



Moss—"It shall not pass."



Charles Bassett

not be viewed as a first step to banning other product commercials. "We stress . . . that our action is limited to the unique situation and product," they declared. (The current TV blackout on hard liquor advertising, for example, is voluntary.) However, Commissioner James J. Wadsworth, the only one to vote against the proposed ad ban, warned that other products could eventually become involved and called the majority's move "unreasonable and arbitrary."

The Tobacco Institute, naturally, puffed along with Wadsworth: "In the present state of scientific knowledge about smoking and health, the ruling contemplated by the FCC would be arbitrary in the extreme."

A spokesman insists that Dr. Clarence Cook Little, described as a scientist who has been connected with "more research in tobacco and health than any other person," finds "no causal relationship between smoking and any disease." In fact, Dr. Little is noted as saying that "pure biological evidence is pointing away from, not toward, the causal hypothesis." Dr. Little is scientific director for the industry-supported Council for Tobacco Research—U.S.A.

The FCC categorically names Congress as the final advertising arbiter. On June 30, the 1965 law that requires cigarette manufacturers to include a health warning on package labels, and at the same time, forbids any agency from requiring any further action on cigarette advertising, expires. The FCC says that it announced its proposed ban now as a signal of its intentions to Congress. If Congress allows the current law to expire and if it passes no new legislation, the FCC will proceed—and doubtless face suit.

This puts the tobacco industry, which in 1968 spent \$215 million for television time, in a position of pushing for extension of the 1965 laws, warning labels and all. Though cigarette sales were down in 1968 (consumers smoked 526.5 billion, or 1.2 billion fewer than

in 1967), the package label is clearly less damaging—in industry's eyes—than a blackout of television and radio commercials. They opted for it, in fact, in lobbying the law through the Congress.

And Congressmen who favored the legislation as the best they could get four years ago are now prepared to kill it. Senator Frank E. Moss (D-Utah), who has traditionally disapproved of the filibuster, is ready to use that technique to block predictable efforts to have the present law extended. "For all those groups and citizens dedicated to the public health, let our motto be: It shall not pass," he says. "In retrospect that law was a tragic step backwards."

Meanwhile, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Robert Finch said he thought the ban "a good idea."

UNIVERSITY FUNDS

Re-opening the tap

It is not exactly the millennium, but university scientists are going to get a few more Federal dollars this year than last. It may be enough to make the Nixon Administration appear a bit more promising to scientists concerned with the support of research.

At his second news conference, President Nixon announced an immediate increase of \$10 million in funds to be distributed to universities by the National Science Foundation.

The NSF suffered a \$40 million grant reduction in its financing authority after considerable cutting and filling during the Johnson Administration.

The financial exigencies of the Vietnam War, the fact that science has grown enough to be sharply visible to a critical Congress, and Johnson's need to cut domestic spending programs if he wanted a surtax from the last Congress, fell heavily upon NSF, and this belt-tightening was passed on to the universities.

Capitol Hill observers are, so far, guarded in their appraisal of the Nixon Administration's decision, noting that it is still much too early to tell whether this marks a definitive change in science financing policy.

At the New York Academy of Science, which sponsored a Town Meeting of concerned scientists last June to fight the budget cut (SN: 7/6, p. 6), a spokesman said, "Of course we are pleased, even though we wish it were the full \$40 million that was being restored."

Here too, no one is predicting the course of the new Administration's science financing policy, but some members apparently feel optimistic. There is widespread agreement that the President and his science adviser, Dr. Lee

A. DuBridge, former president of the California Institute of Technology, understand well the problems of financing basic research.

Officials at the National Science Foundation itself are guarded in their appraisal of the bonanza, but they are making plans. They will devote primary attention to those universities whose projects were hardest hit by the cutback last year. Several of them, including DuBridge's own Caltech, had been forced to dip into endowment funds to keep some major research projects alive.

It is not the amount of the increase, which is modest, that has excited parts of the scientific community, but the fact that the Administration has at least made some tangible move toward refinancing research.

The NSF will now be able to make \$490 million available to its grantees in fiscal 1969. This is \$30 million short of the original \$520 million it had been authorized before the Johnson Administration swung the axe.

President Nixon, in restoring the \$10 million, noted that "university activities cannot be turned on and off like a faucet. Substantial damage has been done to important programs and to many colleges and universities."

Mr. Nixon emphasized that he thought that the Johnson Administration had made a serious error in limiting the NSF expenditure ceiling. He expressed the hope that the restoration would deal with the "most serious disruptions which have occurred in academic programs and research."

Thus the President has opened the faucet a little, and if scientists think it is more a dribble than a torrent, at least it is flowing. ◇