

Circle No. 8 on Readers' Service Card

## WE'LL SHIP YOUR OLIGO IN 48 HOURS, OR WE'LL EAT THE NEXT ONE.

You get your primer or probe on time, or you get your next one for free. No questions, no quibbles. For \$5.00 a base (and \$20 setup charge), you'll receive a research-ready, cartridge-purified product, complete with PAGE gel pedigree. And you'll get it on time, or

	than our words. GENOSY
	<b>Special Offer!</b> Return this coupon for more information, and get a free knife and pen set with your first order.
Name	Title
Institution/Con	npany
Address	
City	State Zip
Telephone	
	nnologies, Inc. 8701A New Trails Drive, The Woodlands, Texas 77381-4241 Dne: (713) 363-3693 (800) 2345-DNA Fax: (713) 363-2212

artifact or contamination (2). Curators and researchers should coordinate efforts to ensure that repetitive sampling of specimens does not occur and that tissue samples and extracted DNA are preserved and shared by interested parties.

> GARY R. GRAVES MICHAEL J. BRAUN National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC 20560

> > REFERENCES

 R. Higuchi et al., Nature 312, 282 (1984); P. Houde and M. J. Braun, Auk 105, 773 (1988); H. Ellegren, Nature 354, 113 (1991).

2. J. Cher, Science 253, 1354 (1991).

## Science at EPA

The 10 January ScienceScope item "Better science at EPA?" (p. 147) quoted me out of context. The invidious comparison I was drawing between the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on the one hand and the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the National Science Foundation (NSF) on the other did not have to do with the quality of the science being performed by in-house EPA scientists, which in many cases is world class. Rather, I was referring to the processes by which these organizations seek out and make funding decisions concerning extramural science. Almost by definition, those successful scientists in the academic community, whom EPA needs to enlist in their search for the best possible science to ensure credible decision-making, have had experience with the NIH and NSF processes. These processes are generally considered to be valid, in the sense that they are usually capable of finding the best scientist to do the best science. In comparison, EPA's dealings with the academic community often seem to be characterized by ineptitude, cronyism, or politics. The only fully peer reviewed program, the External Grants Program, has never been consistently funded to any reasonable level by EPA and accounts for far less than 10% of total extramural funding. This criticism is not restricted to the Office of Research and Development, but is particularly pertinent to the wide range of scientific and technical activities performed by EPA program and policy offices. The disrespect engendered by the failure to recognize and enlist the best science affects the credibility of EPA.

BERNARD D. GOLDSTEIN Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences Institute, 681 Frelinghuysen Road, Piscataway, NJ 08855–1179

SCIENCE, VOL. 255

Circle No. 1 on Readers' Service Card