

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