technicians to take care of 10,000 to 15,000 rodents, each of which was supposed to be monitored individually. When Calandra quit, IBT had a business backlog of $25 million. By then, management controls and staff morale had broken down. The company collapsed from within.

After the fiasco became known, the U.S. and Canadian governments jointly began reviewing all compounds that relied on IBT studies for marketing approval. The few affected drugs have been cleared, but the record on pesticides is not as good. A summary prepared in February by Kevin Keaney of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) shows that of 1205 key studies, only 214 have been found valid. Many are being replaced, but at present, 737 are listed as invalid with no immediate prospect of replacement. Other officials say this summary does not reflect the great number of replacement studies that have been sent to EPA in the last 2 years. On the other hand, Keaney's summary says nothing about the quality of long-term toxicological studies supporting the IBT problem pesticides. Ninety-five percent of these studies are very poor, according to an official with first-hand knowledge. The first full report on all of this is expected in "mid-June," according to EPA.

Federal laboratory inspectors agree that the cheating they found at IBT was in a class by itself. After Senator Edward Kennedy (D–Mass.) held hearings on these problems, Congress passed a Good Laboratory Practices Act in 1978. The two responsible agencies (EPA and FDA) began an inspection program to prevent future IBT's from happening. The new regulations have driven marginal labs out of the market, in particular, out of the complex business of running long-term studies. A couple of firms withdrew only after being hit with criminal indictments, similar to the one in Chicago. An experienced lab watcher at EPA says that no other company since then has tried to grow as rapidly in as many areas as IBT. Today, any outfit that seems to build momentum quickly is watched.

Despite the attention this issue has received, one EPA official concedes, there are still three or four testing centers that have a record of submitting sloppy work or of losing data. They are seen as living in a kind of limbo. EPA has not yet decided how it should regard the work they did in the past in support of pesticide registrations. It is a knotty problem, and one EPA is unlikely to solve by mid-June.—**ELIOT MARSHALL**

Clinch River Supporters Pin Hopes on Baker

Supporters of the Clinch River Breeder Reactor are once again pinning their hopes on the powers of persuasion of Senate Majority Leader Howard Baker (R–Tenn.). Unless Baker can persuade the Senate to vote funds for the reactor, the project will be dead. In the last 2 years, it has been approved by the Senate by a single vote.

The fate of the breeder has been placed in the hands of Baker and the Senate by a tactical move on the part of the House Committee on Appropriations. Rather than risk having the project shot down on the House floor, the committee deleted all funds for the reactor from the Department of Energy's appropriations bill. The House version of the bill will thus contain no funds for the reactor, and it will then be up to the Senate to keep the project alive.

The thinking is that if the Senate approves funds for the reactor, the House members of the conference committee—who will be mostly breeder supporters—will simply go along with the Senate's action. But if the project is shot down on the House floor, the House conference committee members would have to vote against the project.

In the past, Baker, in whose state the reactor would be built, has been instrumental in steering the project through the Senate. But Baker recently announced that he will not seek reelection. As a lame duck, his powers of persuasion may be reduced.

—**COLIN NORMAN**

The Reascendancy of Edward Teller (contd.)

Edward Teller has seen his influence in Washington and his standing in the scientific community wax and wane over the years, but now, at age 75, he is again riding high. His protégé, George Keyworth II, is installed as President Reagan's science adviser, and Teller was recently influential in persuading Reagan to push for a space-based antiballistic missile system. Then, on 24 May, Reagan awarded Teller, along with 11 other scientists, the National Medal of Science, the nation's most prestigious scientific award. The other recipients were:

Philip W. Anderson (physicist) of Bell Labs and Princeton University.

Seymour Benzer (geneticist) of the California Institute of Technology.

Glenn Burton (agricultural scientist) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Mildred Cohn (biophysicist) of the University of Pennsylvania.

F. Albert Cotton (chemist) of Texas A & M University.

Edward Heinemenn (aeronautical engineer) of Heinemann Associates.

Donald Katz (chemical engineer) of the University of Michigan.

Yoichiro Nambu (physicist) of the University of Chicago.

Marshall Stone (mathematician) of the University of Massachusetts.

Gilbert Stork (chemist) of Columbia University.

Charles H. Townes (physicist) of the University of California at Berkeley.—**COLIN NORMAN**

House Appropriations Committee Axes NCAM

Nobody can accuse the House Appropriations Committee of being consistent. On 24 May, it voted to delete all funding for the National Center for Advanced Materials (NCAM) from the Department of Energy's budget request, on the grounds that the proposal to build the facility has not been adequately reviewed. Then, in the same breath, the committee approved $5 million apiece for new research facilities at Catholic and Columbia universities, even though those facilities have had even less review than NCAM (*Science*, 3 June, p. 1024).

The committee complained that the NCAM proposal was added to DOE's budget request by the White House, and was thus not given "the customary and desirable peer review" by the scientific community. NCAM has been vigorously promoted by George Keyworth, President Reagan's science adviser, but last month, 100 scientists wrote to the House Committee on Science and Technology to complain of the lack of input from the

materials science community when the proposal was developed. DOE has now set up a panel to review the proposal, and the committee said it will entertain a request for funds next year, after DOE's study is completed.

The Catholic and Columbia university facilities have been reviewed neither by DOE nor by the House Committee on Science and Technology. They were first proposed in amendments to a DOE authorization bill on the House floor, after some slick lobbying orchestrated by a Washington public relations firm.

The glaring inconsistency in the committee's actions is sure to be pointed out as the bill wends its way through the rest of the legislative process. But the committee can at least take some comfort from Emerson, who noted that "a foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, adored by little statesmen and philosophers and divines."—**COLIN NORMAN**

Argonne Puts in a Bid For Virginia's Accelerator

Plagiarism usually occurs in private, but there was Senator Charles Percy (R–Ill.) telling the press on 25 May that he thought it would be a great idea for the Argonne National Laboratory to "adopt" an accelerator design proposed by a competitor in Virginia and build the machine in Illinois. Percy made the suggestion as he and Secretary of Energy Donald Hodel emerged from a committee room in the Capitol after an hour-long meeting on this subject. The question they discussed is: whom will the government choose to build a new $150-million electron accelerator for nuclear physics research, Argonne or the Southeastern Universities Research Association (SURA) based in Newport News, Virginia?

Both competitors submitted designs to a group of experts earlier this year. The panel, the Nuclear Science Advisory Committee (NSAC), judged SURA's design the best and Argonne's second best of five offered (*Science*, 27 May, p. 929). But NSAC blurred its findings by noting that either of the top two contenders could build an excellent machine, and by urging SURA to look for a better location than Newport News. (It seemed remote from big airports and universities.)

Argonne seized on this as an excuse for trying to override NSAC's decision. Thus Percy arranged the meeting with Hodel to tell him about the economic and political advantages of building the project near Chicago. These are so compelling, Percy argued, that no matter which design is the best, Argonne should build it. Percy claimed that Argonne could shave at least $42 million off the lifetime cost of the accelerator because it already has a technical infrastructure in place.

The project will be funded jointly by the Department of Energy (DOE) and the National Science Foundation, with DOE providing the larger share. Funds are not expected to appear in the budget before 1985, but the interregional rivalry is strong because both Illinois and Virginia are trying to build up their image as high-technology centers.

Hodel, as expected, was thoroughly noncommittal as he left the committee room, saying he had received technical advice from NSAC and now is pleased to hear other kinds of advice, such as Senator Percy's. Hodel left this meeting to visit another key player in the drama, Senator John Warner (R–Va.), the most prominent backer of SURA. An aide said the two met on other matters, but that the senator did "reaffirm his strong support of the SURA proposal" during the meeting. Hodel doubtless is pleased to consider this advice too, for Warner sits on the subcommittee that will write DOE's research budget.

In the gathering outside Percy's committee room, Argonne officials gave out a 52-page impartial report showing why Argonne should get the project and not SURA. It is entitled "Comparative Economic Analysis of Alternative Sites for an Electron Accelerator Facility." An Illinois official also released that day a long letter beginning, "We, the Great Lakes Governors . . ." and concluding (what else?) that the Midwest deserves to get the accelerator.

While this lobbying has its amusing moments, its intensity is beginning to worry the accelerator's first sponsors, the nuclear physicists. It could create a backlash, they fear, which could injure the entire field.

—**ELIOT MARSHALL**

Clark of NSF to Be V.P. of Bowling Green

Eloise E. Clark, an assistant director of the National Science Foundation, has been named vice president for academic affairs at Bowling Green State University in Ohio. Clark, who has been with the science foundation since 1969, was asked to resign last fall when Edward Knapp came in as head of NSF and made a clean sweep of staff at the top echelons (*Science*, 24 December, p. 1286).

Clark, who holds a Ph.D. in developmental biology from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, has been head of the NSF directorate for biological, behavioral, and social sciences since 1976. At Bowling Green she will be working with Paul Olscamp, its new president, to further develop the university's graduate programs.—**BARBARA J. CULLITON**

Stanford Appoints Panel to Review Mosher Case

Stanford University has appointed a three-member committee to review the expulsion of Steven Westley Mosher, a graduate student in the department of anthropology. Faculty members in the department voted 11–0 last February to expel Mosher for "illegal and seriously unethical conduct" while he was in China on a research visit (*Science*, 13 May, p. 692). Mosher appealed his dismissal to Norman K. Wessells, dean of the school of humanities and sciences, who decided to appoint the review panel.

The panel consists of Stanford emeritus professors Gordon Wright, a historian, and Ernest Hilgard, a psychologist, and University of Pennsylvania anthropologist Ward Hunt Goodenough. It has been asked to submit its report by 30 June.

Stanford has so far declined to make public the full charges against Mosher because it claims that to do so could endanger innocent people. The panel has been asked to write its report in such a way that the report itself or a summary document can be published, however.—**COLIN NORMAN**