tion. *Percent* and *per mille* and *parts per million* are easy and have convenient symbols: %, $^0/_{00}$, and ppm. It is true that it is inconvenient to write 0.015%, or $0.15^0/_{00}$, or concentration of 1.5×10^{-4}, or 150 ppm. To write *15 mg percent,* which is present custom in our clinical laboratories, seems to me not much of an improvement. *Fifteen milligrams percent* does run off the tongue quite smoothly. *One hundred fifty parts per million,* however, runs just as smoothly and is only 12 percent longer.

Now I have an invention. It is to use, instead, the East Indian word for 100,000, namely, *lac. Fifteen milligrams percent* then becomes *15 per lac.*

R. R. NEWELL
Stanford University School of Medicine, San Francisco, California

Insect Control by Radiation

In the article "Current status of insect control by radiation" [*Science* **124**, 1011 (1956)], Charles C. Hassett gives a table of costs per ton for a 50,000-roentgen dose from various sources in which some of the data appear to be misleading. In particular, I think that the figures given for electron accelerators are a little unrepresentative and, in this connection, I would like to call attention to data given by Wolfgang Huber [*Western Canner and Packer* (Aug. 1956)]. Huber shows that, for a dose of 50,000 roentgens (approximately 0.05 Megarep) at 50-percent utilization, machines are available that can treat more than 100 tons per hour at a cost of 40¢ per ton or less.

I should also like to point out that there appears to be a discrepancy in Hassett's stated cost of the cobalt-60 irradiation unit: "$10 per ton (5¢ per pound)."

M. C. CROWLEY-MILLING
Accelerator Laboratory, Metropolitan-Vickers Electrical Company, Manchester, England

The article by Huber, referred to by M. C. Crowley-Milling, appeared after my article had been written and submitted for clearance; hence, it could not be included in my discussion. The data cited actually reinforced my conclusions: that these machines will soon make large-scale radiation economically feasible.

With reference to Crowley-Milling's second point, the manuscript submitted to *Science* shows the correct values: "$10 per ton (0.5¢ per pound)." This typographic error unfortunately passed both *Science's* proof reading and mine.

CHARLES C. HASSETT
Entomology Branch, Chemical Warfare Laboratories, Army Chemical Center, Maryland