Washington for the storage facility. Late this year or early in 1976, the Energy Research and Development Administration is expected to pick one of them; ERDA's selection of a site should stimulate new discussion of the waste issue.

Many critics—who insist that they are not necessarily opponents of nuclear power—would prefer a simple and direct remedy of a moratorium on new reactor construction, combined with a gradual phase-out of existing plants and a phase-in of conservation measures and "clean" technologies emphasizing solar and geothermal power. No serious critics expect Congress to impose a moratorium on a technology that is supposed to help relieve the nation of its dependence on foreign oil, and which already constitutes about 8 percent of the nation's installed generating capacity (20 percent in New England and 30 percent in the Chicago area). Thus, while a few groups, notably Nader's, will lobby for moratorium bills, most will content themselves with sniping at subsidies and airing the technology's troubles, all in hopes that congressional attention will

Science Policy: House Committee Wants in on the Action

Afraid that the White House might suddenly announce plans for a new science policy apparatus and thus achieve a fait accompli, leaders of the House Committee on Science and Technology have made their own move. On 6 March, Representative Olin E. Teague (D–Tex.), chairman of the committee, and Representative Charles A. Mosher (R–Ohio), ranking minority member, introduced the National Science Policy and Organization Act of 1975. But this bill, which embodies some new as well as familiar ideas, is offered not as a final product but as a negotiable package.

On introducing the measure, Teague said, "We have no desire to force a science advisory mechanism on the Executive Office which the President may find distasteful or foreign to his mode of operation. That is wheel spinning."

Besides calling for clearly thought-out strategies to use science and technology in the pursuit of domestic and foreign policy goals, the Teague-Mosher bill would provide for two major new institutional entities:

1) A five-member Council of Advisers on Science and Technology, smiliar to the Council of Economic Advisers (CEA) and the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). There seems to be virtual unanimity in the scientific community that the establishment of such a presidentially appointed body of three or more members would be highly desirable. The AAAS board, the Federation of American Scientists, the National Academy of Sciences' Killian committee, and a number of prominent individual scientists have urged that this be done. Such a council is also central to the science policy legislation passed last fall by the Senate and reintroduced in January by Senator Edward Kennedy (D–Mass.), chairman of the Senate subcommittee on the National Science Foundation.

2) A Cabinet-level Department of Research and Technology Operations, based on what appears to be an entirely novel concept. The secretary would play essentially a coordinating and advocacy role rather than exercise functional authority over any scientific agency. The department would take in six agencies—the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Energy Research and Development Administration, the National Bureau of Standards, the National Science Foundation, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the Science and Technology Information Utilization Corporation (a new agency that the bill would create). It would not include agencies such as the U.S. Geological Survey (in the Department of the Interior) which perform functions vital to the departments to which they now belong. But the secretary's recommendations to the Office of Management and Budget would cover the budgets and programs of all federal scientific and technical entities, wherever situated within the bureaucracy. Similarly, in the Cabinet, the secretary would be a voice for science and technology as a whole.

None of the above is presented as the last word, or as even representing a position agreed on within the Committtee on Science and Technology itself. The bill is tentative inside as well as out. It leaves it to the discretion of the White House whether the chairman of the council of advisers would be used as the President's personal science adviser. Indeed, if a President were not satisfied with the council arrangement as prescribed in the bill, he could submit to Congress a reorganization plan that would take effect after 60 days unless disapproved by *both* houses (under general law, a presidential reorganization plan is rejected if disapproved by *either* house).

The hope is that there will be a meeting of minds soon between the House committee and the Executive Branch team under Vice President Nelson Rockefeller assigned to come up with plans for a science advisory system. Teague and Mosher might have held up introduction of a bill pending discussion with the White House except for their worry that the Congress was about to be left out of the action. "We heard rumors that they [the White House] might announce what the President's action would be, as a fait accompli," Mosher told *Science*.

Whether the rumors actually had substance may now be beside the point. What matters most is whether plans formulated by the Rockefeller team are consistent with at least that part of the pending House and Senate bills which commands a broad consensus in the scientific community—namely, the part calling for a council of advisers.

According to one source fairly close to the Rockefeller study up until a few weeks ago, the study has pointed toward a "smallish office of science and technology in the White House." One can only speculate whether this office (*Science*, 14 March) will, as ultimately defined, take the form of the kind of advisory council favored by the scientific community.

In any case, momentum for replacing, somehow, the White House science advisory apparatus so abruptly dismantled 2 years ago by President Nixon is continuing to build.—LUTHER J. CARTER