

National Laboratory, the "big science" community does not escape scot-free: about \$60 million has been deleted from the basic energy science research budget, which includes much support of energy physics experimentation.

Research into superconductivity, leaving traditional "low-temperature" materials as well as the new superconductors, benefits to the tune of \$95 million and a project to collaborate with industry on the exploitation of high-temperature superconductors is planned under Alamos National Laboratory.

A sum of \$19 million has been set aside for work on the human genome project, in cooperation with NIH.

Department of Defense

Retains high priority with a 40 per cent increase requested, well above the 2.8 per cent rise scheduled for total defence spending, and the 2.0 per cent for non-research programmes. But the proposed \$4,950-million expenditure is still about \$2,000 million below that planned by the administration a year ago and will require cuts in some SDI projects.

The trend towards research on high energy interceptor rockets and other anti-energy weapons at the expense of research on exotic particle-beam weapons likely to intensify as the administration pushes for early results.

The fact that more tests will be necessary is sure to bring the administration into conflict with Congress over the interpretation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

In the non-SDI research programme, the Orient Express' National Aerospace and Space is budgeted for a large increase in a project with NASA. Another collaboration with NASA is the Advanced Launch System, an expendable rocket for high payloads.

A set of basic research programmes in electronics is also emphasized, including a high-speed integrated circuit project supported by Sematech, the private industry research consortium.

Other Agencies

An administration request for the US Geological Survey (USGS) reflects concerns for "numerous lower priority program activities". The areas being cut include regional aquifer analysis, nuclear waste and coal hydrology and research on coastal erosion. Extra money is needed for advanced cartographic systems.

The National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration continues its search for financial favour in the White House budget. Marooned by bureaucratic inertia in the Department of Commerce, it will be cut in all research and operational areas, except environmental monitoring, which receive an increase for the purchase of replacement weather satellites. □

Army renews controversial plans for biological warfare laboratory

Boston

THE debate over the US Army's plans to build a controversial high-containment facility to study biological warfare agents was rekindled with the recent release of a draft environmental impact statement attesting to the safety of the venture.

The Army's lengthy report concludes that the facility, designed for aerosol testing and experimentation with deadly and highly infectious biological warfare agents, "would have no reasonably fore-

seeable impacts on the unprotected populace or the environment". The multi-million-dollar facility is at the Army's Dugway Proving Ground in Utah.

The Army's impact statement does acknowledge a potential hazard from "accidental occupational exposure" if an infected worker were to leave the facility, but claims that sufficient steps have been taken to avoid such a prospect in the design of the facility and in a programme to immunize workers against the diseases they will study. A two-month comment period now follows the issuing of the draft report, after which a final impact statement will be released. But critics of the Dugway facility are already complaining.

The proposed "maximum-containment" facility at Dugway has been a cause of controversy since its conception. The Army's current environmental impact statement emerged only after a court ruling in 1985 in response to a successful lawsuit brought by the Foundation on Economic Trends, led by Jeremy Rifkin.

Rifkin calls the latest report "grossly inadequate", claiming that the reviewers failed to consider seriously the possibilities of sabotage and terrorism, the proposed use of non-lethal simulants instead of actual pathogens, or the possibility of siting the facility elsewhere. Rifkin threatens to sue again unless these and other criticisms are dealt with in the final report.

Barbara Rosenberg, a research scientist at the Sloan Kettering Institute in New York and also an outspoken critic of the facility, and other scientists, including Nobel laureate David Baltimore, have argued against the construction of the facility at Dugway.

Very few known warfare agents require the highest biosafety level (BL-4) containment that the Army proposes for the Dugway facility. In fact, the Army claims that only research requiring the lower BL-3 rating will be conducted at Dugway, but it wants the capability to conduct the more dangerous research.

Seth Shulman



seeable impacts on the unprotected populace or the environment". The multi-million-dollar facility is at the Army's Dugway Proving Ground in Utah.

The Army's impact statement does acknowledge a potential hazard from "accidental occupational exposure" if an infected worker were to leave the facility, but claims that sufficient steps have been taken to avoid such a prospect in the

NIH conclude misconduct investigation

Washington

AN investigation by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) has concluded that there were "serious misrepresentations" in two published papers on the T-cell-activating substance interleukin-4A (IL-4A), and has recommended that the senior author of the paper, Claudio Milanese, be excluded from receiving any further money from NIH.

Milanese was a postdoctoral fellow in the laboratory of Ellis Reinherz at the Dana-Farber Cancer Institute in Boston. In October 1986, Reinherz became aware that some of the data provided by Milanese had been fabricated (see *Nature* 324, 193; 1986). He contacted NIH about the irregularities, and retracted two papers containing the fraudulent data (*Science* 231, 1118; 1986 by Milanese, Neil E. Richardson and Reinherz and *J. exp. Med.* 163, 1583; 1986 by Milanese, Robert E. Siciliano, Reinhold

Schmidt, Jerome Ritz, Richardson and Reinherz). Two other papers in the press were withdrawn. An investigation by Dana-Farber and Harvard Medical School concluded that, in addition to inventing data, Milanese had supplied fraudulent materials to others, and was guilty of "tidying" data to achieve better-looking results.

NIH have now accepted the conclusions of the Dana-Farber investigation. Although the main blame is laid on Milanese, the investigation noted that Reinherz's extensive research commitments "raised troubling questions about the supervision of junior staff in the laboratory." Harvard Medical School and Dana-Farber have agreed to form a committee to monitor Reinherz's laboratories. NIH praise Reinherz and Dana-Farber for investigating this incident and promptly informing the scientific community. Joseph Palca