

battle over the best way to manage basic research funding, there are pure political elements to the battle as well. As chairman of the subcommittee on health and the environment, Waxman's power over NIH is of a second order. His committee "authorizes" funds for the institutes which, in congressional terms, means it plays only an advisory role vis-à-vis the powerful "appropriations" committee which actually makes the final, real decisions about how much money Congress is going to spend on something. But once a specific item is mandated in authorizing legislation, some level of funding is bound to follow. Here is where Waxman is trying to draw his strength. "If we are going to stand on the sidelines and merely hope the Appropriations Committee will protect these biomedical research priorities we think are important, I submit we are abdicating our responsibility," Waxman declares.

Current predictions are that the NIH bill will come up soon after Congress reconvenes, at which time the Madigan-Broyhill substitute will officially be introduced. Although House aides talk of trying to work out various compromises between now and then, it is anybody's guess how much either side may be willing to yield.

Then, once a House bill is passed, the issues will have to be fought over in House-Senate conference with Senators whose enthusiasm for the Waxman approach is decidedly lacking. The Senate version of the NIH authorization bill, introduced by Orrin G. Hatch (R-Utah), contains a provision for a new arthritis institute but is, in general, substantially less prescriptive and detailed than the Waxman bill.

Furthermore, the question of whether the Hatch bill will even come to a Senate vote is presently uncertain because of a "hold" that Bob Packwood (R-Ore.) has placed on it. Packwood opposes the legislative provisions to proscribe fetal research which are in the NIH bills. Unless some compromise is reached there, the bill may never make it out of committee.

It would not be the first time that Congress has simply been unable to resolve its differences over NIH. As Representative Madigan has noted, "... an NIH reauthorization bill has not been signed into law since December 1980 when the House and the other body reached a stalemate in conference and threw out both [House and Senate] bills, replacing them with a simple reauthorization" to keep NIH in operation without legislating a change in its way of doing business. It could happen yet again.—BARBARA J. CULLITON

Ruckelshaus Picks New EPA Team

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) administrator William D. Ruckelshaus, in contrast to his predecessor, is selecting a team of senior officials with wide government experience. So far his choices for the agency's top posts have met with environmentalists' approval and have already bolstered morale within EPA.

While Anne McGill Burford brought in individuals who were Washington outsiders and were also mainly from industry, Ruckelshaus generally has chosen veterans of government, some of whom worked for Ruckelshaus when he was EPA administrator from 1970 to 1973.

Last week the Senate confirmed Alvin L. Alm as deputy administrator and Howard M. Messner as assistant administrator for administration. Alm, 46, a Democrat and now second in command at EPA, comes to the job from the Harvard Kennedy School of Government. He was EPA's chief of planning and management from 1973 to 1977. Later, he served as assistant secretary at the Department of Energy. Alm replaces John Hernandez, Jr., who plans to return to the University of New Mexico.

Messner served under Ruckelshaus in the early 1970's, and is taking on many of the same duties he had then, overseeing personnel and the budget. He was chairman of the government task force that led to EPA's creation. In recent years he has been a senior official at the Office of Management and Budget and, since February, he has been controller for the Energy Department. He succeeds John Horton, a wealthy entrepreneur from private industry.

Ruckelshaus had chosen others for top posts at the agency, but their nominations have not been formally submitted to the Senate by the White House as yet. Their confirmation is expected. Bernard D. Goldstein, chairman of the department of environmental and community medicine at Rutgers University, has been named to head EPA's office of research and development. He was a key witness for the federal government in 1977 when it pushed successfully for strict regulation of benzene.

Josephine S. Cooper is slated to become the assistant administrator for external affairs, which puts her in charge of liaison with Congress, the public, and the press. For the past 2 years, Cooper has been on the staff of Senate majority leader Howard Baker (R-Tenn.) and helped to draft amendments to hazardous waste legislation. Her proposed changes would have strengthened the regulations, but more moderately than those recommended by environmental groups such as the Sierra Club. Prior to her Senate job, Cooper served at EPA for 10 years in a variety of posts, eventually rising to a senior position in the office of research and development.

The job of assistant administrator for water is to be filled by John Ravan, a former EPA regional administrator under Ruckelshaus. Joseph Cannon is expected to remain assistant administrator for air, one of the few holdovers from the Burford administration. Cannon was an opponent of Burford's attempts to relax rules requiring lower lead levels in gasoline

—MARJORIE SUN

Toxicology Labs to Bar Financial Conflicts

The nation's most prestigious toxicology laboratories are getting ready to impose a new code of ethics and a program of quality control on themselves. "I don't know quite how it's all going to work yet," says Harold Brown, Jr., executive director of the National Association of Life Science Industries (NALS), the labs' Washington lobby. But NALS officials have decided already that an important part of the new code will be a requirement that laboratory officers have no financial stake in the products they are testing.

"This is going to be difficult for us," Brown says, "because most of our people are entrepreneurs who believe in the business and like to invest in it." But the industry recognizes that it has a problem and must avoid even the appearance of a conflict of interest. "The question is, 'How much stock can you own?' Maybe it won't be zero," Brown thinks. Perhaps lab owners and operators will be asked to hold only "de minimis" shares in com-

panies whose products they investigate.

NALSI announced this new effort at self-regulation during hearings on 27 July before the House agriculture subcommittee on research, chaired by Representative George Brown, Jr. (D-Calif.). It was the third in a series of hearings this year on the Environmental Protection Agency's record as a manager of pesticide health risks. "One of our most disturbing findings," the congressman claimed, "is the wholly inadequate attention paid to the auditing of laboratories conducting these vital experiments" which serve as the basis for chemical regulation.

Most of the inquiry on 27 July focused on gaps in the government's data on pesticides. Many of them appeared in 1976 when inspectors learned that a major lab near Chicago had turned in hundreds of invalid studies. The officers of that company, Industrial Bio-Test, Inc. (IBT), went on trial for fraud in May, sparking this new concern about lab integrity.

Because of this concern, NALSI's board appointed a committee in May to design an inspection program and write a code of ethics. The code is being drafted by Lloyd Hazelton, founder of the biggest of all the independent firms, Hazelton Laboratories. All members of NALSI will be expected to seek accreditation under the new rules, a first draft of which should be available in September. NALSI's executive director seemed to welcome the suggestion made by Representative Brown that the federal government might want to rely on data produced only by accredited companies. Among other things, this would give a boost to NALSI. By NALSI's own count, there are only 19 major testing laboratories. This is less than one-tenth the number cited by an earlier government witness at the hearings. NALSI regards the other nine-tenths as marginal.

The Environmental Protection Agency's chief pesticide official, Edwin Johnson, also spoke before the subcommittee. He described the steps he has taken to clean up the debris of the IBT scandal. He mentioned his decision of 11 July to notify the manufacturers of 35 compounds that they would have to replace IBT studies with new data or lose their marketing licenses (*Science*, 29 July, p. 442). Johnson said that "the major

uncertainties caused by invalid data have been brought under control or are well on their way to being resolved." However, he conceded that the EPA's laboratory audit program, which went into high gear after the discovery of the IBT case, shortly afterward slipped into lethargy. (At one point, a committee aide says, only 20 audits were being done per year, with only one and one-half full-time staffers to do the work.) Johnson said that one reason for the slowness to clean up the IBT problem was that "this responsibility fell on the agency in addition to existing tasks, without increased resources." The EPA is now "rebuilding" the lab audit program, Johnson says, and he hopes to carry out 50 to 60 audits next year.

—ELIOT MARSHALL

Science at State Under Scrutiny Again

The perennial debate over the State Department's ability to deal with science and technology has flared up again over an attempt to scuttle the requirement for an annual report on the subject by the Executive Branch to Congress.

Congressional and academic advocates of the importance of science and technology in diplomacy have rallied to the defense of Title V of the State Department's permanent authorization act, containing the reporting requirement. Title V was given the chop by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee after the Administration included it in a list of routine reporting requirements it wanted deleted from legislation. The main justification given for axing Title V was that it was redundant because the information was available elsewhere.

The action galvanized proponents of Title V, including House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman Clement J. Zablocki (D-Wis.), who happened to be the main patron of the provision in the first place. Title V was added to

*Leslie H. Brown, former number two man at OES, now at the Center for International Affairs at Harvard; Justin L. Bloom, former U.S. science attaché in Tokyo and London, now a consulting engineer; Rodney W. Nichols, executive vice president, Rockefeller University, and member of the OES advisory committee; Eugene B. Skolnikoff, director of the Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

the law in 1979 after a major demonstration of congressional concern about the State Department's shortcomings in giving science and technology its due in diplomacy.

In early August, Zablocki made Title V a main focus of his committee's oversight hearings on the State Department's Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs (OES). A panel of Administration witnesses on 3 August was generally supportive of OES, and the next day a panel of knowledgeable nongovernment witnesses* was sternly critical.

OES was established 10 years ago as a result of another surge of congressional choler and for most of the last decade has been a whipping boy of foreign policy experts.

Odds are that Title V will emerge fully restored from the House-Senate conference on the State authorization bill, which will take place after the summer recess. Title V, where input is mainly symbolic, has no passionate opponent in the Senate, and chairman Zablocki's zeal in its favor should suffice to rescue it.—JOHN WALSH

Chemical Ecology Group Formed

An interdisciplinary group of scientists having the combined interests of chemistry and ecology last month formed the International Society of Chemical Ecology (ISCE). Anticipating an initial enrollment of 350, the society could grow to 1000 members, says Gerald A. Rosenthal, professor of biology and toxicology at the University of Kentucky, Lexington, and a moving force behind the society.

"The heart of it is natural products," he says, referring to the new organization. But because one of its major aims is to attract a diversity of botanists, modelers, pharmacologists, and the like, ISCE's founders chose not to affiliate with any larger organization representing a single discipline, such as the American Chemical Society. ISCE has persuaded the publishers and editors of the *Journal of Chemical Ecology* to take a "more expansive view of chemical ecology" and also to become the society's official organ.

—JEFFREY L. FOX