

Letters

Nuclear Power Regulation

In a News and Comment article of 30 January (p. 360), Philip M. Boffey characterizes our recent study of the validity of state legislative and initiative measures aimed at halting the spread of nuclear power plants as "an advocacy brief" and repeatedly suggests that we reached our conclusion that such measures are invalid in order to serve the needs of the study's sponsor, the Atomic Industrial Forum, Inc.

Boffey did not discuss the article with us and thus fails to convey a full view of our position. He does not, for example, note that we confine our finding of invalidity to the state measures as currently drafted, nor that we concluded that there is a substantial area for state public utility commission regulation of nuclear power plants.

We would not quarrel with Harold P. Green's notion (as reported by Boffey) that state laws applicable to all forms of power, not just nuclear, would have a better chance of survival; indeed we suggest it.

The short answer to Boffey is that our article is not a brief; it is an objective study of a narrow legal problem. And the conclusions are ours—not the Atomic Industrial Forum's. Those conclusions should not be altogether surprising in view of the fact that the Supreme Court has already ruled that state regulation of nuclear power plants is preempted. Boffey is simply wrong when he states that the Supreme Court did not rule on the merits of the Northern States Power Company case.

However, the most depressing aspect of the matter is Boffey's suggestion that sponsorship by an organization like the Forum precludes an independent, academic inquiry into a subject. Such an approach to scholarly inquiry is unworthy of the AAAS. Our report is freely available to be read and judged on its merits, and we expect it to be judged by the severe standards of scholarship. Any statement of "what the law is," as Justice Holmes pointed out long ago, is a prediction of how courts will behave. Our prediction may turn out to be wrong, but that will not detract from its validity as an analysis of the subject.

ARTHUR W. MURPHY
D. BRUCE LA PIERRE

*School of Law, Columbia University,
New York 10027*

I did not mean to imply that Murphy and La Pierre tailored their conclusions to meet the needs of their sponsor. Rather, I consider their study "an advocacy brief" in the sense that it was commissioned by, paid for, and distributed by the Atomic Industrial Forum, the trade association of the nuclear industry. The Forum would almost certainly not have commissioned a study by scholars whose findings were apt to undermine its own position. Nor would it have issued a press release touting their findings.—PHILIP M. BOFFEY

Disclosure of Grant Applications

The suggestion of Moore, Ladda, and Rapp (Letters, 16 Jan., p. 136) that the names of those who request copies of grant applications be published is, unfortunately or not, not supported by law.

The Freedom of Information Act, as amended (PL 93-502), nowhere requires any list of inquirers to be kept, nor does it require the inquirer to identify himself. Although several agencies have instituted registers of inquirers for administrative convenience, a refusal to identify oneself is not, under the Act, grounds for rejection of the inquiry.

Further, publication of a list of those requesting copies of grant applications, in *Science* or elsewhere, would seem to be in violation of the Privacy Act of 1974 (PL 93-579) and would subject the federal official releasing the list to a fine of up to \$5000.

T. D. C. KUCH

*8419 Idylwood Road,
Vienna, Virginia 22180*

The recent decision of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals that grant applications to the National Institutes of Health for research support are not exempt from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act raises a serious practical question with respect to patents that is not discussed in the letters of 21 November 1975 (p. 736) or 16 January.

If it is required that copies of grant applications be made available to anyone who asks, it appears that, according to interpretations of the Patent and Trademark Office and the courts, a grant application is a "printed publication," as that term is

used in the patent laws. If this is true, then a potential statutory bar against issuance of a valid patent is created by the filing of a grant application, unless an application for a patent directed to the same subject matter is filed within 1 year.

Until there is a decision to the contrary, the prudent course is to ensure that a patent application is filed before the first anniversary of the grant application. This will likely burden the Patent and Trademark Office with numerous speculative patent applications based on little or no data, followed by a series of continuation applications, if and when supporting data are generated.

L. PAUL BURD

*Burd, Braddock & Bartz,
1300 Foshay Tower,
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402*


Heart Disease Prevention Trials

In the article by Gina Bari Kolata "Prevention of heart disease: Clinical trials at what cost?" (News and Comment, 21 Nov. 1975, p. 764), a number of cost estimates are placed in confusing apposition. The costs for the Lipid Research Clinic Primary Prevention Trial and the Multiple Risk Factor Intervention Trial (MRFIT) are estimates of 8-year totals, whereas the National Heart and Lung Institute (NHLI) budget cited is an annual total. In fact, the cost of MRFIT is not disproportionate to the total budget of the Institute. Its annual costs of \$10 million to \$13 million have been approximately 3 to 4 percent of the recent annual NHLI budgets (\$325 million in fiscal year 1975). Prudent management has kept the actual expenses within this budget despite continuing rapid inflation and increase of personnel and material costs which are beyond the control of the Institute. Although corners have had to be cut, the scientific integrity of MRFIT has not been compromised.

A major charge by Congress to NHLI is to translate newly gained research knowledge into effective measures for prevention of heart disease and into the best treatment of heart patients. The MRFIT study was carefully designed to maximize practical utility and minimize what would necessarily be a major commitment of funds and scientific resources. More than 360,000 potential participants have been screened and final recruitment has been completed of 12,000 men who have volunteered for random assignment to the two treatment groups and expressed willingness to participate through the 6 years of follow-up activity. The cooperating investigators in the clinics, laboratories, and coordinating

SCIENCE, VOL. 191


The world's most complete High Voltage Electrophoresis System ...and it's SAFE, TOO!



SAVANT'S HIGH VOLTAGE ELECTROPHORESIS ENCLOSURE WITH TWO LUCITE TANKS.

**A fully integrated ELECTRICAL and
FIRE PROTECTED chamber.**

- ☐ Fire Detection and CO₂ Extinguishing System.
- ☐ Audible Alarm and Remote Alert Signal.
- ☐ Electrical Interlocks for Primary and High Voltage Protection.
- ☐ Ground Fault Detection and Circuit Interruption.
- ☐ Flow-Thru Ventilation for Vapor Disposal.
- ☐ Cooling Water Flow Monitor and Visual Indicator.
- ☐ Unobstructed Visibility.
- ☐ Dimensions: 36" Wide x 39" Deep x 80" High.



Savant HVE Systems are "PROVEN"
in over one thousand laboratories
around the world. Request cat. #8036.

**Savant
Instruments, Inc.**
221 Park Avenue Hicksville, N.Y. 11801
(516) 935-8774

Circle No. 197 on Readers' Service Card

center are successfully coping with the variety of problems which are bound to develop in such a large pioneering project. In terms of the basic scientific value, scientific excellence, ethics, community and scientists' cooperation, administration, and fiscal prudence, MRFIT is maintaining successful progress toward its objectives.*

JOHN C. CASSEL

*Department of Epidemiology, School of
Public Health, University of
North Carolina, Chapel Hill 27515*

WILLIAM INSULL, JR.

*Center for Prevention of Premature
Arteriosclerosis, Rockefeller University,
New York 10021*

DAVID JENKINS

*Department of Behavioral Epidemiology,
School of Medicine, Boston University,
Boston 02118*

DONOVAN THOMPSON

*Department of Biostatistics,
School of Public Health,
University of Washington, Seattle 98105*

PARK W. WILLIS, III

*Section of Cardiology, School of
Medicine, University of Michigan,
Ann Arbor 48104*

CHARLOTTE M. YOUNG

*Cornell University, Ithaca,
New York 14850*

*The undersigned are nonfederal scientists who comprise the MRFIT Policy Advisory Board.

Health Statistics

Horacio Fabrega's article, "The need for an ethnomedical science" (19 Sept. 1975, p. 969) and the comments by Bergner *et al.* (Letters, 9 Jan., p. 26) were indeed timely. This year's AAAS annual meeting included a symposium, Health Status Indexes—Their Role in Tomorrow, which addressed the same issues. Information was presented about the current applications of health indicators, such as morbidity and mortality, within the social indicator framework. Discussion focused on the methodology of measuring positive aspects of health, with implications for developing health indexes for policy purposes.

Measures of health are now becoming sufficiently developed to assist in the decision-making process. Various research efforts during the last 50 years have produced significant literature published in a variety of respected professional journals on the development of measurable concepts of health and disease. Much of this research has been supported by the U.S. federal health establishment, as well as by the United Nations and the World Health Organization.

To coordinate the dissemination of this information and to encourage communication and cooperation among health status researchers, the National Center for Health Statistics, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has established the Clearinghouse on Health Indexes. The Clearinghouse prepares annotated bibliographies of current information related to health measurement and generates bibliographies on specific subjects. These services are available without charge.

PENNIFER ERICKSON

*Division of Analysis,
Clearinghouse on Health Indexes,
National Center for Health Statistics,
Rockville, Maryland 20852*

Climate Research

Among the host of warnings of environmental degradation now facing the public is the claim that disaster is in store if mankind fails to realize that his well-being depends on a stable global climate and that climatic change, either natural or man-made, is a real threat which must be attended to today.

As is true in the case of many environmental advocacy causes, some claims are gross exaggerations, thereby lending less credibility to the remainder. In addition, due in large measure to the degree of ignorance regarding the fundamentals of the nature of climatic variability and change, disagreements among climate experts concerning the plausibility of possible traumatic effects of climatic change have caused confusion on the part of the lay-public and within government circles, making it difficult to assess the true state of affairs.

However, these circumstances are hardly sufficient to account for the lack of federal funding of climate research in response, not just to the clamor of the doomsday prophets, but also to a series of highly authoritative and respectable reports (1), all of which have reiterated the need for a major increase in climate research activities. No doubt the demise last spring of the National Climate Program (2) can in part be ascribed to the nation's economic difficulties, but there is another more trenchant cause for the problem, specifically a failure to demonstrate to funders of such research the practical benefits that can result within a time frame of relevance to their mandate. For example, at its most ambitious, climate research would generate untold benefits if it could lead to a predictive capability; at present, however, this is more a hope than an expectation. Research funding with such an objective would be long-term, high-risk, and have a