peer review system, which would compile the sort of detailed information in which Conlan is interested and make it available to Congress. The office, for example, would maintain an elaborate log on applications, containing details of proposals, reviewers, and foundation action. The log would make it possible to trace relationships between applicants and reviewers more readily.

The bill also requires that grant applicants be given access to verbatim reviews

Briefing

NACOA Backs Industry Ocean Bills

Taking a new tack, the highest level committee advising the government on ocean affairs urged last week that Congress pass legislation to extend U.S. fishing jurisdiction to 200 miles from shore and to give U.S. mining companies a green light to mine the deep seabed. In doing so, the National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere (NACOA), a scientific group that advises the President and the Secretary of Commerce, reversed its previous opposition to these bills. Both bills have been vigorously advocated by the fishing and mining industries for years, while NACOA counseled delay.

NACOA's previous annual reports have been broad policy statements that usually pleaded for more money for ocean research. Ocasionally it has criticized government activities, such as military weather modification research. On the questions of deep-sea mining and fisheries, past reports have reflected the view of many university scientists that the United States should postpone taking unilateral action that might offend other nations at the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, and endanger the chances of a new oceans treaty.

But this year, NACOA changed its stance. Its report calls for passage of a fishing bill enabling the United States to "create . . . an Economic Resource Zone," which would include "a model system for rational use of the zone" and its fish stocks. The creation of such 200-mile-wide zones is one of the few points of agreement at the sea law meeting. In effect, NACOA is recommending that the United States lead the way.

On mining, NACOA recommends a bill ensuring that "the minerals of the deep seabed will be available to decrease the United States' dependence on foreign sources and to increase world supply." The Secretary of Commerce, however, reflected the Administration's view in his formal comments and disagreed with both these recommendations.

Why the change of course? For one thing, the scientists whose views NACOA reflects are themselves—like many other observers—getting impatient that the sea law meetings have not made more progress. NACOA itself warned last year that it could not advocate waiting beyond 1975. Second, among NACOA's new members this year are some well-known industry figures, such as Marne A. Dubs of the Kennecott Copper Corp., a key proponent of the industry's mining bill.—D.S.

Another Energy Study

A "balanced, comprehensive" study of the future of nuclear power in the United States is about to be undertaken by the National Research Council of the NAS-NAE at the behest of the Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA). The study, intended to take 2 years and consume $2 million, will be cochaired by Harvey Brooks of Harvard and Edward L. Ginzton, electrical engineer, former Stanford professor, and now chairman of the board of Varian Associates, an electronics firm in Palo Alto.

It has taken quite a while to get the project organized (the contract was signed the end of June)—partly because people are hard to track down during the summer, but also because Brooks took time to say Yes. He retired in July as dean of engineering and applied physics but now has a full-time appointment as Benjamin Peirce professor of technology and public policy at Harvard.

The study is to be a detailed, long-range look at nuclear power, within the context of other energy systems, with emphasis on the period between 1980 and 2010. Organizer Micah Naftalin, director of the Assembly of Engineering, says there will be considerable attention given to how the nation can keep its energy options open through research and development without automatically committing itself to particular courses of action made possible thereby. And the NRC states it will not be taken for granted that a major role for nuclear power is necessary.

Membership of the 16-person task force is now being firmed up. Much care has been taken to create a balance of biases. Brooks has a nuclear background, and Ginzton's expertise is in solar energy. The principal concerns of the study director (chosen but not yet announced), according to Naftalin, are over the environment and conservation. Some members are experts in particular energy systems, but most specialize in areas such as health and economics that cut across these fields.

A preliminary report is due 18 months after the onset of the study.

—C.H.

Minorities Report Sells Fast

The Scientific Manpower Commission published recently a report* in a humble, loose-leaf binder that has become a surprise best seller. The report is the first quantitative compendium of women and minority group members in all academic fields and most professions in the United States. The data is needed by colleges, corporations, even government agencies to cope with the welter of federal civil rights laws, which may explain why some 800 copies have sold since June, despite the $40 purchase price and $20 annual fee for updates.

The report will tell you everything you ever wanted to know about women and minorities but never dared to ask—because the answer was likely to be buried in someone else's computer. For example, most blacks, American Indians, and Puerto Ricans attending graduate schools today enroll in the field of education; only miniscule numbers study science, so much so that only 1 percent of all physics doctoral recipients are black. Orientals, by contrast, enroll in larger numbers in engineering and physical sciences.

By law, every employer of 25 people or more must hire in proportion to the availability of persons in a specific field in the labor force. The commission's re-

*"*Professional Women and Minorities: A Manpower Data Resource Service,*" Scientific Manpower Commission, 1776 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

and the identities of reviewers of their proposals. A formal appeals mechanism would be set up. NSF would have to carry out a "needs assessment" on research projects and curriculum development projects before funding was approved. Under the provisions of the bill, NSB would get its own small professional staff, a move clearly designed to lessen its dependence on regular NSF staff.

Conlan's passion to reduce the influence of NSF program managers is evident in

port details the labor pools they draw from, such as the fraction of health technicians who are of Oriental, Spanish, or American Indian origin.

The womens' movement will find fuel for its fires in the report as well. For example, despite all the brouhaha about womens' gains, only 3.4 percent of all 4-year college presidents are women and they are paid 84 percent of what their male counterparts receive. In science generally the number of women is increasing, but in astronomy the proportion of doctorates given to women has been halved, from 15.8 percent in 1959 to 6.2 percent in 1973.

The 2½-person commission has run in the red in recent years. But as a result of having institutions from Vassar College to the American Express Company buying the report like hot cakes, it may turn a profit this year.—D.S.

Narrow Reprieve for EPA Pesticide Control

A controversial proposal to change drastically the existing program of pesticide regulation by giving the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) the right to veto key decisions by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) was defeated in the House of Representatives on 3 October, but by a surprisingly narrow margin. The closeness of the outcome could be interpreted as a warning to the EPA that the farming and agricultural chemical interests who have been bitterly complaining about EPA regulatory decisions are winning over many members of Congress, however unjust many of their complaints may be.

Earlier this year the Ford Administration asked for a simple 2-year extension of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), which would have expired on 30 September 1975 except for an interim measure recently adopted by Congress to extend the act for 45 days. Still pending before the House is a bill reported by the House Agriculture Committee that would extend FIFRA for 1 year and amend it in various ways to please the farming and chemical interests.

For instance, the committee bill would require that, anytime the EPA decides to cancel the registration of a pesticide, it must give the Secretary of Agriculture notice of its intent and an analysis of the proposed action's impact on the agricultural economy. Then, if the Secretary chooses to comment within 30 days on the proposed action, this comment, together with EPA's reply, must be published in the Federal Register.

The fact that this new procedure would apply even to orders to suspend the use of pesticides that are declared to be an "imminent hazard" to human health has made it particularly objectionable to environmental groups, who point out that USDA views and economic considerations are by no means ignored under existing regulations. These groups are also much opposed to the provision in the committee bill that would allow farmers and other "private applicators" of potentially hazardous pesticides to meet EPA certification requirements simply by signing a form to be provided by the dealers from whom these chemicals are purchased.

The committee itself voted in early September to exclude from its bill a provision that would have made all new EPA pesticide regulations and suspension or cancellation actions subject to the Secretary of Agriculture's concurrence. The feeling was that it would be overwhelmingly rejected by the House.

In light of the foregoing, Representative Steven D. Symms (R-Idaho), who offered a floor amendment to restore the requirement for USDA concurrence, must himself have been surprised when his proposal lost by only 175 to 167 on a recorded vote. After the vote on the Symms amendment, the House rejected by a vote of 272 to 66 a proposal by Representative George E. Brown, Jr., (D-Calif.) to extend FIFRA for 1 year unchanged.

The House is expected to complete action on FIFRA on 8 or 9 October, and, to judge from the voting on the Symms and Brown proposals, the committee bill may very well win approval pretty much as reported. Environmental lobbying against the farmers "self-certification" provision could prove to be telling, however. And, in the case of the procedural delay that would affect "imminent hazard" suspensions, Representative Thomas S. Foley (D-Wash.), chairman of the Agriculture Committee, has himself indicated that he wants this struck from the bill.

But, already, it seems clear that when critics of the pesticide regulatory programs speak of EPA choosing "moths over trees, coyotes over sheep, and fire ants over people," their credibility in Congress is greater than what one might have expected.—L.J.C.

Scientists Seen as Respected but Bespectacled

"When I think of a scientist, I think of a highly intelligent, practical, and logical person, usually somewhat eccentric." So runs the typical response to an English survey designed to establish what people imagine scientists are really like.

The survey was based on a questionnaire completed by 1559 readers of the English magazines *New Scientist* and *New Society* and is reported in the former. Some 58 percent of the scientists responding to the survey, and 67 percent of the nonscientists, agreed with the statement that "scientists are respected by the public," an attitude the survey analysts find surprising. Respondents included two minorities who were extremely friendly (129) or extremely hostile (92) toward science. The latter group cited animal experimentation among their grouses.

The prevailing physical stereotype of the scientist is that of a white-coated man working in a laboratory and wearing spectacles. The spectacles are variously described as "gold rimmed" or with "thick black rims," and the hair is said to be "smooth, carefully brushed back" and "sticking up in uneven tufts." How far such stereotypes extend beyond Britain is hard to say, but the generally positive view of scientists' public standing is similar in direction and extent to the attitude found in the United States by a survey conducted for the National Science Foundation.

—N.W.