the community being served. There are unmet needs within the chemical community that will grow without a cogent national policy on computational technology. Beyond the immediate harm of eliminating an organization whose focus was to address some of these needs, the larger danger exists of stigmatizing any future efforts in this area.

G. M. MAGGIORA, B. GARRISON
G. SCHATZ, D. SILVER
S. HAGSTROM, G. LOEW
Office of the Executive Committee, NRCC User Association, c/o Department of Biochemistry, University of Kansas, Lawrence 66045

Environmental Assessment

My colleagues and I read with considerable interest the editorial on environmental regulation by Richard C. Atkinson (29 Aug., p. 969) calling for a new national commission to develop a consensus among concerned parties on dealing with environmental problems over the next two decades.

A group with identical concerns has been formed and is known as the Environmental Assessment Council, of which I am chairman. The council has already attracted the participation of respected individuals from the private and public sectors, as well as academia, and includes Laurance S. Rockefeller, George R. Lamb, Abel Wolman, William K. Reilly, Robert G. Dunlop, Lane Kirkland and his representative Thomas Kahn, and Caryl Haskins.

The council, which is privately funded in order not to be dependent on established government policies, is dedicated to the mission of identifying our most significant environmental problems and recommending appropriate courses of action to deal with these issues from the standpoint of technical validity and responsible public policy. The council sponsored an initial background study by Resources for the Future to assess the current state of environmental regulation. With the completion of this report we have now embarked on an assessment program that will address national environmental priorities and the development of balanced programs for their management and resolution. We are also gathering data on the problem of acid lakes and some of the actions of our society that may be contributing to this condition. These studies, we believe, will lead to a better understanding of this problem.

This is a time when, as Atkinson points out, we need a more integrated utilization of scientific information and new analytical tools such as risk assessment to make judgments based on an informed consensus about developing rational future environmental programs. The council hopes to assist in resolving the difficult problems that confront us and to channel our best thinking and energies into equitable solutions.

RUTH PATRICK
Academy of Natural Sciences, Nineteenth and the Parkway, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

Fruit Fly Breeding

William J. Broad (News and Comment, 10 Oct., p. 168) calls attention to an impending crisis in the field of fruit fly genetics resulting from the rapidly decreasing availability of half-pint milk bottles as laboratory breeding vessels for *Drosophila melanogaster*. And, reflective of a national malaise, Broad notes that, "Yankee ingenuity has produced no answers and the worried parties are looking overseas for a solution."

But what's wrong with half-pint mayonnaise jars or the like? Glass manufacturers in the United States still produce those in quantity, and innovation is as apt a concept for U.S. science as for U.S. industry.

WILLIAM SPINDEL
Office of Chemistry and Chemical Technology, National Research Council, 2101 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20418

Credit

In the article "Thalassemias: Models of genetic diseases" (Research News, 17 Oct., p. 300), my name is mentioned in connection with data concerning β^+ thalassemia. Most of these data were actually obtained by Lynne Maquat and Alan Kinniburgh, postdoctoral fellows in my laboratory.

JEFFREY ROSS
Department of Oncology, McArdle Laboratory for Cancer Research, University of Wisconsin, Madison 53706

Erratum: In the article by Don E. Dumond, "The archeology of Alaska and the peopling of America" (29 Aug., p. 984), the scale bar in Fig. 4 on p. 987 is more than twice as long as it should be to represent 1 centimeter. The artifact in part a, for example, has a maximum width of about 3.5 centimeters.