

prove troublesome. Several proposals that would have placed restrictions on animal research and possibly entailed considerable expense in upgrading facilities gained support in Congress over the past few years. But the bill that was finally approved included a compromise that was generally acceptable to biomedical researchers. In essence, it required NIH to come up with guidelines much along the lines it recently proposed and directed that a study of the whole issue be conducted by the National Academy of Sciences, if it were willing to do it. Animal rights groups are sure to push for something stronger next year.

Reaching a compromise on fetal research was even more difficult. Several key senators pushed for a complete ban on research on fetuses, while the version of the bill approved by the House would essentially have put into law regulations

governing fetal research that have been in effect for a decade. In the end, the House version prevailed, but with the important proviso that there would be a 3-year moratorium on some types of fetal research pending a study of the issue by a congressional bioethics commission. The commission was also established by the bill. (The moratorium would not have had any immediate practical effect since there is no mechanism in place in the federal government for approving the experiments it would cover and thus they cannot at present be undertaken.)

It took months to negotiate that compromise, and a rerun of the battle may be no smoother. Moreover, there is some concern that a very restrictive fetal research amendment will be proposed when the bill is brought to the House floor.

The NIH bill was not the only health-

related legislation Reagan vetoed on 30 October. He also refused to sign the Health Service Act Amendments, legislation that would have extended the legal authority for several programs that provide financial support to medical and nursing students. As with the NIH bill, the veto does not affect appropriations, which were included in separate legislation. In his veto message, Reagan claimed that the bill would be too expensive, and that increasing support for health professionals is not needed because the country is facing a surplus of doctors and nurses.

At least one bill did get through, however. Reagan signed legislation that establishes an Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion in HHS and requires the establishment of 13 university-based centers for disease prevention.

—COLIN NORMAN

Industry Studies the Environment

This month, for the first time, the corporate world has taken the initiative in organizing an international conference to consider how the resources of industry can be better applied to management of the environment, particularly in developing countries.

The World Industry Conference on Environmental Management, to be held in Versailles in mid-November, will bring together some 300 representatives from heavy hitters in the wood products, petroleum, mining, chemical and steel industries.

In addition to discussing how to set up new mechanisms for mutual information exchange and cooperation with local governments, the conferees will talk about new approaches to problems such as ground-water pollution, pesticide use, hazardous waste, and deforestation.

The idea for the conference was originally broached by Mustafa Tolba, secretary of the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP), but what got it off the ground were the efforts of the Washington-based coalition Business Roundtable and its environmental task force, headed by David M. Roderick of U.S. Steel Corp. Interest also was generated at a meeting at the Carter Center in Atlanta co-hosted by former President Jimmy Carter and Environmental Protection Agency head William Ruckelshaus, and at a gathering in Aspen, Colorado, convened by Robert O. Anderson, chairman of the board of Atlantic-Richfield.

Among other executives promoting the conference is George Mitchell of Mitchell Energy Corp., who has been convening periodic conferences on global concerns in Woodlands, Texas. A Mitchell aide says that even 4 or 5 years ago global problems "were not really on the first line of concern except for a small handful of companies."

But now, says a conference organizer, "the climate has changed a great deal," and there has been a "sharply increased awareness" of growing global interdependence. With it may be occurring an expanded perception of

corporate self-interest. The conference also signals a softening of industry's adversarial stance toward UNEP, which is sponsoring it along with the International Chamber of Commerce.

What appears to be happening is that multinationals are taking the first steps, in their own style and at their own cautious pace, toward a coherent approach to global environmental and economic issues that have received widespread publicity over the past 15 years.

Industry has by and large failed to embrace *Global 2000*, the frightening document issued at the end of the Carter Administration, not only because of the perceived antifree-market bias but because businessmen did not feel the report took into account the effect of new developments such as resource substitution.

Last year, Business International did a survey of business leaders internationally and came up with its own report, *Toward an Unlimited Future*. The establishment of an international coalition, "Global 100," which now has about 37 members, resulted. According to a Business International spokeswoman, the coalition will be addressing a series of "bottom line issues" and its first manifesto, on international debt and national deficits, will be issued on 13 December.

One thing big companies are going to need if they are to assume more responsibility in managing the world is better information. The Council on Environmental Quality, which has been slogging away at this Administration's answer to *Global 2000*, asked the World Wildlife Fund to find out about the private sector's resource and environmental data needs. Wildlife found that although companies rely heavily on government data, almost 90 percent said it is not timely enough; nor is it easily accessible. Study director Joel Horn reported that companies' interests tended at first to be rather parochial but that their outlook seemed to broaden during the year of the survey.—CONSTANCE HOLDEN