

the attention of Lee's office involved a scientist excluded from a HEW panel because his father-in-law had subscribed to a Jewish Communist newspaper in the time before his daughter was married to the scientist.

According to other accounts, a good many of the people barred from panels are older scientists who were politically active in the 1930's, some of whom were members of student or other groups later put on the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations. There are also people reported to have been barred from panels because of political activities of their parents or other relatives.

Frederick H. Schmidt, the HEW Internal Security Director, explained that his office relies on the FBI for loyalty or security investigations and on the Civil Service Commission for investigations on questions of suitability. He explained that his office has a staff of only 16 people for a department with 100,000 employees. Schmidt said there were no written guidelines for the HEW investigating staff which made "primarily a common sense judgment" in dealing with cases. When asked if his office would make actual recommendations about whether a scientist should be cleared for a panel, he said, "I'm primarily a fact-finding organization but I will still make recommendations."

A key man in the HEW security and suitability review process is Bernard Sisco, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Administration. Sisco meets every Friday with Schmidt to discuss personnel cases. If he thinks the case is questionable, Sisco will take it to the HEW Under Secretary. (Apparently, cases involving HEW panel members rarely, if ever, are taken all the way up to the HEW Secretary.)

Sisco, who has served in his present position since last September, said that he didn't know of anyone who had been denied panel membership on political grounds. "Just because a man is a liberal doesn't mean that there's anything against him," he commented, "there are all kinds of liberals." Sisco said that Socialist party members or past members of the Communist party could be appointed but that he could not appoint current members of the Communist or Fascist parties or anyone else who believes in violent overthrow of the government. Sisco said that HEW was checking more for "suitability" than for security. He said that if it was decided that

an individual should not be approached, HEW would in the great majority of cases turn to someone else rather than try to elicit more clarifying information about the unsatisfactory individual. Other HEW officials also said that the general practice is to appoint acceptable scientists rather than trying to fight through an effort to clear a scientist who had been rejected for security or suitability reasons.

Opinion on Security System

The scientists and scientific agency officials interviewed on the HEW check for advisers were almost unanimous in criticizing the system. "I've talked to Secretary Finch about this; I've expressed our serious concern over this practice on NIH," said NIH Direc-

tor Robert Q. Marston, "... our business is getting the best scientific advice we can. Anything that gets in the way of that, we're against." NIH Deputy Director John F. Sherman said: "It is a serious impediment. I know of no case where a man's political actions would have any bearing on his work. What bothers me is the sub-rosa, un-American character of this system."

When queried by *Science*, HEW Secretary Robert Finch said that he was "looking into" the matter of security and suitability checks for HEW advisory groups and that he would like to do away with security procedures for employees in some parts of HEW. However, this seems like it may be merely one of the hundreds of things a new HEW Secretary has to look

HEW Examines Cancer Institute Report

Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Robert Finch may be taking a hard look at a National Cancer Institute (NCI) research report on an investigation of the long-term role of a number of pesticide chemicals, including DDT, on tumor formation in mice. An advance copy of the report, soon to be released in the June issue of the *Journal of the National Cancer Institute*, was rushed to Finch last week. Observers say that the study could possibly trigger the invoking of the Delaney Amendment to effectively limit or ban the use of DDT.

The Delaney Amendment, sponsored by Rep. James Delaney (D-N.Y.), which, so far, has never been successfully applied to remove pesticide chemicals from the market, was passed by Congress in 1958. It gives the HEW Secretary authority to rule that no food additives can be deemed safe if they have been found to induce cancer when ingested by man or animals. Authorities in this case say the real question is whether the National Cancer Institute report provides substantial evidence to link DDT pesticides with carcinomas, and whether Finch will be disposed to use the study to invoke the Delaney Amendment. If such should be the case, Food and Drug Administration Commissioner Herbert L. Ley would be delegated responsibility for enforcing the ruling.

The study, under way since 1964, tested the long-term toxic effects of some 130 chemical compounds, at

high dosages, on approximately 20,000 mice. An analysis suggests that some of these compounds at these high dosages, were associated with a significant elevation in tumor development, particularly in the liver, and, to a lesser extent, in the lung and in lymphoid organs.

Evaluation of the results of oral administration of certain of these compounds revealed that 11 were "clearly tumorigenic," at high dosages, for the strains of mice used; results for another group of 20 compounds are still inconclusive and will require further evaluation. Eighty-nine compounds did not give significant indication of tumorigenicity.

In the report, National Cancer Institute scientists indicate that major evidence of tumorigenicity in animals exposed to experimental compounds raises a number of significant and not easily answered questions. It is often difficult to determine whether the tumors are malignant or benign. It is not easy to judge experimental data unless several species of animals are used. It is difficult to interpret tests on the effects of single chemicals when man's environment includes a highly complex series of chemicals.

While NCI scientists indicate that their study does not produce conclusive evidence, it seems likely that the study will generate considerable interest, particularly if it paves the way for regulation of the use of DDT.

—MARTI MUELLER