of gamma interferon and the first to file related patent claims.

Biogen is also pursuing two other potentially lucrative commercial products, but more research is needed. The blood clotting agent, Factor VIII, may be used in therapy for hemophiliacs. The animal vaccine could help control foot-and-mouth disease that is endemic to Europe and South America. In 1981, Biogen researchers were the first to clone the antigen of one strain of the virus, but an effective vaccine has not yet been developed.

—MARJORIE SUN

In Vino, Veritas

A federal judge has apparently ended a decade-long struggle by the manufacturers of alcoholic beverages to avoid disclosing the ingredients of their products. In a decision on 8 February, Judge John Pratt ordered the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms to require such disclosure within a year, by reinstating a regulation that was enacted under the Carter Administration but canceled by Reagan appointees in 1981, before it ever took effect.

The lawsuit was brought by the Center for Science in the Public Interest (CSPI), which said that the regulation would benefit as many as 1.7 million consumers who are allergic to chemical additives commonly used in beer, wine, and liquor. The center alleged that the regulation was canceled in response to pressure from industry and from California's congressional delegation, acting at industry's behest.

Two months before the Administration's action, 18 California congressmen challenged the regulation in a letter to Treasury Secretary Donald Regan. According to CSPI, most had received substantial campaign contributions from the industry. Senator Alan Cranston, for example, received a total of $8856 from the Wine Institute and two beer manufacturers.

Judge Pratt concluded that the "initial decision to issue the regulation was the result of years of research and careful consideration." The Administration's decision to cancel it was, in contrast, "ill-considered and superficially explained." Little or no evidence was presented in support of claims that it was unduly expensive, unnecessary, or in violation of international commitments.

The rule requires that a list of chemical additives and other ingredients appear on beverage labels, or be provided by mail to consumers who request it. Sulfur dioxide, sodium bisulfite, yellow number 5, potassium metabisulfite, calcium disodium EDTA, propylene glycol, and paraben are among the additives whose presence in various products would become known.—R. JEFFREY SMITH

Animal Welfare Bills On Legislators' Agenda

Federal legislators, who last session sponsored bills to reduce the number of animals used in research, are promising to take up the issue again, but the details of new legislation have yet to be worked out.

Both Representative Doug Walgren (D–Pa.) and Senator Robert Dole (R–Kans.) plan to sponsor measures that would further regulate the treatment of animals in research, but specific proposals probably will not be discussed until after authorization hearings this spring, according to staff aides.

A Walgren staffer said that the congressman is likely to sponsor a bill that is "pretty much the same" as the one he proposed last year. The bill mandated that federal agencies consider alternatives to animal testing and that a federal oversight group be created to accredit researchers to use animals in experiments. The bill passed the House Science and Technology Committee and was considered by another committee during the lame duck session before time ran out.

Dole sponsored the Senate counterpart to Walgren's bill. In this session, however, Dole may introduce a more moderate proposal that does not require accreditation. Such a process is too costly, an aide said. The senator may also ease the proposed requirement that scientists search for alternatives to animal testing, such as tissue culture or mathematical modeling. Dole may propose a measure that simply "encourages" scientists to consider other kinds of testing, the aide said.

Proponents of animal welfare legislation are likely to find fuel for their argument in a recent report by the National Research Council. In the testing of chemical mutagens, "There has been spectacular progress in developing short term tests that use microorganisms and mammalian cell cultures," stated the report, *Identifying and Estimating the Genetic Impact of Chemical Mutagens*. "These tests are sensitive, efficient, reproducible, and inexpensive." The committee recommended that short-term tests be used for the huge number of chemicals that currently need screening and the more expensive mouse tests be reserved for "crucial" chemicals.

—MARJORIE SUN

The Growing Corporate Role in University Budgets

Corporate funding of university research is currently running at about 6 to 7 percent of all academic R & D, according to a recent analysis by the National Science Board.* That is about twice the level that most other studies have reported.

The board's figures indicate that corporations provided between $400 million and $450 million in 1980–1981 through a combination of direct project support, donations of scientific equipment, and unrestricted funds that universities themselves channel into research. Since there have been several multimillion dollar deals since those figures were collected, the total annual corporate investment in university research now probably tops $500 million.

The report, which contains the usual discussion of the costs and benefits of the new academic-industrial complex, points out that industry is still a minor player in terms of total funding: "All available evidence indicates that private industry has neither the resources nor the intention to compensate for any substantial cuts in publicly funded academic research. . . . If the present level of academic research is to be maintained, the principal burden will continue to fall on the public purse."—COLIN NORMAN

University-Industry Research Relationships (National Science Board, Washington, D.C., 1983).