alaska pipeline project, regardless of the environmental hazards).

A fundamental criticism often made of Hickel is that neither he nor his top advisers have shown leadership in developing the kind of strategies and policies—a national land-use policy, for instance—which a department of natural resources might be expected to implement. "Mr. Hickel spends his time responding to crises," observes Representative John D. Dingell (D-Mich.), chairman of the House Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation Subcommittee. "Instead of thinking about land-use policies, he is off in an airboat in the Everglades chasing alligator poachers."

The reorganization plans to establish EPA and NOAA are assured of substantial congressional support. Senator Edmund S. Muskie (D-Maine), chairman of the Senate Air and Water Pollution Subcommittee, in January proposed the establishment of an agency such as EPA. In his view, bringing all programs for controlling air and water pollution and solid wastes together in one agency would invest the environmental protection effort with higher status and allow a better marshalling of resources to carry it forward. He believes, moreover, that pollution control should not be the responsibility of a department that is also responsible for promoting mining, oil development, and the like.

The Senate Minority Leader, Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania, in February also introduced a measure to establish an independent "Environmental Quality Administration," his bill being similar to Muskie's. EPA would have the major outlines of the agencies contemplated in the Scott and Muskie bills, although it would differ from each in some particulars. Besides taking FWPCA from Interior, EPA will take the clean-air and solid-waste-disposal programs from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; pesticide research and standards setting from the Food and Drug Administration; pesticide registration from the Department of Agriculture; and the Division of Radiation Protection Standards from the Atomic Energy Commission.

Representative Chet Holifield (D-Calif.), chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, has not looked kindly in the past on proposals that would diminish the power and scope

of authority of the AEC. He has told aides that he is reserving judgment on the plan for EPA until he learns more about it. Representative Dingell will oppose the EPA plan, partly in the belief that federal reorganization plans generally result in much confusion and little progress. Also, Dingell would prefer to see an agency such as EPA be part of a Department of Natural Resources. He questions whether EPA's administrator will have the influence of a department secretary, even though he is to have the same rank as the administrator of NASA.

The establishment of NOAA would represent a start toward building the "wet NASA" that members of the oceanography subcommittees of the House and Senate have been talking about enthusiastically. The NOAA plan falls somewhat short of their highest hopes in that it does not provide for the Coast Guard, with its numerous ocean-going vessels, to be part of the new agency. But it provides for more than many of them had expected. In addition to getting the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries (BCF) and the anadromous fish and marine mining programs from Interior, NOAA would have the Environmental Science Services Administration (ESSA already is in the De-

partment of Commerce); the sea grant program from the National Science Foundation; the Great Lakes Survey functions from the Corps of Engineers; the data buoy program from the Coast Guard; and the National Oceanographic Center from the Navy.

The Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources, which President Johnson appointed at the direction of Congress (Julius Stratton of the Ford Foundation was its chairman), had urged that NOAA be created as an independent agency. But, while the oceanography subcommittees themselves have wanted an independent agency, indications are that, if NOAA must be in a department, they prefer Commerce to Interior. For one thing, ESSA, which would be NOAA's largest unit, should suffer no disruption since it is in Commerce already. Also, the oceanography community has not been favorably impressed by the way BCF has performed and has fared in Interior. Just this year, for example, BCF has moved to close its new aquaculture laboratory at Milford, Connecticut, and to cut back personnel at its Great Lakes laboratory at Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Representative Charles A. Mosher (R-Ohio), a top ranking member of the House oceanography subcommittee, has

been informed by Administration officials that the head of NOAA will have the rank of either an assistant secretary or an undersecretary. Mosher, wanting the new agency to have the highest status possible in the bureaucracy, is urging that it be an undersecretary. He told *Science* that, in order for NOAA to have the contracting authority and other powers it will need to carry out a "big job" of ocean science and technology, legislation will be necessary. "It needs to be spelled out [by statute] that here is a major mission," he said.

Representative Dingell will oppose the plan for NOAA as well as the one for EPA, although he entertains no hope of defeating either. He views the separation of the BCF and the anadromous fish program from Interior's sports fishery programs as illogical and disruptive.

The plans for both NOAA and EPA were developed in the main by the President's Advisory Council on Executive Organization, a body headed by Roy L. Ash of Litton Industries. The Ash council's recommendations have not been made public, however. The final decisions on the NOAA and EPA plans were made, of course, by the President.—LUTHER J. CARTER

Senator William Proxmire: What Makes Him Run?

Senator William Proxmire, one of the Pentagon's most persistent critics, leads the kind of disciplined life that a military man might admire. He awakens each morning at 6:30, performs a half-hour of calisthenics, eats a breakfast of juice, whole wheat toast, and skimmed milk, and then runs the full 5 miles from his home in Washington's Cleveland Park to Capitol Hill.

"Remember, now. He doesn't jog. He runs," cautions a friend. "The distinction is important to him." Consistency is also important to him. The running and exercise are always observed, even if he has an early morning appointment or if he is in another city. At age 54, the senior senator from Wis-

consin is lean, muscular, and youthful from this regimen.

His workday is as disciplined and programmed as the chaotic nature of Senate life will allow. But no matter how busy the schedule, he refuses to miss a roll call vote on the Senate floor. He has not missed one since 1966, probably a record in the modern era of year-round sessions.

Proxmire's office also has a spartan, military character. No paintings or pictures grace the walls. The furnishings are plain and functional—a stark contrast to the carpeted elegance in which most of his colleagues like to work. Even the staff meets high disciplinary standards: an employee who is tardy

on too many mornings loses part of his vacation.

Despite this well-ordered style of life, Proxmire is not dour, stuffy, or unpleasant. He is as amiable and well liked as anyone in the Senate. But it is easy to understand why, many years ago, his classmates at the Hill School in Pottstown, Pennsylvania, voted him the "Biggest Grind."

In many ways he has become the biggest grind in the Senate during the past 13 years—a grinding critic of wasteful spending, a scourge of the Pentagon, a tormentor of sacred cows (except those that produce milk in Wisconsin), and an advocate of strict senatorial ethics. He manages to combine all these roles with a consistent social liberalism, a demonstrated concern for the poor, the black, and the young.

Proxmire has emerged in the past 2 years as an important figure in the growing public debate over national priorities. As chairman of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, an advisory and investigative body, he has searched for waste in the federal budget