

three journals into English. He said it was made on the grounds that the institute wanted them to appear as "international journals."

Schwartz argued that a French title "makes it appear that the contents are also in that language," while the inclusion of the name of the Institut Pasteur in the title "gives the impression that they are internal reviews of an institution, only publishing work which is carried out at that institution."

However, Schwartz described as a "misunderstanding" suggestions that in future the journals would only publish papers in English. All three would "continue to accept articles in French," he said.

This will go some way to bring the journal into line with an increasingly common practice in the European scientific publishing world, which is to aim to carry the majority of articles in English, but to accept publication of a few articles in languages such as French or German.

"It is better if the normal good scientific paper is published in English," says Guy Ourisson, director of the Institute of Chemistry of Natural Substances of the National Center for Scientific Research and editor of the chemistry journal *Tetrahedron*. "But of course, if a paper is exceptionally good, the language it is written in does not matter," he says.

In the meantime, the publicity surrounding the whole affair means that it has taken on a broader political significance. At a recent preparatory meeting in Paris for a summit of the Francophone countries due to take place in Senegal next month, the Canadian environment minister (and former ambassador to Paris) Louis Bouchard expressed his "disappointment, concern, indeed almost discouragement" at what was referred to as the "affaire de l'Institut Pasteur." He described the institute's proposals for changing the name of the journal into English as "absurd."

The French government, sensitive to the claim that it should be doing more to defend the French language as part of the country's cultural heritage, has now stepped in to regain some of its lost honor.

After discussions with the government, Pasteur director Schwartz announced that the institute would shortly be publishing a new journal—entirely in French. Known as *Annales de l'Institut Pasteur: notes, débats et résumés*, this will contain both original articles and a summary of all papers and articles appearing in the other three journals. According to institute officials, a government grant to help offset the cost of publishing the new journal is being sought.

■ DAVID DICKSON

Gramm-Rudman Avoided, for Now

The budget agreement reached last week between the White House and the congressional leadership may be good news for researchers who rely on the federal government for funds. If it sticks, the agreement will put off for another year the threat of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings deficit-reduction machine, the fiscal chain saw that is poised to lop large chunks off the 1990 federal budget—including the new growth proposed for many federal science programs.

There had been talk in Congress earlier this year of simply giving up on producing a 1990 budget and letting Gramm-Rudman do its work in cutting federal spending across the board. In an effort to squelch that idea, House Budget Committee chairman Leon Panetta (D-CA) sent a letter to his colleagues on 20 March, spelling out the consequences. For some science programs, they would be devastating: \$2.8 billion would be lopped off the \$12.2 billion requested for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation would see its budget request plummet from \$2.17 billion to about \$1.8 billion, and the general science programs funded by the Department of Energy would end up with about \$900 million—nearly \$300 million less than the amount requested.

The agreement reached last week sketches the broad outlines of the fiscal 1990 budget, penciling in the totals that Congress will appropriate—and that the Administration will accept—for defense, domestic programs, and foreign affairs. On paper, at least, it would bring the federal deficit next year down to \$99.4 billion, a shade under the \$100-billion limit set by Gramm-Rudman and a whopping \$60 billion less than this year's estimated deficit.

The totals will now be incorporated into a budget resolution that is expected to be endorsed by Congress. Then the appropriations committees will get to fight out the details of how much each individual program will receive. It is there that the fine print of the R&D budget will be written. Although the threat of automatic Gramm-Rudman cuts has receded, science programs still face a tough time.

The agreement provides for a total of \$157.5 billion for all so-called discretionary domestic programs. This includes the entire \$23.3 billion proposed for civilian R&D in the Reagan and Bush budgets, together with a lot of politically popular programs in areas such as housing, education, and health. As Representative Vic Fazio (D-CA) put it at a AAAS symposium on the R&D budget last week, "science is competing with the disadvantaged" for its share of the budget. Moreover, as Robert Reischauer, the director of the Congressional Budget Office, pointed out, science programs stand out because they constitute about the only areas of growth in the discretionary part of the budget. The combination of prominence and stiff competition "is likely to dampen any increase in the science and R&D budget," he warned.

The \$157.5 billion agreed to last week is about \$5 billion more than the amount included in the Reagan and Bush budgets, however, so the competition will at least be slightly eased. Some of the additional funds came from shaving a little off the total proposed for defense.

The budget agreement has not exorcized the Gramm-Rudman demon entirely—only put it off for another year. The deal includes no significant new taxes and does not curb growth in expenditures on pensions and other "entitlement programs." Moreover, many of the devices used to shrink the projected 1990 deficit below \$100 billion—such as selling off federal assets, taking the Postal Service off the budget, and shifting some farm support payments into fiscal 1989—will not affect the 1991 deficit. Gramm-Rudman, which requires the deficit to shrink below \$64 billion in 1991, will clearly be looming over next year's budget as well.

Robert Grady, the newly appointed assistant director of the Office of Management and Budget who is responsible for the budgets of most nonmedical civilian science programs, told the AAAS symposium that "we are not investing enough in science and technology." But he warned that the budget trends over the next few years indicate that "we are going to be gobbled up" by increases in entitlement programs.

Grady also told the audience, which consisted mostly of researchers and research managers, "you in this community are being outlobbied by senior citizens, environmental groups, and others, and I don't think that's healthy." Said Fazio, "we don't get a lot of cards and letters from home about the need to support research."

■ COLIN NORMAN