

DOE-NSF accounting practices would place the cost for the LHC accelerator and detectors at about \$6 billion, with about two-thirds for the accelerator and one-third for the detectors. It is against these figures that the proposed U.S. contribution should be compared, namely, \$200 million by DOE for the LHC accelerator and \$330 million (DOE and NSF) for the two detectors. All of the U.S. accelerator funding and the vast majority of the detector funding will be used to provide materials and equipment from U.S. industry, national laboratories, and universities.

George Trilling

Chair, U.S. LHC Collaborators
Executive Committee,
Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory,
University of California,
Berkeley, CA 94720, USA
E-mail: ght@lbl.gov



Marine Biodiversity Budget

Ecosystem protection is a crucial strategy for conserving biological diversity (1), but the Clinton Administration's fiscal year 1998 budget proposal reveals a striking disparity between U.S. spending on protected

areas on land and in the sea. It asks Congress for \$1.6 billion for the National Park Service to manage 374 units totaling 344,000 square kilometers of land and \$3.1 billion for the Forest Service to manage 159 units totaling 772,000 square kilometers of land. But its budget request for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Marine Sanctuaries Program is only \$13.2 million—two orders of magnitude less—for 12 units totaling 47,000 square kilometers of sea.

Funding for terrestrial protected areas is inadequate, but resources dedicated to marine protected areas are so meager that the commitment of the United States to protecting marine biodiversity deserves a fundamental reevaluation before the next federal budget goes to Congress.

Elliott A. Norse

President,
Marine Conservation Biology Institute,
15806 N.E. 47th Court,
Redmond, WA 98052-5208, USA
E-mail: enorse@u.washington.edu

Amy Mathews-Amos

Program Director,
Marine Conservation Biology Institute,
205 North Edgewood Street,
Arlington, VA 22201, USA
E-mail: amymcbi@erols.com

References

1. E. A. Norse and R. E. McManus, in *Environmental Quality 1980* (Council on Environmental Quality, Washington, DC, 1980), pp. 31-80; G. K. Meffe and C. R. Carroll, Eds., *Principles of Conservation Biology* (Sinauer, Sunderland, MA, 1994).



Aspirin and Stroke

Martin Enserink's article about the Second European Stroke Prevention Study (ESPS 2) study (News & Comment, 20 Dec., p. 2004) raises two issues that merit serious attention: (i) fraud in scientific research and (ii) the ethics of using placebos in situations where there is already an effective treatment.

There can be no place in scientific research for unreliable data or for the people who perpetuate fraud. This issue came to light with respect to this study because quality control procedures put in place by Boehringer Ingelheim detected suspicious data from one of the 60 participating centers. We fully informed the Dutch health authorities, notified the authorities at the institution in question, and cooperated fully with their investigations. We regret that the hospital director was unable to establish either guilt



Malcolm is imp
by the new Pre
Protease be
it's a GST
fusion prot

"Not being a protein chemist, I just want to clone the gene, express it, isolate the protein and move on," says Malcolm Zellars, who's working on his post-doc at Tufts University Medical School in Boston, Massachusetts, USA.