

gram of Monroe County, New York, with \$0.4 billion committed to upgrading regional sewage collection and treatment and to phosphate removal. The conservation council of that county and a local science information group, the Rochester Committee for Scientific Information (RCSI), were instrumental in creating the public demand for a cleanup that made this program possible. Now the RCSI wishes to encourage the next step in the reclamation of the lake, as suggested by J. H. Hubschman (12 Feb. 1971, p. 536). The Rochester Prize for Environmental Management will be awarded in 1972 for a proposal to aid the recovery of Lake Ontario.

The prize of \$1000 will be awarded to the authors of a manuscript proposing a way to improve water quality at swimming beaches on the south shores of Lake Ontario. In judging merit, the jury of scientists will favor methods that would increase species diversity in the lake, increase the consumption of algae, and lower the standing crop of *Cladophora*. A copy of an article published in a scientific journal or a manuscript of an article suitable for such publication will qualify for the competition. Entries should be mailed to the secretary of the Rochester Committee for Scientific Information at the address below and must be postmarked before 1 October 1972.

ROBERT E. LEE

Rochester Committee for Scientific Information, Post Office Box 5236, River Campus Station, Rochester, New York 14627

President's Science Message

I was distressed to see Deborah Shapley (News and Comment, 24 Mar., p. 1343) take the President and his science adviser, Edward E. David, Jr., to task, and characterize the first message to Congress on science and technology as "vapid." I was impressed by the President's message. It lays the foundation for an effective teaming of the academic and industrial communities.

David, his team at the Office of Science and Technology, and James Wakelin at the Department of Commerce should be complimented for originating a practical plan that is not a multibillion-dollar handout to those who prefer to sit on their tails and bemoan the fate of science at the hands

of the Philistines. Instead the message sets a note of high challenge and proposes mechanisms by which those who prefer positive thinking can take action. It deserves the support of all of us in science.

Let's stop attacking our friends in office. Soon we will wonder where they also went.

ADEN B. MEINEL

Optical Sciences Center,
University of Arizona, Tucson 85721

Cans

The comment by Savas (Editorial, 22 Oct., p. 365) that the island of Jamaica is coming to be represented throughout the United States by a "layer of aluminum beer cans" is a fair statement of the case. His qualitative remarks can be easily quantified, for according to the U.S. Department of Commerce the number of "throwaway" aluminum beverage containers produced in 1969 was 3.2 billion; in 1970, 4 billion; in 1971, 6 billion; and in 1972, 8 billion will be produced. Since more than 90 percent of the bauxite used is imported into the United States, and since we have an increasingly unfavorable balance of trade, one might think that this importation could be curbed; that is a problem for the economists.

What is more important than economics is the fact that it takes 17,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity to convert 5 tons of bauxite to 1 ton of aluminum, which may then be fabricated into 40,000 cans. There is considerable lip service given today to the concept of recycling, especially of cans. According to the *Wall Street Journal* (1) about 3 percent of the aluminum cans fabricated last year were recycled. Industry (2) disputes this figure and estimates that 12.5 percent of the cans produced in 1971 were collected for recycling. Even if the collection of aluminum cans continues at that rate in 1972, there will still be 175,000 tons of aluminum reduced from bauxite and dissipated over the landscape. Put in more general terms, the electricity required would be sufficient to supply the city of Washington, D.C., for about 20 months.

ELLIS L. YOCHELSON

12303 Stafford Lane,
Bowie, Maryland 20715

References

1. *Wall Street Journal*, 5 November 1971, p. 32.
2. J. C. Dale (The Aluminum Association, 750 Third Avenue, New York 10017), personal communication.

The Polytron® homogenizer.

If it can be done, we can probably do it.

The Willems Polytron® homogenizer is unlike

any mixer you've ever used. It works on a unique principle—kinetic plus ultrasonic energy. And it often succeeds where other instruments fail.

Homogenization by sound waves means that tissues are broken down quickly to sub-cellular level without destruction of enzyme activity. You'd be hard-pressed to do that with other kinds of mixers.

In the applications field, the Polytron has proved so effective in inducing physical and chemical change that it has already revolutionized many procedures. Whether it be for dispersing, homogenizing, emulsifying or disrupting, a Polytron is available in the size to meet your specific requirements.

Contact us if you have any questions. Both literature and a demonstration are available on request.



Brinkmann Instruments, Inc.
Cantiague Road,
Westbury, L. I., N.Y. 11590
Brinkmann Instruments
(Canada), Ltd.
50 Galaxy Boulevard,
Rexdale (Toronto), Ontario.

