fers to acute or short-term effects. The IOM report related that a 1972 literature review by Scottish researchers concluded that among women who were denied abortions and had the children, "a large minority suffer considerable distress, and a small minority [eventually] develop severe disturbance."

Indirectly bearing on this issue is a longitudinal investigation of unwanted children conducted in Czechoslovakia by Henry David, head of the Transnational Family Research Institute in Bethesda, with the Prague Psychiatric Research Institute. David, who calls it "the only study of its kind in the world," has been conducting periodic follow-ups on a group of 223 children of married women who wanted but were denied abortions, matched with a control group of women who "accepted" their pregnancies. All the children were born in the early 1960s, when women had to apply to a commission for permission for an abortion.

David says the study "demonstrates rather conclusively" that unwanted children are at "considerable developmental risk." Despite comparable IQs and socioeconomic status, they have done more poorly in school than the wanted children, and have experienced more mental health problems as evidenced by crime and drug abuse registers.

There has been little recent research in the United States directed at the effects of abortion, partly because it is now generally accepted as a low-risk operation, and partly because the Reagan Administration stopped funding such research. Now, Koop's office has the go-ahead from the Reagan White House to proceed, in cooperation with the National Center for Health Statistics, in the design of a questionnaire on the psychological effects of abortion. (There has not yet been any communication on the subject with the Bush White House.) This would go to a national sampling of 8,000 to 10,000 women of reproductive age. The big challenge, says Walters, is to design a survey that will elicit a high response rate.

This sample might ultimately form the basis for a longitudinal study, ideally conducted through the Centers for Disease Control, says Walters. Koop, in his letter to the President, says what is needed is a 5-year "prospective study on a cohort of women of child-bearing age in reference to the variable outcomes of mating," designed to include "the psychological effects of failure to conceive, as well as the physical and mental sequelae of pregnancy-planned and unplanned, wanted and unwanted-whether carried to delivery, miscarried, or terminated by abortion." The ideal study would cost about \$100 million; but Koop says "satisfactory" results could be obtained for \$10 million. CONSTANCE HOLDEN

Reilly Vows Environmental Activism

Breaking with the "research only" stance of the past 8 years, the Bush Administration will soon propose an acid rain bill and other amendments to the Clean Air Act. William K. Reilly, Bush's new EPA administrator, announced the new initiative at his nomination hearing last week. Coming just one day after Secretary of State James Baker's call for action to halt global warming, it signals a major departure from 8 years of environmental inaction under the Reagan Administration.

The acid rain bill was one of several changes Reilly articulated in the hearing before the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, which was a virtual love-in. This is the first time in EPA's 20-year history that a professional environmentalist has been nominated for the top slot, and the change was clearly welcomed by the liberal committee, which has consistently been at loggerheads with the Reagan Administration. Reilly, 48, former president of the Conservation Foundation and the World Wildlife Fund, was confirmed by unanimous Senate vote on 2 February.

Reilly declined to provide details on the bill, other than say it would be "credible and realistic" and that it would lead to a "substantial reduction of acid rain by the end of the century." The bill will also address the vexing problem of urban ozone, or smog, said Reilly. Some 70 metropolitan areas currently violate federal air quality standards, and meeting them will be expensive and difficult.

A sizable staff is already working on the bill, which Reilly calls his highest priority. "It will be the first thing out of the box." Although he would not be pinned down on a delivery date for the bill, he promised to be back to the committee with his ideas within 3 weeks.

There were no hardball questions at the hearing. Indeed, the committee's only concern seemed to be whether Reilly, known as a consensus builder, will be tough enough for the job. "Will you conciliate away our environmental laws?" asked Max Baucus (D-MT).

"I have always been an advocate for the environment," responded Reilly. "I make no bones about it." Dismissing the notion that consensus building is somehow "soft," Reilly pledged "aggressive

sus building for the environment." "aggressive

enforcement" of environmental laws and said one of his first tasks will be to meet with the Attorney General and work with the Justice Department on enforcement.

Reilly also endorsed the idea of creating a new position of assistant administrator for global environmental issues—specifically, for climate change—within EPA. This would be a major restructuring, most likely requiring congressional approval, another indication that the issue has a high place on the Administration's agenda.

Reilly advocated an accelerated schedule for phasing out production of chlorofluorocarbons, or CFCs, which contribute to both greenhouse warming and the thinning of the stratospheric ozone layer. Although he stopped short of endorsing the elimination of CFCs, Reilly said the United States "will be very concerned to go beyond the Montreal Protocol," an international treaty that calls for a 50% reduction in worldwide CFC production by 1998.

On domestic issues, Reilly said he opposed relaxation of fuel economy standards for cars and that he intends to organize an internal review at EPA "with the aim of significantly speeding up clean up" of toxic waste dumps under the Superfund program.

Throughout the 3-hour hearing, Reilly portrayed Bush as a strong environmental president to the sometimes skeptical committee. Reilly intimated, however, that Bush will not elevate EPA to Cabinet status, a move Reilly has advocated in the past, simply because Bush wants to keep the group small. Legislation to do just that is expected to be introduced this session. In response to their repeated questions, Reilly assured the senators that he would nonetheless have the President's ear. "The President made it very clear I will have access. I have been assured I will be in the Cabinet room whenever actions touch upon the environment."

