

that on at least some occasions Goddard has acted precipitously: they cite in particular an occasion on which he publicly threatened criminal prosecution of a major drug firm, before he had the evidence to begin such a prosecution.

Dissatisfaction at the moment appears to rest more on Goddard's manners

than on his politics. Publicly, Goddard has Gardner's full backing, and, as far as the White House goes, right now the consumer vote that Goddard is attracting probably at least balances the industry campaign contributions he may be repelling. Nonetheless, how far the White House will go in permitting Goddard's assaults on industry is an

open question, and it would not be surprising if, in the next few months, he treaded a bit more softly. What he wants from now on he will have to fight for harder, either in public or behind the scenes. About all that can be said with certainty is that Goddard's honeymoon is drawing to a close.

—ELINOR LANGER

Oceanography: Congress Wants Cabinet Council and Study

The best manner of planning and directing the national effort in oceanography has long been a subject of debate within Congress and between Congress and the Executive Branch. Now, however, Congress, though still uncertain how the oceanography effort should be managed over the long run, is prescribing a provisional answer to this question and calling for a study intended to produce recommendations for a more definitive solution. But the congressional prescription is being critically appraised by some of the President's advisers, and its rejection is not inconceivable.

A cabinet-level oceanography council*, chaired by the Vice President, would be created under a bill on which congressional action was completed last week. The President has until 17 June to sign or veto the bill. The council, a temporary body unless made permanent by some later act of Congress, would advise the President on the planning and coordination of the overall national oceanographic effort—an effort which many people in and outside of Congress believe would be larger if it were given more attention at the highest echelons of government.

The bill creating the council also would require the President to appoint an oceanography commission to review

national needs in the field of marine science and engineering, recommend a comprehensive national program, and propose whatever reorganization of the governmental apparatus for oceanography it finds desirable. The commission would consist of 15 regular members drawn from government, academic circles, and industry and four advisory members from Congress. It would have 18 months to prepare its report and submit it to the President, via the new council, and to the Congress. The commission would then disband. Four months after the commission had reported, the council, too, would disband, unless Congress had directed otherwise.

A declaration of policy and objectives is included in the bill establishing the two temporary bodies. It calls for the United States, through direct government action and by support of industry and other private endeavor, to keep its place as a leader in marine science and marine resource development. The declaration emphasizes, among other things, the importance of advancing education and training programs in oceanography and of developing improved methods and equipment for undersea research, exploration, recovery of resources, and transmission of energy.

This new oceanography legislation is the product of a congressional compromise. The final bill, fashioned by House-Senate conferees from the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the Senate Commerce Committee, was passed by the House on 26 May and by the Senate on 2 June, in each case by voice vote and without

opposition. The original House and Senate bills, passed last year, were quite different. The House measure had directed the President to appoint a study commission but did not provide for a council. The Senate bill provided for a council but left to the President's discretion the setting up of a study commission.

Senator Warren G. Magnuson, the Washington Democrat who chairs the Senate Commerce Committee, noted, in explaining the House-Senate compromise, that the House conferees had questioned the wisdom of including the cabinet-level council. They did so, he said, for two reasons: (i) establishment of the council might prejudice one of the issues to be studied by the commission, by appearing to indicate the kind of governmental structure for oceanography preferred by the Congress; and (ii) inclusion of the council against the advice of administration witnesses who had testified on the bill might lead to a Presidential veto.

Magnuson suggested that the House-Senate compromise had removed the basis for those two objections. Making the council's life largely co-terminous with that of the study commission makes it clear, Magnuson said, that the council's purpose is simply to coordinate current oceanographic activities until a final federal governmental framework is achieved. He said he expected the council to prove itself worthy of becoming a part of that final framework. As for the possibility of a veto, Magnuson observed that President Johnson himself, when he was Senate majority leader and chairman of the Senate's special space committee, laid the groundwork for the national space program by obtaining passage of the National Aeronautics and Space Act, which included a provision for a National Aeronautics and Space Council. "His wisdom then will be matched by similar wisdom as we meet our responsibilities in knowing and using that 70 percent of the earth's surface that is covered by water," Magnuson said.

* In addition to the Vice President, the council would be comprised of the Secretaries of the Departments of State, Treasury, Interior, Commerce, Navy, and Health, Education, and Welfare; the chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission; the director of the National Science Foundation; and such other officials as the President might choose to designate. In case of "unavoidable absence," the council members could be represented at council meetings by alternates, who would have to be officials appointed to their agency posts by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The analogy drawn between the space council and the oceanography council may or may not be effective in convincing President Johnson that he should sign the bill. As a former chairman of the space council he has been able to judge at first hand the effectiveness of that body. Some people question the efficacy of any cabinet-level council, believing that cabinet members and agency heads are far too busy to give much of their personal attention to the work of such bodies. Without attempting to pass judgment on the effectiveness of the space council, it is fair to observe that, given the atmosphere of near-panic created by sputnik, the space and missile programs were assured of plenty of attention at the highest levels of government, regardless of whether or not a cabinet-level council was created.

Actually, if the oceanography bill does escape veto, its good fortune may be explained partly by a reluctance on the part of the President to thwart the bill's sponsors and partly by the fact that the council would not be created as a permanent body. As the situation appeared late last week, however, the possibility of a veto could not be dismissed, though Magnuson and other sponsors of the measure appeared fairly confident that Johnson would sign the bill. Bureau of the Budget staff people responsible for reviewing proposals on government organization were understood to have decided to recommend a veto.

On the other hand, the Navy Department and at least one other agency interested in oceanography already had decided to recommend approval of the measure. The Navy's approval seemed especially significant, since Robert W. Morse, assistant secretary of the Navy for research and development, is chairman of the Interagency Committee on Oceanography (ICO). Morse had previously opposed the council proposal, contending that, if the council supplanted ICO, oceanography might receive less attention than it had been getting. If ICO were not supplanted, duplication and confusion might result, Morse said. The fact that, under the revised proposal, the council would be a temporary body has caused him to see in the measure more good than harm.

Last August, during hearings before the House Subcommittee on Oceanography, witnesses explained why the administration was opposed to the establishment of a council. Donald F. Hor-

nig, the President's science adviser and director of the White House Office of Science and Technology, said that existing arrangements for planning and interagency coordination in the field of oceanography were adequate.

Under the Federal Council for Science and Technology, a body always chaired by the President's science adviser, are 11 interagency committees, one of which is ICO, Hornig noted. ICO is made up largely of officials who direct those bureaus and divisions within their respective agencies which are most concerned with oceanography. Only two of these officials, however, hold agency posts of sufficient rank to require Presidential appointment with the advice and consent of the Senate. Those two are Morse and Vice Admiral H. Arnold Karo, deputy administrator of the Commerce Department's new Environmental Science Services Administration (ESSA). (Morse leaves the government 1 July to become president of Case Institute of Technology. Robert A. Frosch, now deputy director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency, will succeed him as assistant secretary. It will be up to Hornig to decide whether to appoint Frosch or someone else to the chairmanship of ICO.)

The President's Science Advisory Committee, particularly through its special panel on oceanography, also is giving attention to the advancement of marine science and marine technology. Hornig, as chairman of PSCA, is able to see that its work is related to the dominant concerns of the Federal Council and the interagency committees. Moreover, OST itself is concerned with the advancement of oceanography, though only one permanent staff man has been working in this field full time.

Duplication Feared

"The functions of the proposed national oceanographic council would largely duplicate those of the Federal Council and the ICO," Hornig told the House subcommittee. He indicated that establishment of the new council would take oceanography out of the OST-Federal Council structure and raise a fundamental question about the administration of the government science policy.

"The bill raises in principle the desirability of establishing a series of national councils which report directly to the President," Hornig said. "This means of organizing to deal with problems of science and technology would

pose complicated problems for both the President and the agencies themselves."

If President Johnson does take strong exception to establishing an oceanography council and vetoes the bill, there is reason to believe that the sponsors of the measure will simply drop the council provision and have the bill reenacted in a form providing for only the study commission and the declaration of policy and objectives. Some of the sponsors, including Representative Alton Lennon, North Carolina Democrat and chairman of the House Subcommittee on Oceanography, regard the commission as the bill's heart. No one seems much disposed to tilt at windmills over the council issue. Congress is just now regaining the initiative in the field of oceanography, an initiative which was lost when President Kennedy, by pocket veto, killed an oceanography bill in 1962.

That measure would have created not a council but a special oceanography staff within OST. The staff would have had the responsibility of establishing and maintaining a comprehensive, coordinated oceanography program. Although no direct explanation of the veto was made public, Kennedy and his advisers apparently felt that the operating responsibilities the bill would have entrusted to OST were not compatible with the Office's advisory role.

Another major consideration believed to have figured in the veto decision was a belief that establishment of the special oceanography staff would lead to demands for special attention for other fields of science. In other words, while the 1962 bill and the current legislation are quite different and pose some different issues of principle, one question of principle is common to both—Should oceanography, like space and atomic energy, be singled out from other fields of science and technology and accorded special treatment?

However that question is ultimately resolved, the dissatisfaction of many qualified (though often interested) observers with the present coordinating and decision-making machinery for oceanography suggests strongly a certain complacency in the administration's assessment of that machinery. The classic argument for a council is that its members, being the heads of their agencies and departments, would have a good chance of making their decisions on the size and apportionment of the oceanography budget stick. Only the President, together with his

Budget Bureau, or the Congress could override them. ICO develops a budget plan each year, but it is not the ICO members, but the heads of their agencies, who finally decide how much money to request for use in oceanography.

Hornig has identified one weakness of ICO and other interagency committees which undoubtedly would be shared by a cabinet-level council. In his view, interagency bodies are constitutionally incapable of developing a sharp critical faculty with respect to the performance of the agencies they represent. Hornig believes, however, that the principal problem in oceanography is not one of organization but of better defining what the substance of the national oceanographic effort should be.

This problem of defining an appropriate program has been under review by a PSAC panel headed by Gordan J. F. MacDonald, deputy director of the Institute of Geophysics and Planetary Physics at the University of California, Los Angeles. The panel's report, recently completed, is, or soon will be, in the hands of the President. Although to follow the panel study with one by the proposed commission might risk some duplication, it is no less true that the commission could take advantage of the panel's findings and pursue its own studies in greater breadth or depth than the panel was able to.

While the MacDonald panel, to judge from its mandate, probably has not overlooked the question of governmental structure, the commission would be able to consider this matter more thoroughly and from some different perspectives. Such questions as whether or not it would be appropriate to create a new agency consolidating at least some of the oceanography functions now scattered among various existing agencies might be exhaustively explored. The commission could include up to five government members—the MacDonald panel included none—who might participate effectively in such an exploration.

In any event, given the apparent willingness of the oceanography bill's sponsors to accept half a loaf, presumably there will be a commission study, whether or not a council is created. At the moment, the long-range outlook on the makeup and management of the national oceanography program is still hazy, but an effort is being made to reach a vantage point from which the view will be clearer.

—LUTHER J. CARTER

Editorial Board of Science Meets

The Editorial Board of *Science* convened 26 May in the Board Room of AAAS with the following members present: Robert L. Bowman, Joseph W. Chamberlain, Emil W. Haury, Alexander Hollaender, Willard F. Libby, Everett I. Mendelsohn, Neal E. Miller, John R. Pierce, Alexander Rich, and Clarence M. Zener.

The purposes of the meeting were (i) to familiarize board members with crucial features of the editing and production of *Science*, (ii) to discuss means for improving content and procedures, and (iii) to explore new ways in which the Editorial Board can participate.

It is anticipated that annual meetings will be held.

Announcements

Temple University has established a college of allied **health professions**. The college will accept students who have completed 2 years of liberal arts work at Temple or other institutions. It will absorb the school of medical technology, which was established in 1939, and the physical therapy program which is currently being organized. Bachelor's degrees will be offered in these areas and in nursing, occupational therapy, and medical records library science.

The **Stony Brook** campus of the State University of New York this fall will initiate a system of small residential colleges of 200 to 400 students. John S. Toll, Stony Brook's president, said last month in his inaugural address that the new arrangement is designed to allow undergraduates, graduate students, and members of the faculty and staff to live together as a "community of scholars." Commuting students will also be able to participate in the programs.

In announcing the program Toll said: "It has been fashionable to deplore the dangers of size in the great state universities; however, we think the critical question is not one of size but one of organization." The colleges at Stony Brook will be organized with a degree of autonomy to plan and manage their own programs. Each will have its own group of faculty associates who will participate in the intellectual life of the college, and at least one senior fellow or master will

live there after the first year. Each college will also have a student government and extracurricular activities.

The university's first seven colleges will be set in residential quadrangles already built on campus. Plans call for increasing the number of individual colleges as enrollments grow and residence halls are added.

Toll also announced during his address that a departmental honors program will be instituted this fall; and at the same time the first courses in Latin and Greek will be offered at the University Center.

Meeting Notes

Education in the neurological sciences will be discussed at a conference 13–16 November in White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia. The work sessions will be centered around pre- and postdoctoral neuroscience training, pre- and postdoctoral clinical training, and the highly gifted student. Attendance will be limited. Sponsors: American Academy of Neurology, American Neurological Association. (J. L. O'Leary, Department of Neurology, Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, Missouri 63110)

Scientists in the News

Edward G. Sherburne, Jr., director of public understanding of science at AAAS, will succeed **Watson Davis** as director of Science Service, Inc., effective 15 June. Davis, who has headed Science Service since 1929, has reached the organization's mandatory retirement age of 70.

Alfred B. Chaet, a visiting research scholar at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, has been appointed professor of biology and associate dean of science, mathematics, and technology at the new University of West Florida, Pensacola, which is scheduled to admit its first class, of juniors, in 1967. Chaet has been at Scripps since 1964, on leave from American University, Washington, where he is a biology professor.

William V. Wright, Jr., has been named director of the Office of Science and Engineering in the Environmental Science Services Administration. He had been vice president of Electro Optical Systems, Pasadena, California.