

Society, now the Division of Analytical Chemistry. He was also instrumental in the establishment of the Metropolitan Microchemical Society, now the American Microchemical Society. Both organizations guarantee future improvement in the status of analytical chemists and permit a more scientific approach to analytical problems.

With his co-workers, Dr. Pichler laid the foundations of the techniques in handling ultra-micro amounts of samples by strictly logical and mathematical treatment of the principles established for the milligram and microgram ranges by both Emich and Pregl. Based on this fundamental work, it was possible to develop, quickly and efficiently, the chemistry of the transuranium elements which led to the Manhattan Project during the Second World War, and the atomic bomb.

British analytical chemists are familiar with Pichler's work, having listened to his brilliant plenary lecture at the Birmingham Analytical Symposium in 1958. International societies heaped numerous honours on Dr. Pichler; for example, he received the 1932 Fritz Pregl prize in microchemistry from the Academy of Sciences of Vienna; the Emich Plaque of the Austrian Society for Microchemistry in 1955; the Honor Insignia of Arts and Sciences (First Class) from the President of Austria in 1962; and the Anachem Award of the Association of Analytical Chemists in 1963.

His love for beauty in Nature took him on extensive trips to the western parts of the United States on several occasions, and influenced him not only to become a member of the National Parks Association, but also to stay in the United States.

He also decided to develop several acres of farmland near Camden, South Carolina, primarily for his wife, the daughter of an Austrian forester. While there, he became interested in conservation. With the help of the local representative of the Department of Agriculture, he was striving to restore the farm's fertility at the time of his death.

His desire for accuracy can be illustrated by his research on establishing the origin of paintings. He found it necessary to study methods of painting in oil himself so he could interpret correctly his findings of the authorship of paintings and the period of applications.

His dry sense of humour may have caused him to be misunderstood among the people who met him, but students and associates admired him for his brilliant, scholarly mind. They loved his lectures in which he logically developed his points, and the splendid demonstrations, with the simplest equipment proving the essential points of his dissertation.

His final inheritance to the world he left behind was the book *Identification of Materials, via Physical Properties, Chemical Tests and Microscopy*. It represents a summary and splendid combination of experiences during his lifetime in scientific microchemical approaches, in teaching analytical chemistry and in consulting work to large industrial concerns.

Dr. A. A. Benedetti-Pichler must be considered as one of the pioneers in microchemistry, alongside Emich, Feigl and Pregl, especially for introducing it in the United States. To his students and associates he will be remembered as the precise, modest, true scholar and beloved friend.

H. K. AND W. R. ALBER

## NEWS and VIEWS

### Organic Chemistry in the University of Leicester : Prof. C. W. Rees

DR. C. W. REES, reader in organic chemistry at King's College London, has been appointed professor of organic chemistry in the University of Leicester. Dr. Rees was a student at University College, Southampton, from 1947 until 1953. After working under Dr. (now Professor) N. B. Chapman, he took up an appointment under Prof. A. Albert in the Department of Medical Chemistry of the Australian National University, which was then operating in London. He joined Birkbeck College as an assistant lecturer in chemistry in 1955 and became lecturer in 1956. In the following year he transferred to King's College, London, and was later promoted to a readership. Dr. Rees's research interests have centred largely on the chemistry of heterocyclic compounds with special reference to the mechanisms of their reactions. Certain aspects of his work have been supported by the Medical Research Council and by the British Empire Cancer Campaign. He has numerous publications in the *Journal of the Chemical Society* and in recent years he has been responsible for the section on Organic Reaction Mechanisms in the *Annual Reports on the Progress of Chemistry*.

### The National Institute for Research in Nuclear Science

At the Committee stage of the Science and Technology Bill in the House of Lords on February 23, Lord Bridges again raised the question of the position of the National Institute for Research in Nuclear Science under the Science Research Council. He was concerned that its relations with the Atomic Energy Research Establishment at Harwell might be affected adversely and also that, since from April 1 the laboratories of the National Institute would come under a Nuclear Physics Board, reporting to the Science Research Council which, in turn, reported to the Minister of Education and Science, the

lengthened lines of communication would lead to delay and frustration. He suggested that the Science Research Council should be sufficiently well staffed to be given very wide delegated powers to settle questions of finance and administration, including possibly authority to appoint staff. Lord Bridges was supported by Lord Sherfield and the Earl of Bessborough, and the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Technology, Lord Snow, readily gave Lord Bridges the specific assurance for which he asked, that absorption of the National Institute for Research in Nuclear Science under the Science Research Council would not be used to impose a more rigid bureaucratic system of control in finance and administration, including the appointment of staff. However, Lord Snow firmly defended the proposed arrangements, and the Minister of State for Education and Science, Lord Bowden, later added that the decision as to whether the Institute and the Atomic Energy Authority should come under the Science Research Council was only taken after very considerable debate. It was decided that the Bill allowed sufficient flexibility, if the proposal proved unworkable, to make a change by administrative action without seeking further legislative powers. On finance, Lord Snow explained that within its annual estimated provision, the National Institute had delegated powers up to £25,000 from capital expenditure and the Authority up to £100,000; above this, authorization by the Secretary of State and the Treasury was required. The Finance Member of the Authority was a member of the Board of the Institute. The Department for Scientific and Industrial Research had delegated powers up to £50,000 for capital schemes and the Government was considering the appropriate level of financial delegation for the Science Research Council. The capital expenditure of the Institute in 1963-64 was about £1.6 million, of which £1 million was on schemes of more than £100,000 and £250,000 on schemes between £50,000 and £100,000.