have declined from 52 percent in 1979 to 27 percent in 1983. To continue deliberating whether the biomedical research community should devote $45 million to the self-resolving "problem" of animal use (as legislation currently under congressional consideration would do) is to fiddle while Rome burns.

DOUGLAS M. BOWDEN
Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, School of Medicine, University of Washington, Seattle 98195

References

1. Committee on Laboratory Animal Facilities and Resources, Institute of Laboratory Animal Resources, National Academy of Sciences, *National Survey of Laboratory Animal Facilities and Resources* (National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md., 1980), pp. 20–21.
2. *Primate Rep.* (No. 8) (1981), p. 31.
3. *Fed. Am. Soc. Exp. Biol. Newsl.* **15**, 1 (1982).

Cost of New Journals

I write to seek discussion of a growing problem for our university and institutional libraries. Many of these libraries, caught between increasingly restrictive budgets and an uncontrolled growth of primary literature sources, are turning to both conventional and user-oriented fund-raising campaigns. This tactic may only exacerbate the problem.

The new sources are largely proprietary, for-profit ventures that depend upon the free, goodwill services of the very universities that must pay inflated rates for the final product, a journal or symposium. Journals are a particular concern because subscription implies a long-term investment. All of these journals carry heavy page charges for the authors as well.

Printers ("publishers" is hardly accurate in these cases) exploit universities for editors, charge for publication costs, and distribute thin volumes at exceedingly high cost to university and institutional libraries. Hard-pressed libraries in turn are soliciting students, alumni, and faculty for funds to maintain and expand the market for these profitable ventures. The scholarly community should seek to limit the growth and profitability of these ventures.

In some cases new journals truly fill a much-needed gap. Editors of both reputable society-based and university press journals must compete for manuscripts with the new journals. The more rigorous journals, proprietary or not, impose high standards that lead to accompanying delays for revision. When challenged by the 4-months-to-publication cycle of quickie, nearly unrefereed proprietary journals, editorial boards may compromise standards to attract sufficient manuscripts. A general dilution of quality in published research is certain. As scholars and scientists, we must protect the integrity of our disciplines and our libraries. I propose the following.

1) Universities and other scholarly institutions should impose a nominal fee for the services of editors and associate editors of proprietary journals. After all, the time and services of these persons is already paid by the institutions. The concept of public service is stretched when those services provide a healthy margin of profitability to a private company. These fees would be accumulated into a fund to support library acquisitions. This procedure would restrict the prospect of profitability to the printers and assist libraries in keeping up with the new journal flood. I suggest $2000 to $5000 per year for primary editors and $1000 per year for associate editors and board members. Society, university, and not-for-profit publishers would be exempt from a fee. Those printers who currently pay honoraria for editorial services could shift the payment from the editor to the institution.

2) Committees of evaluators could simply discount publications in proprietary journals in much the same way popular publications are discounted in scholarly evaluations. This would be in lieu of actually reading and evaluating the publications of candidates for appointment or promotion, which seems distasteful and has led to counting papers rather than evaluating them.

3) Some scholars refuse to referee manuscripts for proprietary journals because they see a conflict between the free dissemination of knowledge and the economics of proprietary publication. More scholars could consider taking this position as a means of both pressuring journal publishers to reduce the cost of journals to libraries and inhibiting the start-up of unnecessary new journals.

4) Journals of major circulation, like *Science* and *Nature*, could encourage publication of reviews of new journals a year or two after they are founded. The reviews would focus on the quality of the published papers and include an evaluation of the need for the new journal.

JAMES E. HEATH
Department of Physiology and Biophysics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana 61801

Erratum: Arthur Schawlow should have been identified as a Nobel laureate in physics, not chemistry, in Eliot Marshall's article "Gould advances inventor's claim on the laser" (News and Comment, 23 Apr., p. 392).