ceptives if they requested them. His remark, once reported in the press, became tantamount to a new declaration of policy. For his part, Zablocki, after receiving an assurance that no nation would be pressed to adopt a birth control program as a condition for receiving U.S. economic and technical assistance, let the matter pass.

Agency-financed shipments of contraceptives began later in the year. In September Gaud announced that AID would furnish India $1.3 million worth of contraceptives, including enough birth control pills to supply 100,000 women during an 18-month pilot project. (India did not license oral contraceptives until 1966, and its attitude toward general use of the pill in the national family planning program remains cautious.)

The first move in Congress to earmark funds for family planning was made by Senator J. W. Fulbright of Arkansas, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. On 14 March Fulbright and 15 cosponsors introduced a bill to authorize an appropriation of $50 million for the population program. Fulbright noted that, in 1965, the National Citizens Commission on Population of the White House Conference on International Cooperation had said $300 million should be made available over the following 3 years. In later congressional hearings, William H. Draper, Jr., chairman of the Population Crisis Committee, and Richard N. Gardner, a professor of international law at Columbia and chairman of the Citizens Commission in 1965, strongly supported the earmarking of money for family planning.

The Foreign Affairs Committee, adopting its version of the Fulbright proposal as part of the foreign aid bill, specified that $50 million should be used for the population program and for that purpose alone. Subsequently, when the bill was under heavy attack on the House floor, the amount so earmarked was reduced to $20 million—the sum Gaud had said AID planned to spend.

But, before the foreign aid authorization and appropriation bills finally emerged from Congress, the amount earmarked was compromised at $35 million. The agency, with a large bundle of extra family planning money thrust upon it, so far has spent or "obligated" less than a third of the $35 million and will be hard pressed to spend the remainder by 30 June.

However, the possibilities for using the money are numerous and large. For example, Ravenholt believes every developing nation recognizing a need for family planning should work toward what he feels are two readily attainable goals: to establish a family planning center in every maternity hospital, and to make sure that such centers have contraceptives available. Where funds are limited, he says, maximum use of existing facilities for family planning purposes should take precedence over more costly efforts to extend a nation's network of clinics and hospitals.

Twenty-three developing nations, having altogether more than a billion people, now have official action programs to extend family planning to their lower classes. In 22 other nations, organized family planning activities by voluntary groups are under way, even though little or nothing is being done by government. The increasing interest of the developing nations in family planning allows AID to do much more in this field today than it could have accomplished a few years ago, no matter how much money Congress might have made available.

The agency will help these nations both directly and indirectly—indirectly through the International Planned Parenthood Federation and other voluntary agencies and through the United Nations and its specialized agencies. Centers for research and training in population work, such as those at Johns Hopkins and the University of North Carolina, also will receive support. In short, although $35 million is not a huge sum in view of the need, AID is becoming, almost overnight, by far the largest single supporter in the advanced nations of efforts to check population growth in the underdeveloped world.—LUTHER J. CARTER

British Budget: Tight Funding To Continue in Research Field

London. The cuts in public spending by the British government made as a sequel to devaluation inflicted no mortal wounds on major science or science education programs. These cuts, however, did continue a process of trimming and tightening which began before devaluation and is likely to affect British science for some time.

In most cases the government chose to reduce or forego future increments in spending rather than cut back current programs. The main target of the economy knife is the military budget, and the largest slice is the cancellation of an order for 50 American F-111 aircraft. Total savings over 10 years will be about £400 million; direct dollar savings are estimated at $700 million. The F-111 cancellation is part of a package of cuts made possible by a significant change in Britain's "East of Suez" policy. Withdrawal from most bases in the Far East and Persian Gulf has been moved up to 1971. Britain's aircraft carrier force will be phased out sooner than had been previously planned, fewer hunter-killer nuclear submarines are to be built, and reductions in military manpower are to be speeded up. At home, Britain's civil defense program will be reduced to a "care and maintenance" basis, and civil defense voluntary service will be disbanded. Ultimate savings are put at £20 million a year.

Outside the military sphere the most controversial government actions were reimposition of charges for medical prescriptions and postponement of the planned raising of the age (from 15 to 16) at which students leave secondary school. The approximately 30-cent charge on each prescription is expected to bring in the equivalent of $60 million a year. Exemptions from the charge for children, the elderly, expectant and nursing mothers, and the chronically ill, and refunds for the needy, are planned. But the exemptions are not easy to

Biology in Europe: Cooperation Grows

Geneva. The effort to win government financing for the promotion of molecular biology on a European basis is making definite progress. A draft constitution for a European Molecular Biology Conference made up of Western European governments was agreed upon at a meeting here late in January, and ratification is expected to follow fairly rapidly.

The new conference would underwrite the program of fellowships and summer courses now operated by the European Molecular Biology Organization (EMBO). EMBO's members are individual biologists elected according to scientific accomplishment, and EMBO fellowships and summer courses have until now been financed by Foundation grants. EMBO, however, has been seeking government support for its programs through creation of an intergovernmental organization modeled on the European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN). The Geneva meeting was the latest of several meetings held here involving EMBO members and representatives of government science ministries.

No decision has been reached on the proposal for establishment of a European laboratory for research in molecular biology (*Science*, 2 June 1967). The question is expected to come up at later meetings.

Prospective member countries are in general those which belong to CERN: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom. Yugoslav and Polish representatives attended as observers.

No budget is mentioned in the draft, but expenditures starting at the present $200,000-a-year budget figure and rising to $1 million in 1971 have been discussed.—J.W.

administer, and any sort of means test has been regarded as political poison in Britain since the days of the dole in the 1930's. Free medicine has had a symbolic meaning for a particular generation of the Parliamentary Labor Party's left wing, and the charges were a main factor in the abstention of 25 Labor members in the House of Commons confidence vote on the cuts.

By deferring for 2 years the raising of the age for leaving secondary school, putting it off until 1973, the government expects to save £33 million this year and £48 million in 1969–70, principally in school construction costs. In announcing the cuts Prime Minister Harold Wilson applied some balm when he said that an extra £8 million would be spent in each of the 2 years so that comprehensive reorganization of the secondary schools "is not held up." Additional funds for priority areas in education were also promised.

Pains have obviously been taken to avoid cuts which would inhibit industrial modernization and economic growth. The Ministry of Technology's programs in support of the shipbuilding, computer, electronics, and machine-tool industries will go forward. Savings of £13 million this year and £15 million next year are planned, however. The Atomic Energy Authority will be affected; cuts of £3 million for the AEA have already been announced. Details are not yet worked out, but it appears that cuts will be spread over R & D projects and should not affect reactor research, particularly fast-reactor development. The drop in AEA manpower is expected to continue.

University authorities are in a gloomy mood. The full effects remain to be assessed, but the 5-year financing program announced by the University Grants Committee about 2 months ago was a fairly austere one, and the Prime Minister brought no cheer when he announced that funds for capital construction at the universities this year are to be cut.

Basic research was not specifically mentioned in the Wilson message. The impression is that basic research has escaped the ax, but the Department of Education and Science, which is the main patron of fundamental research, seems to be waiting for the Treasury to release its yearly detailed estimates before commenting on how the research councils will fare.

Government silence on such major technological projects as the Channel tunnel, the Concorde supersonic transport, and the 300-Gev proton synchrotron for CERN (*Science*, 12 January) is intriguing. The clue may well be found in Wilson's statement that Britain intends to "make to the alliances of which we are members a contribution related to our economic capability while recognizing that our security lies fundamentally in Europe and must be based on the North Atlantic alliance." Twenty years ago British withdrawal from India signaled the end of an imperial era. The last two decades have been for Britain a kind of epilogue to empire. But the recent change in military policy East of Suez is, in effect, the renunciation of a world role. The consensus here is that economic necessity has at last forced Britain to accept identity as a European power. A logical result of this new perspective would be a warmer government view of efforts to strengthen scientific and technical ties with Britain's European peers.—JOHN WALSH

APPOINTMENTS

John J. Procknow, medical director and administrator of Barlow, a University of South Carolina affiliated hospital, to first Walter Jarvis Barlow professor of Chest Diseases in the department of medicine, in the university school of medicine. . . . **Ivan Tolstoy**, associate director of the Columbia University Hudson Laboratories, to professor of ocean engineering, Columbia University's School of Engineering and Applied Science. . . . **L. J. Haynes**, dean of the faculty of natural sciences, University of the West Indies, to president of the newly established Jamaican Association of Scientists. . . . **Lawrence Markus**, director of the Center for Controlled Sciences, University of Minnesota, to Nuffield visiting professor, Mathematics Research Centre of the University of Warwick, England. . . . **Gifford H. Symonds**, visiting professor of operations research, to visiting scholar at the Center for Research in Management Science, University of California, Berkeley. . . . **Hans W. Liepmann**, professor of aeronautics, California Institute of Technology's Graduate Aeronautical Laboratories, named as the first Dryden Research Lecturer by the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics. . . . **William P. Weiss**, assistant professor of pharmacology, George Washington University, to chief, program review and development division, District of Columbia Department of Health.