

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

will make the decision. Congress, of course, can alter the draft legislation as it pleases and will probably be more specific about who is to decide when to apply the escape clauses.

Opposition Active

Congressional action, though, will not come until some time next year. There would be only the slightest chance of the legislation getting through during the current brief session even if there were no opposition. In fact there is some opposition, which removes any possibility of Congressional action during the current rump session. O. R. Strackbein, who runs an all-purpose high-tariff lobby known as the Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Export-Import Policy, has informed the House Ways and Means Committee that he would like to testify against the treaty. The Scientific Instrument Manufacturers Association also opposes the treaty. There may be others.

The most active group lobbying for the treaty has been the book-publishing industry, which hopes the treaty will make it easier to sell American books in Canada. The book printers, and the printers unions, on the other hand, seem to have their doubts about the benefits, and some of them, at least, are against the treaty. (Book publishers do not normally own the companies that print their books.) It was in deference to the printers that the United States delayed for so many years before signing the treaty. The International Copyright Agreement was signed about the time the Florence Agreement was opened for signatures. That, too, provided for removing some restrictions on importing books, and the State Department accepted the printing industry's view that the industry should not be subjected to a further lowering of protection until the effects of the first could be gaged. The State Department has a tough fight on its hands every time the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act (i.e. lower tariffs) comes up for renewal in Congress, and it doesn't like to offend any more people than it has to. The British, for their own reasons, took a long time to get around to joining the International Copyright Agreement, and it therefore was not until 1959 that the State Department felt it had enough evidence to indicate the lowered import barriers were causing no discernible damage to the American printing industry.

Scientists Concerned over Fate of Congo Parks

It is a matter of grave concern to natural scientists the world over that the newly established Congo Government should take appropriate measures to safeguard the unique sanctuaries for Central Africa's fauna and flora that are now found within the Congo parks. It is hoped that the new government will not hesitate to call upon the United Nations and its specialized agencies, as well as the International Union for the Conservation of Nature, to furnish it with scientific and technical assistance in carrying out a task which is of such concern to the world of science.

A great achievement in the field of the natural sciences has been accomplished during the past 30 years by Victor Van Straelen, a far-sighted and distinguished Belgian naturalist, with the support of the Belgian Government and the assistance of a small staff of dedicated Belgians and Congolese. More than 10,000 square miles of biogeographically differing territories of tropical Africa have been established in four great natural parks to protect the fauna and flora within these areas from outside influences and to preserve them for the future benefit of mankind.

The parks are the Albert National Park, bordering Uganda (3160 square miles); the Garamba National Park, bordering the Sudan (1922 square miles); the Upemba National Park, in Katanga (4581 square miles); and the Kagera National Park, in Ruanda and bordering Tanganyika (980 square miles). Altogether the parks occupy about 1 percent of the entire land area.

There is little awareness that no large areas in the tropics have been as intensively scientifically studied and inventoried as those that lie within these four parks, which have been administered since 1929 by the Institute of the National Parks of the Congo and Ruanda Urundi, with a board of directors made up of two-thirds Belgians and one-third conservation leaders from England, France, Holland, Portugal, Switzerland, and the United States.

The Congo parks, which include a wide range of habitats from high rugged mountains and active volcanoes to grassy plains and lakes teeming with animal life, have been largely protected against the influence of outside forces, including man. They have been administered in such a way as to preserve as

far as possible the natural balance of their biotic environment from the smallest microscopic worm to the largest elephant, from the largest trees to the most inconspicuous mosses. In fact, these parks represent what was defined by the London African Convention of 1933 as "integral natural reserves" or what we call in this country "primitive areas," areas that have been set aside within our national parks or forest reserves which are not usually open to the general public. In fact, it was the American naturalist, Carl Akeley, who encouraged King Albert back in 1925 to issue the decree first establishing the Albert National Park to protect the habitat of the mountain gorilla. In the Congo parks, such rare species as the northern white rhinoceros and the mountain gorilla have complete sanctuaries, as do hundreds of species of African animals, each filling its niche in a relatively undisturbed natural biotic community.

It should be pointed out that the Institute of National Parks has allowed limited access to certain sections of the parks to the tourist public, particularly in the Ruindi-Rutshuru plains area of the Albert National Park, which has attracted several thousand visitors and tourists each year with its antelope, buffaloes, hippos, lions, and elephants. However, as a general policy, in the rest of the parks access roads have been kept at a minimum, while a wide variety of scientific research has been constantly under way.

The scientific effort that has gone into the study of these parks is evidenced by the fact that back in 1956 the Institute had issued 262 scientific reports totaling more than 20,000 pages, including descriptions of 2467 new species. Their photographic record at that time included more than 50,000 prints. Sample subjects that were dealt with in these comprehensive scientific reports include fossils, plants, insects, reptiles, large mammals, soils, hydrology, geologic structure, and volcanoes.

During the 25 years from 1932 to 1956, 13 naturalists were engaged in repeated field missions, assisted by 34 additional scientists supported by funds of the Institute, with the result that the three biologically differing areas of the Albert, Garamba, and Upemba Parks were so intensively studied that their fauna and flora are actually more thoroughly known than those of any large African area, or in fact of any extensive tropical area in the world. The