

the carbon dioxide evolving from the yeast cells. Back mixing from the top position to the middle position (due to a low length/diameter ratio of the tall 1 L beaker:about 2/1) seems to reduce the protein level at the top of the fermentor.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

N. K. Pandey is grateful to Dr K. K. G. Menon for his encouragement for this work. This study was supported, in part, by the National Science Foundation (Grant No. CPE - 8209945). Don-Hee Park was supported by the Korean Government.

12 September 1986

1. Blobel, G. and Dobberstein, B., *J. Cell Biol.*, 1975a, **67**, 835.
2. Blobel, G. and Dobberstein, B., *J. Cell Biol.*, 1975b, **67**, 852.
3. Silhavy, T. J., Benson, S. A. and Emr, S. D., *Microbiol. Rev.*, 1983, **47**, 313.

4. Talmadge, K., Stahl, S. and Gilbert, W., *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 1980, **77**, 3369.
5. Fraser, T. H. and Bruce, B. J., *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 1978, **75**, 5936.
6. Park, Don-Hee, Baker, D. S., Brown, K. G., Tanner, R. D. and Malaney, G. W., *J. Biotechnol.*, 1985, **2**, 337.
7. Maxon, W. and Johnson, M. J., *Ind. Eng. Chem.*, 1953, **45**, 2554.
8. Bradford, M. M., *Anal. Biochem.*, 1976, **72**, 248.
9. Park, Don-Hee, Tanner, R. D. and Malaney, G. W., *Biotech. Bioeng. Sym.*, 1984, No. 14, 457.
10. Lowry, O. H., Rosebrough, N. J., Farr, A. L. and Randall, R. J., *J. Biol. Chem.*, 1951, **193**, 265.
11. Laemmli, U. K. and Favre, M., *J. Mol. Biol.*, 1973, **80**, 575.
12. Wray, W., Boulikas, T., Wray, V. and Hancock, R., *Anal. Biochem.*, 1981, **118**, 197.
13. Karger, B. L., Lloyd, R. S. and Horvath, C., *An introduction to separation science*, John Wiley, New York, 1973, p. 423.

---

## NEWS

---

### PROVING RESEARCH SAFETY

...“The burden of proof for control of research appears to be changing. Increasingly, the individual researcher or research facility must prove that the research is safe rather than the regulator prove that it is unsafe. A shift in responsibility is clearly occurring in the case of restrictions on scientific and technical communication. Under schemes proposed in 1980 by the American Council on Education, for example, cryptology researchers were asked to carry the burden of deciding which papers to submit to the Natl. Security Agency for review. A similar shift in the burden of responsibility occurred in 1980 changes in Natl. Science Foundation (NSF) grant policy, which made the grantee responsible for notifying NSF if, in the course of an NSF supported project, ‘information or materials are developed

which may affect the defense and security of the US’. If a fundamental constitutional right is involved, then in the past the courts have placed the burden of proof on the government to show a compelling need to infringe. But some legal scholars argue that the situation is now muddled because it is increasingly difficult to distinguish between pure speech and ‘impure’ special action.”

[(US Congress, Office of Technology Assessment in *The Regulatory Environment for Science—A Technical Memorandum*, Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, Feb. 86). Reproduced with permission from Press Digest, *Current Contents*<sup>®</sup>, No. 26, June 30, 1986, p. 10. (Published by the Institute for Scientific Information<sup>®</sup>, Philadelphia, PA, USA)].

---