

automobile exhaust gases; and motor vehicle noise.

Almost every European organization has tried to play a role and recommend action to improve the environment. Yet efforts and actions have often been surprisingly ineffective. An outstanding example is the Commission on the Rhine, which has representatives from Germany, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and Switzerland.

The Rhine commission has been in existence for 10 years, but pollution of the river has steadily increased. The Rhine commission's suggestions for improvement have been consistently ignored, despite the evidence of several scientific reports on the alarming condition of the river. The Rhine carries 110 kilograms of sodium chloride per second in Mannheim, and 268 kilograms per second when it reaches the

frontier between the Netherlands and Germany, nearly half of which is caused by salty waste waters from the potash mines in Alsace. It has also been calculated that the Rhine brings 80 tons of arsenic to the Netherlands each month, 300 tons of copper, 20 tons of cadmium, 10 tons of mercury, and 900 kilograms of pesticides.

Another failure to coordinate environmental policy is evident in the variety of positions adopted toward the automobile and its problems.

It is quite revealing that the concluding chapter of a not-yet-published OECD report on automobile pollution stresses the diversity in economic, industrial, social, and meteorological situations of the member countries. This diversity is one reason given for not adopting common standards for air and water quality. The argument goes:

since the real dangers of the noxious gases emitted by automobiles have not yet been really assessed, it is hardly worth adopting severe product standards. It is a time for studies rather than for action, and European organizations had best define the environment in its strictly physicochemical sense and not in the social or cultural sense.

The OECD report clearly displays the mixed feelings of Europeans toward environmental problems. Industry is still skeptical about the urgency of cleaning up the environment and is fearful of the cost, while governments carefully safeguard their independence by trying to restrain the scope of action of European organizations. A typical consequence of this footdragging is that, although carbon monoxide emissions of 1972 models of European cars are to be 40 percent lower than those

Nadar's Profiles Aimed at Voters, Not Headlines

Any expectations that Ralph Nader's study of Congress would leave little to choose between Capitol Hill and the Roman Senate during the reign of the emperor Elagabalus must have been disappointed by the release this week of a major part of the project's output, the profiles of some 490 members. To judge from those of the congressmen most directly interested in scientific and health affairs, the profiles are factual descriptions, short on evaluations but long on voting records, ratings by interest groups and much other sober data.

Reactions on Capitol Hill seem to be mostly favorable, several offices commenting on the fairness and accuracy of their member's profile. A staff aide to Mike McCormack (D-Wash.), the only scientist in Congress, complains of some misquotations but says the tone of the profile was "probably reasonable." Representative L. H. Fountain has not seen his profile but from his staff's description fears it may give an "incomplete and somewhat misleading picture." Senator Gaylord Nelson (D-Wis.) has only praise for the talent of those who researched him. At a recent press conference held to discuss the profiles, several reporters commented that they appeared to contain little new, and that some profiles could almost be used as campaign literature. Nader, questioning the press's idea of what is new, said the profiles brought together both old and new information, their purpose being for citizens "to understand and to measure members of Congress against standards citizens believe are significant." The profiles, each about 20 to 40 pages in length, are the second phase of Nader's Congress project, which began earlier this month with publication of the paperback *Who Runs Congress?* (*Science*, 13 October). Salient features of particular profiles* are:

* Individual profiles are obtainable from Grossman Publishers, P.O. Box 19281, Washington, D.C. 20036, at \$1 each.

► John W. Davis (D-Ga.), chairman of the House subcommittee on science, research, and development. The profile (written by Claudia Townsend) emphasizes Davis's efforts on behalf of Lockheed (the C-5A transport aircraft is produced in Davis's district) and notes that he nevertheless voted against the SST. As much attention is given to Davis's absences from the House Foreign Affairs Committee, of which he is a recent member, as to his activities as chairman of the science, research, and development subcommittee.

► Paul G. Rogers (D-Fla.), chairman of the House public health and environment subcommittee. Jan Juran, Rogers' profile writer, lucidly describes the complex mass of health legislation that Rogers has engineered through Congress and analyzes the reasons for Rogers' effectiveness. There are sideswipes at "Paul's Practice of Porkbarrel Politics" and Rogers' efforts on behalf of the 60,000 migrant workers in his district.

► L. H. Fountain (D-N.C.), chairman of the House intergovernmental relations subcommittee. Fountain's hearings on the Food and Drug Administration are considered as "among the best prepared and persistent efforts by any congressional committee," although they get little attention in the weekly column Fountain writes for a home district newspaper, profile writer Eileen Franch notes. Probably for lack of space, Franch does not really make clear why Fountain's subcommittee is so successful.

► Edward P. Boland (D-Mass.), chairman of the House appropriations subcommittee that controls the funding of NASA and the NSF, among other agencies. Like most other profile writers, Robert C. Schwartzman puts together a readable and wide-ranging sketch of his man's character and political career. But there's nothing said about Boland's views on science or space or the desirability of funding same.—N.W.