mors of the mammary gland were observed in both genders of rats. Additionally, other tumor increases occurred in the skin (*2*), neck (*3*, *5*), salivary glands (*10*), and in the category "total tumors" (*11*). Obviously then, methylene chloride is a multispecies, multistrain, both-gender, multiorgan, dose-related carcinogen, clastogen, and mutagen that should be considered as a carcinogenic risk for exposed humans.

James Huff
John Bucher
J. Carl Barrett
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences,
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709, USA
E-mail: huff1@niehs.nih.gov

References

1. *Fed. Regist.* **56**, 57036 (1991); G. W. Gibbs, OSHA Docket No. H-71, Exhibit 54 (1992); S. Lanes, K. Rothman, N. Dreyer, OSHA Docket No. H-71, Exhibit 106 (1993); E. F. Heineman *et al.*, *Am. J. Indust. Med.* **26**, 155 (1994).
2. "Toxicology and Carcinogenesis Studies of Dichloromethane [Methylene Chloride] in F344/N Rats and B6C3F1 Mice [Inhalation Studies]," TR #306 (National Toxicology Program, Research Triangle Park, NC, 1986), pp. 1–208.
3. *IARC Monogr.* **41**, 43 (1986).
4. J. H. Mennear, E. E. McConnell, J. E. Huff, R. A. Renne, E. Giddens, *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* **534**, 343 (1988).
5. "Overall Evaluations of Carcinogenicity: An Updating of IARC Monographs Volumes 1 to 42," suppl. 7: 194, International Agency for Research on Cancer, Lyon, France (1987).
6. F. W. Kari, J. F. Foley, S. K. Seilkop, R. R. Maronpot, M. W. Anderson, *Carcinogenesis* **14**, 819 (1993).
7. J. F. Foley *et al.*, *ibid.*, p. 811.
8. M. W. Anderson and R. R. Maronpot, *ibid.*, p. 787.
9. T. R. Devereux *et al.*, *ibid.*, p. 795; M. E. Hegi *et al.*, *ibid.*, p. 803.
10. J. Burek *et al.*, *Fundam. Appl. Toxicol.* **4**, 30 (1984).
11. C. Maltoni, G. Cotti, G. Perino, *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* **534**, 352 (1988).
12. K. D. Nitschke *et al.*, *Fundam. Appl. Toxicol.* **11**, 48 (1988).
13. J. E. Huff, J. Cirvello, J. K. Haseman, J. R. Bucher, *Environ. Health Perspect.* **93**, 247 (1991).

■

Focus on Basic Plasma Science

In the article "Fusion plan gathers steam" describing the U.S. House of Representatives Energy and Environment Subcommittee hearing on restructuring the fusion energy program (22 Mar., p. 1660), Andrew Lawler quotes me as "warn[ing] that the lack of small-scale university fusion experiments is keeping young people from entering the field." While this statement is likely correct, it was not part of my written testimony nor my remarks at the hearing. As co-chair of a recent National Research Council (NRC) study, *Plasma Science: From Fundamental Science to Technological Applications* (National Academy Press, 1995), I focused my remarks on small-scale *basic* research in plasma science. Of all of the areas considered in the NRC study, this was found to be the area of plasma science most in need of support. Because the fusion program is the largest nondefense user of plasma science, the study recommended that the program provide increased support for research in the underlying basic science.

Rather than being a critic of the new Department of Energy (DOE) program, I am pleased to say that both the report of DOE's Fusion Energy Advisory Committee, and the testimony of Martha Krebs at the hearing, indicate that they recognize the need to increase support for basic plasma science. Krebs, director of the Office of Energy Research, outlined DOE's plans to significantly increase funding for basic plasma science, beginning in fiscal year 1997, which will be an important step in remedying the current situation.

Clifford M. Surko*
Department of Physics,
University of California, San Diego,
La Jolla, CA 92093–0319, USA

*Co-chair, National Research Council Panel on Opportunities in Plasma Science and Technology