

Work on the second volume, about the U.S. nuclear weapons production complex, is nearing completion; volume three, on Soviet nuclear weapons, is scheduled to appear late next year. A number of small foundations are providing financial support.

—CONSTANCE HOLDEN

Denton Plan May Limit Perinatal Research

Senator Jeremiah Denton (R-Ala.) is planning to propose a measure that some fear could prohibit the use of federal funds for perinatal research. A staff committee aide to the senator, who is now circulating the proposal, says that is not his intention, but a strict interpretation of the language could limit a broad area of research.

The proposal states, "The director of the National Institutes of Health and the director of any national research institute may not conduct or support research . . . on a living human fetus or infant," unless the experiment is intended to benefit the fetus or infant, or unless the risk to the fetus or infant "is no greater than those encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests."

The language was intended to conform with restrictive legislation that was introduced last year in the House by Representative William Dannemeyer (R-Calif.). But some observers say that Denton is suggesting an even stiffer measure. The Dannemeyer measure says that federally funded scientists "shall not experiment on a living human fetus or infant, whether before or after an induced abortion," unless it ensures the survival of the fetus. Denton's proposal applies to all infants, "regardless of whether or not an abortion is intended or has been performed," the proposal states.

One Senate staff aide alleges that such legislation would have prohibited the testing of the polio vaccine on children since it was uncertain at the time whether the vaccine would be of clear benefit. At the very least, according to a spokeswoman for the American Academy of Pediatrics, "The Denton language raises questions whether perinatal research

would be prohibited." The Denton aide, however, says that the amendment would simply put into law a part of the federal regulations governing human experimentation.

In any event, Denton is planning to offer his proposal as an amendment to a National Institutes of Health bill. The bill is up for consideration in the Senate but is unlikely to go anywhere soon. Several senators are joining Senator Bob Packwood (R-Ore.) to put a hold on the bill until an agreement can be reached about fetal research. This could tie up the creation of an arthritis institute.

—MARJORIE SUN

Pork Barrel Funds Not Yet Released

The fiscal year (FY) 1985 budget request for the Department of Energy (DOE) contains no funds to complete research labs at Catholic and Columbia universities, which were beneficiaries of celebrated pork barrel amendments proposed on the floor of the House of Representatives last May (*Science*, 3 June 1983, p. 1024).

Congress eventually approved an initial installment of \$5 million for each university for FY 1984, but told DOE not to disburse any funds until it has reviewed proposals for the facilities. According to a DOE official, the proposals have yet to be submitted and thus there was no basis on which the department could request funds for FY 1985. This means that the universities may have to persuade Congress to add funds to DOE's budget request, and that will be difficult in view of the publicity surrounding last year's events. Columbia's facility will cost about \$20 million and Catholic's will cost about \$14 million.

Meanwhile, Schlossberg-Cassidy and Associates, the lobbyists who steered the Catholic and Columbia amendments through the House, have announced a new addition to their consulting firm—Carl Godfrey, Jr., former executive assistant to House Speaker Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. (D-Mass.). O'Neill's support was a decisive factor in securing passage of the funds for Catholic University.

—COLIN NORMAN

Nonproliferation Proposals Challenged

Four members of Congress have accused the Reagan Administration of attempting to weaken reviews of nuclear exports. Reacting to a draft document they have obtained that proposes changes in the export review procedures, the congressmen charge that the proposals "could result in a significant loosening of U.S. constraints on proliferation."

In general, the objections center on what the critics see as a move to weaken the so-called second-look philosophy embodied in the U.S. Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act (NNPA), which currently requires multiple reviews of some nuclear exports. For example, the Administration must give separate approval not only for the initial export of nuclear fuel but also for its later disposal or retransfer. The Administration's draft proposals would apparently eliminate some requirements for separate reviews and make it easier for multiple licenses to be issued to particular countries.

The proposed changes are the result of a lengthy review of the NNPA procedures, which the Administration believes are currently so cumbersome that they make the United States an unreliable supplier. The four congressmen—Edward J. Markey (D-Mass.), Richard L. Ottinger (D-N.Y.), Howard Wolpe (D-Mich.), and Morris K. Udall (D-Ariz.)—have objected that the revisions are being developed "without either congressional consultation or the benefit of public participation."

They have urged that the proposals be held in abeyance until Congress is fully briefed and the public has been given the opportunity to make its views known.

Ron Bettauer, an attorney in the State Department who has been trying to revise the export review procedures, says they are not yet in final form and claims that "the changes are not major."

He points out that the revisions are not legally subject to review by Congress. When they are ready, the revised procedures will be published in the *Federal Register*, he says.

—JEFFREY L. FOX