une, March 14, 1943; the *Washington Times-Herald,* March 14, 1943.

Their passage would be worth 100 divisions to the enemy.—*The Chemist,* April, 1943, page 252.

The bill would be worth 100 divisions of trained, motorized troops to Adolph Hitler. *Chicago Tribune,* June 17, 1943.

Adolf Hitler wrote in "Mein Kampf":

. . . in the big lie there is always a certain force of credibility.

And:

. . . only constant repetition will finally succeed in imprinting an idea on the memory of the crowd.

So here we have Dr. Egloff, of the Universal Oil Products Company, using two of Hitler's techniques in his effort to defeat this bill. Also, it is significant to note that the *Chicago Tribune* and *Washington Times-Herald* gave strong play to his words.

I am deeply concerned that American men of science participate in a full discussion of this legislation: They alone can provide the advice and counsel to make the bill adequate to the national need.

The bill is based on five primary needs:

1. The need for a central independent agency of government devoted exclusively to the progress and expansion of science and technology, first to win the war and later to contribute to the peace. Science and technology need to be considered as a national resource, serving the interests of the nation as a whole and not those of select groups. Indeed, it is the only remaining sector of our public domain. This agency should be an independent arm of Government, eventually on the same footing as the established departments.

2. The need for integration of existing government research and development facilities. There are about 20 major and 40 minor bureaus in the Government devoted to research and development; their operation cost more than $557,000,000 last year. The excellent work of these groups should be so integrated as to widen the usefulness of their work and to provide a greater service to the public.

3. The need for active governmental support of fundamental research. The Government should give widespread support to basic research, by grants to existing non-governmental as well as governmental groups. This would apply particularly to universities and colleges, where fundamental research should flourish. Insufficient budgets have caused our educational institutions to depend increasingly on industrial grants and fellowships. This, to an alarming degree, has reduced much of university research to the status of handmaiden for corporate or industrial research, and has resulted in corporate control of many of our schools.

4. The need for a uniform and effective policy to achieve the fullest utilization of scientific and technical manpower in wartime.

5. The need to promote the use of government patents in the interest of the public. These patents are to be clearly distinguished from privately owned patents. They are of three types: Those derived from government research and development and assigned to a Federal Department or Bureau; those held by the Alien Property Custodian; those derived from non-governmental research financed by Federal funds.

The use of these patents needs to be promoted, and they should be administered for the public good.

I have long realized the basic importance to the welfare of the country of a free science and an expanding technology. I have long advocated a far-reaching program of governmental research. The experience of Federal agricultural research provides ample precedent for such a step. I have also observed that all advances in the public interest are fought bitterly by selfish interests. Examples have been the establishment of our public school system, public ownership of municipal water supplies, enforcement of sanitation of the milk supply, range and forest conservation, public ownership of power, and so on.

Scientific and technical men hold in their heads and hands the collective knowledge of the ages. Whose knowledge is it? This group, more than any other, can help achieve these purposes: To free technology for its maximum use in this technological war, and to free technology for the greater advancement of the American people.

HARLEY M. KILGORE

U. S. SENATE

SALMON CONSERVATION

I WISH to call attention to an article in "Discussion" in the March 12, 1943, issue of SCIENCE, entitled "The Fundamentals of Salmon Conservation."

The article in question has absolutely *nothing* to do with salmon conservation. The author, however, has taken advantage of the current food shortage to try to show some practical use for a pet experiment.

Just what difference could it possibly make to salmon conservation if ". . . the salmon with lateral line nerves bilaterally sectioned should be less apt to find their home stream than those with their lateral line nerves intact."

If the author merely wishes to discover what factor guides salmon in their return to their parent stream we have no quarrel with him. We do wish to point out, however, that his project should not masquerade either as a war-time food problem or even as a project fundamental to salmon conservation.

GEORGE A. ROUNSEFELL

U. S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE,
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.