

close relationships he established with leaders in Iran were important in cementing the present close relationships between that country and the United States.

Throughout his career Harris had the warm support of his wife, Estella Spilsbury Harris. She accompanied

him to public functions and made their home notable for generous hospitality, and together they reared a distinguished family of six children.

The death of Harris in April of this year terminated a busy career which had been a source of inspiration to thousands of college students. He had

produced six books and numerous scientific articles and had guided the development of agriculture in several foreign nations as well as in the western United States.

WYNNE THORNE
*Agricultural Experiment Station,
Utah State University, Logan*

Science in the News

Use of Funds from Sales of Surplus Foods for Science and Education Is Not up to Expectations

For six years the United States has been selling about a billion dollars' worth of surplus food abroad each year. Most of the money is given back to the purchasing country in the form of outright grants or long-term loans.

About one-fifth of the money is actually available for the United States to spend. Most of this "U.S. use" share of the proceeds is used to supply the foreign currency needs of American diplomatic and military personnel in the countries involved in the sales agreements. Some of it is earmarked for such programs as the Fulbright scholarships and agricultural research. In a few countries there is an excess of currency. We have more than we can spend, and to remove this embarrassment of riches Congress last year authorized the use of excess foreign currency for such things as scientific and cultural ventures. But the effects of this new authority have, so far at least, turned out to be unimpressive. Indeed, due to some wording slipped in late in the Congressional deliberations, the amendments to Public Law 480 intended to expand the science and education programs financed under this act have actually had the effect of inhibiting those activities.

The law is known formally as the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and more familiarly as simply PL 480, despite some efforts to give it a more impressive title, such as the Food for Peace Act. Es-

entially the law represents an effort to get rid of some of our immense food surpluses to the mutual advantage of ourselves and the rest of the world.

During the last fiscal year (ending 30 June 1960) the "U.S. use" share of the proceeds came to just over a quarter of a billion dollars, or 22 percent of the total value of the food shipped abroad. Of this, only \$5.1 million was available for the scientific, medical, and cultural programs under the new authority given in the 1959 amendments. Nearly 80 percent of this limited amount was for agricultural research, the remainder was for the National Science Foundation translation program. This was spent in three countries: Yugoslavia, Poland, and Israel. The Yugoslavs and Poles worked mainly on translating their own publications into English; the Israelis worked mainly on English translations of Russian work.

There was no money available for such newly authorized programs as the acquisition and distribution by the Library of Congress of foreign publications and the establishment of chairs in American studies in foreign universities. The limited "U.S. use" funds are, in most countries involved in the program, fully committed to cover the needs for foreign currency under the older programs, which have priority. The new authority to pay for cultural, scientific, medical, and educational activities (Section 104k) only becomes useful when the government finds it has an excess of foreign money that might otherwise go unused. As inter-

preted by the Bureau of the Budget, this means that no money can be made available for the new programs until the U.S. has accumulated a backlog of several years' currency in a country, enough to meet any shortage that might develop. The decision as to whether there is surplus money available in a given country is somewhat arbitrary, depending on what you call a reasonable layaway for future years. But even the most generous estimators do not see any surplus money in more than a dozen of the 38 countries taking part in the agreements. The Bureau of the Budget, which has the final say, narrows this down to only six. This means there is some but not a great deal of money that might be made available to expand programs under Section 104k next year.

Federal Bookkeeping

To get this money, an agency that would like to spend some excess currency puts in a request with the Bureau of the Budget. The bureau then distributes whatever excess money there is available among the requesting agencies. The agencies put the requests, in terms of the equivalent in American dollars, into their next budget request to Congress. If they get an appropriation they draw the money out of the Treasury and give it to the Commodity Credit Corporation, which handles the PL 480 program, and in return draw the equivalent in foreign currency. Thus, although for bookkeeping purposes the money appears as an addition in dollars to the agency's budget, the American money merely travels around within the government. Nevertheless, in the view of some critics this bookkeeping arrangement has had an unfortunate effect on the programs for using excess PL 480 funds. These critics, including some within the Administration, suggest that the Bureau of the Budget is so intent on keeping the federal budget as low as possible that it tends to try to cut down even spending of excess foreign currency under PL

480. For, although this involves no actual expense to the government, the bookkeeping arrangement does lead to an apparent increase in the budget.

There will probably be an increase of Section 104k programs in the years ahead. Neither Nixon nor Kennedy is as conservative on budget questions as Eisenhower has been, and both insist that they will vigorously support an expansion of sales of surplus goods; this will make more PL 480 funds available in any case. Meanwhile, unless Congress finds time in the current hectic session to alter the wording that went into the law with Section 104k, the chief immediate effect of this amendment designed to increase spending on scientific, educational, and cultural activities will be to limit such activities.

What happened was that Senator Ellender of Louisiana, who has long been irked by what struck him as excessive waste in the foreign aid programs, took the opportunity while the bill was being prepared for final passage in a House-Senate conference to insert a clause requiring that any spending for the *purposes* of Section 104k—that is, for medicine, science, education, or culture—had to be authorized by a specific Congressional appropriation. It is not clear whether the majority of the conference committee realized at the time that Ellender's wording would apply to any spending of PL 480 money for such purposes, and not only to the spending of excess "U.S. use" money. The Administration has been trying to have a correction made, but so far without success. Efforts to add a correcting amendment to this year's Mutual Security bills were killed in committee in both the House and Senate on the grounds that such a correction could not properly be included in the legislation at hand. It now appears unlikely that a correction will be made before some time next year. Meanwhile, when the State Department negotiates a trade agreement under PL 480 it can readily agree to make some of the foreign country's share of the funds available for building a road or a dam, but if the country wants some money for a school or a laboratory, the State Department must tell it to wait until a specific appropriation can be gotten from Congress. This takes about 18 months, and the State Department's negotiators have been having some difficulty in explaining that, despite the delay, the United States really has nothing against science and education.

Treaty Reducing Tariffs on Books, Art, and Scientific Instruments Takes Another Small Step Forward

The State Department has now sent to Congress draft legislation to implement the Florence Agreement on removing tariffs and import restrictions on scientific, educational, and cultural material. There is not enough time left, at this late date, for the legislation to be put through in the current session. But it appears that the agreement is likely to actually go into effect some time next year. It has been in the works for a dozen years.

The State Department says it is uncertain about the likely effects of the agreement. They are not likely to be earth-shaking. But implementation of the treaty will mean tariff reductions that will save a fairly substantial amount of money for educational institutions buying certain narrowly restricted types of scientific equipment. It will allow modest savings for people who buy books that have been published abroad. The most obvious beneficiaries will probably be museums and art collectors who for years have felt harassed by customs inspectors who have frequently insisted that works of modern art were not really art under the provisions of the U.S. customs regulations and were therefore subject to the heavy import duties laid on "decorations."

The Florence Agreement was negotiated in 1949 by the United States and other members of UNESCO. In June 1959, the United States became the 31st country to sign the agreement. The Administration asked the Senate for its advice and consent at the end of August 1959. By that time it was too late for the Senate to act, but hearings were held in January of this year, soon after the new session began, and on 23 February the Senate consented to ratification by a vote of 71 to 14. The debate was brief. The only criticism was voiced by Senator Cotton (R-N.H.), who said that he would have to vote against the treaty because although no communist countries had joined the agreement it was possible some might and he didn't want to undergo the risk of this country "opening the door to an influx of literature from those countries." The principal items covered by the treaty are books, works of art, and, with severe limitations, scientific instruments.

The treaty's actual effectiveness will depend very much on the way in which

the next Administration chooses to interpret it. There are several escape clauses, the most important allowing a country to clamp on tariffs or import quotas in spite of the treaty if it feels the imports might unreasonably damage domestic producers of similar goods.

In the case of scientific instruments the treaty is especially limited: it applies only to instruments going for research purposes to educational institutions. Individual buyers will not benefit, and in any case the treaty will apply only when instruments equivalent to the ones being imported are not produced within the importing country. This means that a foreign microscope costing \$100 could not be imported duty free unless it were superior in some way to any microscope produced in America, no matter what the price.

Another escape clause, intended primarily for books, allows the treaty members to bar any items they regard as a threat to "national security, public order, or public morals." Despite this, none of the communist countries has shown any interest in signing the agreement. They apparently share Senator Cotton's apprehensions about the danger of opening their countries to an influx of literature from foreign countries.

Implementing Legislation

Under the Constitution treaties are self-implementing—that is, their provisions take precedence over any domestic laws to the contrary. But as a practical matter the Administration makes a practice of holding up the final steps of ratification of most treaties until Congress has passed legislation revising domestic laws to conform with the treaty, assuming such revisions are necessary. In this case, the necessary revisions relate to the elimination of tariffs and import quotas on the goods covered by the treaty and to establishing some mechanism for deciding when use of the escape clauses might be justified. After the Senate approved the treaty it took six months for the various interested agencies (the State Department, the Treasury, the Tariff Commission, and several others) to confer among themselves over who should make the determination. This accounts for the delay between the time the treaty was approved and the submission of draft legislation. Actually no decision was ever made. The draft legislation simply grants the President the power to designate someone who