

Nor is the government able to identify the poorer performers and target them for close and continuous scrutiny. . . .” Among other things, the NAS report says the government should “conduct more comprehensive and frequent inves-

tigations of OCS accidents (and near misses)” to learn about their causes and effects.

At the moment, Watt is pausing to consider whether or not he should proceed with his West Coast sale (number

53) as planned. A decision is expected in 2 weeks. That will give him time to read and consider the OCS report, which he had not seen when Representative Mofett quizzed him about it last April.

—ELIOT MARSHALL

NIOSH Under Siege

The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) is under siege these days. Two weeks ago, the Reagan Administration announced plans to split up the agency's Washington staff and transfer its scientists to Cincinnati and its administrators to Atlanta to be closer to its parent, the Centers for Disease Control (CDC). On another front, the agency's proposal to study workers at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard for possible chromosomal damage from ionizing radiation has been denied by Admiral Hyman G. Rickover, deputy assistant secretary for naval reactors for the Department of Energy.

CDC, which has never warmly embraced its Washington member of the family, apparently wants tighter control over NIOSH. Reportedly at the suggestion of CDC director, William Foege, NIOSH is being called home “in order to increase administrative efficiency,” the Administration announced. To ensure that control, a CDC veteran was recently named the new director of NIOSH—J. Donald Millar, formerly director of the environmental health center.

Officials from NIOSH, where morale is already sagging after the ouster of director Anthony Robbins earlier this year, say that the transfer is just one more attempt to diminish the agency's importance. They speculate that the Administration's ultimate intent is to phase out the institute, which is responsible for recommending changes in workplace health standards to the regulatory agencies.

“The transfer is supposed to move us into the mainstream of research,” says Paul Streudler, a senior scientist for radiation. “Is that the Chattahoochee?”

“The move is, in effect, obliterating NIOSH,” says Robbins, who is now an aide to Representative John Dingell (D-Mich.). “CDC has never accepted NIOSH as part of the fold.”

As the plans stand now, 50 scientists from the criteria documents branch, which develops regulatory recommendations, will be transferred to Cincinnati where NIOSH already has field offices and laboratories. About 100 administrators and staff will be heading for Atlanta. There is some talk among officials that the group as a whole might try to resist the uprooting.

The relocation will make implementation of workplace standards much tougher, Streudler says. “Rules get made in a social and political framework. We have to take the science and sell it [to the regulatory agencies and to legislators]. I'm not going to be able to do much good if I'm in Atlanta or Cincinnati.”

The news about NIOSH drew strong protests from two Democratic congressmen, David Obey of Wisconsin and Joseph Gaydos of Pennsylvania. Obey, who is a member of the house appropriations subcommittee on labor, health, education and welfare, says, “Worker health will not be a

priority with CDC.” Moving NIOSH to Atlanta would be a “disaster,” he says.

With NIOSH officials sending out résumés, looking for realtors and generally wondering what the future will bring next, science at the agency has been pretty much put on hold, including the proposed study of Portsmouth shipyard workers. NIOSH, with the help of Secretary of Health and Human Services Richard Schweiker, has been trying to persuade Rickover since last January to allow the cytogenetics study to proceed. The study would examine 266 workers and 266 controls for any cellular abnormalities that might be associated with exposure to low-level ionizing radiation from the nuclear-powered ships. NIOSH says the study would require 1 to 2 hours of a worker's time to collect blood and sperm samples. The data may ultimately help scientists to determine if any chromosomal damage found can be used as a predictor of disease later in life.

Schweiker wrote Rickover in May, “As long as there is any doubt about the long-term consequences of exposure to ionizing radiation, it is the opinion of NIOSH that studies which can further define the absence or presence of such effects should be performed.”

Rickover replied in a letter, dated 3 June, “This statement represents one of the more all-encompassing justification statements I can recall seeing. Indeed, the same thing can be said in support of studying every substance or experience that human beings face. By deleting the words, ionizing radiation, you could substitute milk to motherhood to justify a study of their long-term consequences. The proposed cytogenetic study clearly falls into the category of research for the sake of research.”

Rickover concluded the letter by asking Schweiker to cancel the study in the interests of the workers and “the national defense work that must be performed there.”

The original concern about the effects of ionizing radiation stems from a study reported by a Boston researcher, Thomas Najarian, in 1978. Najarian, after examining death certificates of shipyard workers, concluded that those who were exposed to low-level radiation suffered twice the expected rate of cancer and have fivefold greater chance of leukemia. Later, under contract with NIOSH, Najarian repeated the study with better data supplied by the Navy. The second study repudiated the earlier findings.

These two investigations only were mortality studies, NIOSH officials say. With the wealth of data on shipyard workers from the previous studies, they argue they have a rare opportunity to conduct a cytogenetic study with relative ease.

With NIOSH in disarray and its political base eroding, agency officials will have a tough time convincing the Navy to let them on base. For the time being, they have bigger problems to tackle.—MARJORIE SUN