will be only after much further study and pondering.

Indeed, the land use legislation itself has been long in evolving, and, if resurrected this year in the same form in which it died last year (the House voted 211 to 204 not to take it up), it will promise only a modest and cautious beginning. Perhaps wisely, given the political resistance to land use regulation, the principal congressional sponsors of land use legislation, Senator Henry Jackson (D–Wash.) and Representative Morris Udall (D–Ariz.), have favored a limited approach emphasizing federal planning grants and state oversight of critical areas and large-scale development. Their bills would not have mandated comprehensive land use controls. Furthermore, a "sanctions" provision to withhold some highway and airport development funds from any state failing to establish the appropriate land use controls was finally dropped.

The Ford Administration will be under some political pressure this year to propose land use legislation at least as strong as that advocated by Udall, who has already announced he will seek the presidency in 1976, and by Jackson, who has all but announced his own candidacy. An Administration task force headed by Secretary of the Interior Rogers Morton is currently drafting a land use bill, but just what form it will take is as yet unclear.

Thus far, President Ford's concept of environmental policy seems to involve bringing environmental and development values into some kind of vague "balance." He appears to believe that, for these concerns, there is little common ground, although he does acknowledge the environmental benefits of energy conservation. Yet, in truth, the White House may be overlooking a chance to reduce conflicts between development and the environment through policies to regulate land use and guide growth and development. And, while such policies would have no bearing on certain of the more intractable environmental problems, they could help keep many air and water pollution problems from growing worse—as, for instance, by seeing that no additional nonpoint sources of water pollution are created.

The White House actually has shown little sign of taking much interest in environmental issues, even though the President gives Train and Peterson respectful hearings. Indeed, suggestions from CEQ that the President send an environmental message to Congress this year have thus far been coldly received. A cynic might think that when the President speaks approvingly of the environmental movement's "maturity," what he really likes is the fact that it isn't coming over as loudly as it did in the early 1970's.

—LUTHER J. CARTER

Congress Gets on with Reform, Seeks to Reassert Itself

The 94th Congress convenes on 14 March, and if the senators and representatives have been reading their clippings, they will expect to find significant changes in the patterns of power in the Capital. The big Democratic victory in the November elections will give the majority party greater leverage in Congress and capacity to trump presidential vetoes. Beyond this legislative calculus, some observers think the Nixon resignation and the aftershocks of Watergate will bring about the most substantial reversal to the growth of "presidential government" since the New Deal.

The prospect of a revaluation of congressional influence prompts the question of who runs Congress. The civics-class answer is the majority leadership, operating through the committee system according to party policy. But in neither Senate nor House has the leadership been particularly assertive in recent years and the House has experienced a wave of democratizing reform in procedures and organization which appears to be still rolling.

The momentum of reform and the arrival of about 60 newly elected Democrats (*Science*, 22 November), most of them relatively young, liberal, and apparently sympathetic to change, could make for a lively spirit of iconoclasm in the 94th Congress. In the House the basic shift of power has been to the Democratic Caucus, to which all Democrats belong. This is likely to mean an enhancement of majority rule (in the sense of a majority of the majority) at the expense of committee chairmen and other senior members who have formed an effective holding company in the House for as long as anyone now serving in Congress can remember.

Some with a sense of congressional history now see the possibility of a return to the reign of "King Caucus," which occurred after 1909 when the House rebelled and unseated an autocratic Republican Speaker, Joseph G. Cannon of Illinois. The House can be dominated by a strong Speaker, an alliance of powerful committee chairmen, or the caucus; normally it has been run by combinations and permutations of the natural competitors for power. History seldom repeats itself (King Caucus had its heyday when a Democratic president, Woodrow Wilson, and an unusually able Democratic majority leader, Oscar Underwood of Alabama, were able to cooperate effectively). And what the rise of the caucus is more likely to signal in the present context is the end of an epoch during which the so-called "conservative coalition" made up of Southern Democrats and Midwestern and Western Republicans dominated Congress and particularly the House, essentially by exploiting the seniority system.

The coalition was formed to oppose President Franklin D. Roosevelt and, since World War II, has been effective far beyond its numbers in derailing, delaying, or modifying legislation, particularly economic and social legislation. The coalition has exercised influence through its control of congressional machinery, which it maintained through seniority, as well as by a command of parliamentary skills and legislative knowledge.

The post-Watergate surge of reform in the House was basically aimed at reducing the power of committee chairmen, and the main force of the culminating attack in the caucus in early December was directed at the Ways and Means Committee, which exercises jurisdiction over all revenue measures. The caucus voted to raise the number of members of Ways and Means from 25 to 37, increasing the representation of junior, younger, and more liberal members. More drastic was the vote to remove the power of the Ways and Means to act as the Democrats' committee on committees and to make

committee assignments. This wellspring of congressional authority was put under control of a revivified Steering and Policy Committee in which the regular Democratic leadership is heavily represented. The caucus action provided the occasion for and certainly contributed to the de facto deposing of Wilbur D. Mills (D–Ark.) from the chairmanship of Ways and Means. Mills' public embarrassments peaked at about the time the caucus met, but forces had been gathering against him for several years and he was, at least in symbolic terms, the rear guard of the House old guard.

The process of reform in the House, in fact, has been much less like a sudden thaw than the waning of an ice age. The current cycle of reform can be traced back at least to 1959, when the 1958 congressional elections produced an incoming group of freshmen—a kind of congressional proletariat—almost as large as the present crop. The House Speaker in those days was Sam Rayburn, himself an institution. He mediated between the liberals and the coalition and in some cases invoked his ineffable prestige in favor of liberal legislation. But he was essentially committed to the status quo in Congress. After Rayburn's death in 1961, the speakership was inherited by John W. McCormack of Massachusetts, whose role, as the 1960's progressed, seemed to grow progressively more ceremonial while the majority grew more disorganized. In 1970, when Carl Albert of Oklahoma became Speaker, he generally backed House reformers but failed to establish a forceful leadership style before Watergate embroiled Congress.

Reform in the House, it should be noted, is directly attributable only in part to the reformers. The impact in the early 1960's of the Supreme Court's one-man-one-vote decision, the effects of civil-rights-voter-registration drives, the growth of the proportion of young people in the electorate, and the political fallout from the reaction to the Vietnam war altered the climate in the House and in the Senate, which in the 1960's was generally more liberal politically and fiscally than the House.

Throughout the decade, however, the reformers on the House side kept up steady pressure for procedural and organizational change. In the middle 1960's, for example, the big Democratic House majority returned in the Goldwater-Johnson presidential election broke the lock of the conservative coalition on the Appropriations and Ways and Means committees membership. In 1973 the Democratic Caucus made threateningly explicit its power to grant or withhold approval of the appointment of committee chairmen at the beginning of each Congress and voted a "subcommittee bill of rights" which broke the grip of the chairmen on subcommittee assignments (*Science*, 2 March 1973). The House Democrats' ardor for reform last year, however, was not intense enough to carry recommendations for extensive changes in committee jurisdictions proposed by a committee headed by Richard Bolling (D–Mo.) (*Science*, 25 October 1974). A much milder compromise measure was voted by a coalition including a number of reformers who, in this case, found the old ways more comfortable.

During the long campaign for change, the rallying point for reformers in the House has been the Democratic Study Group (DSG), established by frustrated younger members in the late 1950's. A small staff supported by the DSG members conducted research on issues, and the organization provided a forum in which the liberal wing of the Democratic party in the House could develop policy. Junior members saw it as an alternative to the caucus, which was dominated by the elders. But in the early years, the DSG seemed to have only marginal influence on legislation. The DSG's influence grew throughout the decade and certainly, in alliance with independent operators like Bolling, it became the primary source of reform ideas and initiatives.

This year, Philip Burton (D–Calif.), an influential figure in the DSG in recent years, handily won election as chairman of the caucus and by so doing became a force to be reckoned with in House affairs. Burton is one of the few congressmen recently to ascend to prominence outside the traditional leadership-seniority structure of both parties. And there is a certain symbolic symmetry in the rise of Burton and the fall of Wilbur Mills. It is far from clear, nevertheless, how the House will replace Mills and lesser members of the old guard in carrying out its daily business. The committee chairmen, by their exercise of the jurisdictional imperative over the years, have insured that Congress would take a piecemeal approach to national problems. This relieved the leadership of the necessity of leading and members of voting on many complex and controversial issues. Old habits are hard to break, but congressional leaders now have pledged to fashion comprehensive measures to fight recession and inflation and to formulate a national energy policy if President Ford fails to take what they regard as adequate steps.

Up to now, Congress has lacked both the expertise to make comprehensive policies and the party discipline to carry them out legislatively. The size of staffs on Capitol Hill has been increasing steadily. And in the past year Congress has established its own Office of Technology Assessment and passed a budget control act designed to overcome the old criticism that Congress has neither a will nor a way to coordinate federal spending and revenues. In a move designed to give the majority a policy blueprint, the Democratic Steering and Policy Committee has created a task force to devise an "action agenda" which is to include specific recommendations for dealing with major problems, including the economy and energy. The new initiatives reflect changed congressional attitudes, but the timing of them, unfortunately, suggests someone learning to fly when the plane is in a spin.

The reforms so far would appear to have redistributed power and made the House more responsive to the rank and file and to those who elected them. The next 2 years should show whether these reforms will make the House a more effective legislative body.

—JOHN WALSH

RECENT DEATHS

Stephen C. Cappannari, 57; head, human behavior division, School of Medicine, Vanderbilt University; 16 August.

Charlotte Elliott, 91; retired plant pathologist, U.S. Department of Agriculture; 7 August.

John E. Fenton, 75; former president, Suffolk University; 14 August.

Philipp Gross, 74; retired director, Fulmer Research Institute, England; 20 May.

James P. Heath, 59; professor of biology, San Jose State University; 6 June.

Paul L. O'Connor, 65; former president, Xavier University; 10 September.

Godfrey Vassallo, 81; professor emeritus of physics, University of Portland; 5 September.

George Zyskind, 44; professor of statistics, Iowa State University; 9 September.