last few calories applied to the hotspot led to his resignation.

Besides Goddard's mantle, Dr. Ley has inherited some tough fights. Chief among these is the agency's attempt to hang a label, which the industry describes as a kiss-of-death label, on packages of vitamins and food supplements that, in effect, says they are not normally of any value in a society that eats well. He also inherits an effort to bring medical devices under the same regulations that now apply to drugs.

There is even a row brewing with government agencies. The Army, the Atomic Energy Commission and the Brookhaven National Laboratory have been experimenting with sterilizing food by radiation. The FDA is taking a cautious view on the safety of such food treatment despite some industrial eagerness to develop it.

The hearings on the vitamin labeling regulations have gotten no further than the point of settling how the hearings will run. They are likely to stretch well into 1969. The hearings are on revisions of revisions of regulations originally suggested in June 1962, pre-Goddard. Such a storm was raised then that the proposal went into limbo for four years.

It was revived in June 1966 by Goddard, whose view of vitamins and other nutrition supplements is that nearly everybody gets more than enough vitamins in food; what they pay good money for in the drug store is most likely going to be quickly excreted.

The label being fought so bitterly would state that "vitamins and minerals are supplied in abundant amounts by the food we eat. Except for persons with special medical needs, there is no scientific basis for recommending routine use of dietary supplements."

Not only industry but many nutrition scientists have replied that there are many people who fail to get the proper vitamins and minerals and that not enough is known about the need for vitamins to say what is abundant and what is not.

The label regulation has already been promulgated, but it will not go into effect until after the current protracted set of hearings are over, if then.

The medical-devices power sought by Goddard before his departure, and by Larrick before him, faces debate in Congress. An Administration-backed bill introduced by Rep. Harley Staggers (D-W.Va.) would bring medical devices under the provision of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, under which the FDA regulates new drugs.

With devices under this act, Food and Drug would be able to require that manufacturers demonstrate both the safety and efficacy of medical devices before marketing them.

Medical devices include such things as artificial hearts and other organs, if and when developed, artificial limbs, contact lenses, surgical instruments, equipment used for therapy, and other hardware directly involved in treating patients.

Another bill, introduced by Rep. Ed Reinecke (R-Calif.), is considered much tamer. It would set up a 20-man National Medical Devices Standards Commission composed of representatives of science, Government and industry. This commission would be able to recommend only, the Food and Drug Administration would have no enforcement power.

Both bills currently are in the House Commerce Committee, with action on neither having been scheduled. Hearings, at least, are probable next year.

UNIVERSITY SCIENCE FUNDS

Spreading the gravy

Even though this is a bad year for Federal appropriations and especially for research appropriations, Representative George P. Miller (D-Calif.) has chosen the last weeks of the 90th Congress to move for action on a bill that would grant $150 million a year for the next five years for the improvement of college and university science and technology departments. Subcommittee hearings will start June 25.

Representative Miller, who is chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, introduced the bill as a courtesy to the Association of State Colleges and Universities and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, which have wanted to get such legislation before Congress for several years; they will be its principal beneficiaries.

The Miller bill divides its annual appropriation into three $50-million sections, each of which would be granted according to a different formula. One-third of the money would be granted to institutions in proportion to the total amount of specific project grants they receive from all Federal agencies. One-third would be divided geographically: a share of the $50 million to be assigned to each state according to the share of the nation's high-school graduates that state has in the given year. Each sum would be distributed among institutions in the particular state according to the credit hours in undergraduate science offered by each school. The final $50 million would be divided among institutions according to the advanced degrees in science—including teacher certification degrees—that they award in a three-year period.

The Miller bill is not intended to supersede or repeal present institutional grant programs of various government agencies, including the so-called centers-of-excellence programs, though it is being promoted in their name. That term was coined in a request by President Johnson early in 1967 that government agencies see what they could do to help institutions that had good bases for research work in particular subjects develop into excellent ones.

The term is currently applied to programs such as the Defense Department's Themis and the National Science Foundation's University Science Development Program. The National Institutes of Health have a program of General Research Support Grants, but they do not like the generic term. All of these, however, stress agency priorities —defense, health research or science development—without regard to geography.

A major criticism of all present programs, including the centers of excellence, is that they go to those already supported by other grants. The Miller bill seeks to get around this both by its mandatory geographical provision and by the distribution of two-thirds of the appropriation by formulas related to the institutions' teaching effort rather than their research. The $50 million that is apportioned among the states will be distributed to institutions according to their undergraduate teaching effort. This is intended to benefit junior colleges, teachers' colleges, nuns' colleges and other types of institution that seldom get into current programs. For the third $50 million masters and teacher-training degrees have the same weight as Ph.D.'s in the formula. This distribution should also aid many institutions whose research programs are modest.

The Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development, under the chairmanship of Representative Emilio Q. Daddario (D-Conn.), plans to spend nine days of hearings on the bill over a three-week period. Even with this amount of time, an aide says, of those who want to testify only about a quarter can be accommodated.

The purpose of holding hearings now is to gain information according to which the bill can be reworked into a form likely to pass and be presented to the opening of the 91st Congress in January. Supporters expect that the bill's provisions, which will benefit almost every Congressional district, should attract widespread support, whatever the intrinsic merits of the provision might be.