



**The Background
of the
McIntire-Stennis Act
for Cooperative Forestry
Research**

by R. H. Westveld

Director

School of Forestry

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION

SPECIAL REPORT 31

JUNE, 1963

THE BACKGROUND OF THE McINTIRE-STENNIS ACT
FOR COOPERATIVE FORESTRY RESEARCH

by R. H. Westveld¹

When President Kennedy signed the McIntire-Stennis Act into law (P. L. 87 - 788) on October 10, 1962, one phase of nearly six years of effort by forestry school administrators to strengthen forestry research and graduate education became a reality. The McIntire-Stennis Act of 1962 authorizes Congress to appropriate "such sums as the Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary. . ." to promote research in forestry at (1) Land Grant Colleges or agricultural experiment stations and (2) other state-supported colleges and universities offering graduate training in the sciences basic to forestry and having a forestry school.

Where there is more than one eligible institution in a state, the Act provides that the governor will decide which institutions will participate in the program and how the state's federal apportionment will be shared. The participating institutions must match the federal allotment with funds from non-federal sources.

Other significant provisions of the Act are (1) appointment by the Secretary of Agriculture of an advisory committee with equal representation from the forest industries and the federal-state agencies concerned with developing and utilizing the nation's forest resources and (2) election by the forestry schools of a national advisory board which shall consult with the Secretary of Agriculture on apportionment of funds and which shall seek at least once a year the counsel and advice of the advisory committee. The Secretary is authorized and directed to furnish advice and assistance through a co-operative state forestry research unit in the Department of Agriculture. The McIntire-Stennis Act could be as significant to the progress of forestry in the United States as the Weeks Act, the Clarke-McNary Act, and the McSweeney-McNary Act.

When forestry educators began exploring ways and means of strengthening forestry research and its counterpart--graduate education--they realized that a national effort would be necessary if the results were to be significant. They re-

¹Dr. Westveld, of the University of Missouri School of Forestry, played an important role in all the events which led to the enactment of this legislation. He served successively as chairman, Council of Forestry School Executives (October, 1956 to November, 1957); chairman, Research Committee, Council of Forestry School Executives (November, 1957 to September, 1958); chairman, Working Committee on Forestry at Land-Grant Colleges (October, 1958 to November, 1960); chairman, Commission on Forestry at Land-Grant Institutions (November, 1960 to October, 1961); and chairman, Commission on Forestry at Land-Grant and Other State Institutions (October, 1961 to present). Other educators who played important roles as officers or Advisory Committee members during all or part of this six-year period were: Walter F. McCulloch, Richard J. Preston, Frank H. Kaufert, Peter W. Fletcher, Henry J. Vaux, Albert D. Nutting, Wilbur B. DeVall, Carl H. Stoltenberg, and R. M. Kallander. Directors of agricultural experiment stations who gave assistance were F. Earl Price, John H. Longwell, M. A. Farrell, Mark Buchanan, and Norman Volk. V. L. Harper, Deputy Chief of Forest Service in charge of Research, and W. C. Hammerle, representing industry, also had roles in planning this legislation.

alized that it would take an all-out effort, but none realized that nearly six years would be required to make concrete progress. Neither did they realize that some of the methods they would choose to support would lead to failure. Many persons played a part in the progress made between 1957 and 1962 which led ultimately to the McIntire-Stennis Act. Included among those who helped were foresters in all types of work, friends of forestry in all walks of life working as individuals or through organizations, directors of agricultural experiment stations, and members of Congress. This report aims to record the events and factors that led to the present legislation and to give credit to those persons who played prominent roles in the final outcome.

Research at Forestry Schools Is Undernourished

The small contribution of the forestry schools' research to the total forestry research effort had been recognized for some time and reported first by Westveld (1954) and later by Kaufert and Cummings (1955). Both studies showed that although the forestry schools had received greatly increased support for research since World War II, this expansion had begun from such a low base that the programs were still woefully small. In discussing research at the accredited forestry schools, Kaufert and Cummings (1955) state: "It is evident that although the accredited forestry schools have increased their research activity and budgets considerably since World War II, their total research effort is a relatively small part of the national total and constitutes an important but decidedly undernourished segment of the forestry and related research effort." In the fiscal year 1959-60 the forestry research budgets of the educational institutions constituted 7.4 percent of the research budgets of all agencies doing forestry research. As research programs of the Forest Service and private agencies expanded substantially in recent years, the demand for research personnel with advanced degrees, particularly doctor's degrees, increased sharply. Forestry school administrators realized more than ever that their limited research programs were handicapping them in developing the type of graduate programs needed to meet this demand for research scientists. This became even more evident when a committee of the Council of Forestry School Executives met in Washington in February of 1957 to review a report of the United States Department of Agriculture's Committee on Research Evaluation.

The Review of the Report of the Committee on Research Evaluation and Its Aftermath

In March, 1956, a committee on research evaluation was established within the United States Department of Agriculture. Its purpose and duties were defined in an administrative memorandum signed by B. T. Shaw, Administrator, Agricultural Research Service, and concurred in by O. V. Wells, Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, and R. E. McArdle, Chief, Forest Service. The committee was asked to review the current research program of the United States Department of Agriculture in terms of its relation to the current and foreseeable future problems and objectives. When the report was completed in October, 1956, it was to be reviewed by a subcommittee of directors of agricultural experiment stations and a subcommittee of heads of forestry schools. V. L. Harper, Assistant Chief, Forest Ser-

vice (in charge of research), requested that the Council of Forestry School Executives appoint the forestry subcommittee.²

The two review subcommittees met with the Committee on Research Evaluation in February, 1957. With a preponderance of persons trained in agriculture at the conference, communication on forestry was not easy. Nevertheless, toward the end of the two-day meeting the agriculturists had a better understanding of forestry problems and began to realize that a different approach needed to be taken on forestry than on agricultural problems. Numerous revisions in the report were agreed upon, including specific recognition of the part played in agricultural research by the state agricultural experiment stations.

The revised report was reviewed by the two subcommittees, personnel of the United States Department of Agriculture and the national farm organizations. The final report was issued in three parts by the Agricultural Research Service (1960a, 1960b, 1960c). Members of the forestry subcommittee realized during the conference, more than ever, how poorly forestry schools were faring in the allocation of public research funds. For example, whereas the Forest Service budget for research constituted 14 percent of the total research budget of the United States Department of Agriculture, the forestry schools at land-grant institutions were receiving only about 1.7 percent of the federal funds received by the agricultural experiment stations under the Hatch Act. Three of the members of the subcommittee representing land-grant colleges, in discussing this problem, agreed that some type of organized effort was needed to secure larger allocations of federal funds for research at the forestry schools. This problem was discussed further with V. L. Harper, who, in earlier discussions with Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Peterson, had found Peterson sympathetic. The four members of the subcommittee associated with land-grant institutions were asked to explore this matter further.

A meeting of this committee with Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Peterson was arranged for June 4, 1957. Only the author and R. J. Preston of the Council of Forestry School Executives were able to attend this meeting at which V. L. Harper and E. C. Elting, Deputy Director for Experiment Stations, Agricultural Research Service, were also in attendance. Prior to the meeting, Preston and the author reviewed the whole problem with Harper and McArdle, who assured them all possible assistance to accomplish their objective of greater financial support for forestry research from federal funds.

In these discussions, four possible approaches to the problem were reviewed: (1) Substantially greater appropriations for payments to the states under the Hatch Act with the objective that a larger portion of these funds be allotted for forestry research; (2) an earmarked appropriation for forestry research under the Hatch Act; (3) an amendment to the McSweeney-McNary Act to authorize payments to educational institutions for forestry research; (4) increased appropriations to the Forest Service with an earmarked amount to be used for contract grants to the forestry schools.

In summary, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Peterson expressed the following views: (1) Forestry research at all levels must be greatly strengthened,

²The subcommittee was composed of R. H. Westveld, chairman of the Council of Forestry School Executives; G. A. Garratt; F. H. Kaufert; W. F. McCulloch; R. J. Preston; H. L. Shirley; and H. J. Vaux.

(2) strengthening of forestry research must not be made at the expense of agricultural research, (3) earmarked appropriations for forestry research under the Hatch Act are not desirable, and (4) special legislation for authorizing grants to states for forestry research outside the Hatch Act is undesirable.

At the conclusion of the conference, Secretary Peterson suggested that the Council of Forestry School Executives appoint a standing committee on forestry research which would have as one of its functions an annual meeting with representatives of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, including the Forest Service, to continue to explore ways of strengthening research at the forestry schools.

Meeting with the Experiment Station Committee
on Organization and Policy

The meeting with Secretary Peterson was discussed with the director of the Missouri Agricultural Experiment Station, John H. Longwell, who in 1957 was a member of the Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy (ESCOPE). The conclusion was that a need existed for improved liaison between the directors of the state experiment stations and the heads of the forestry schools. It was suggested that a better understanding of each other's problems and objectives could be mutually advantageous.

Since the meetings of ESCOP and the Council of Forestry School Executives occurred on the same day (November 9, 1957) making it impractical for the research committee of the Council to meet with ESCOP, Frank Kaufert, a member of the committee, met with the latter group in Denver while the Council of Forestry School Executives was meeting in Syracuse, New York. At the meeting of ESCOP, Kaufert expressed the concern of the forestry schools over their inadequate research programs. He reviewed the recent activities of the research committee of the Council of Forestry School Executives, including its report of October 31, 1957, to ESCOP and the conference with Secretary Peterson and others.

In the discussion which followed, it was apparent that (1) there was greater sympathy and understanding of the need for development of forestry research than ever before, (2) ESCOP was opposed to earmarked funds for forestry research under the Hatch Act, (3) if increased funds were to be secured under the Hatch Act, forestry projects would have to compete with projects in other fields for the additional funds, (4) ESCOP had no objection to amendment of the McSweeney-McNary Act to provide funds through the Forest Service for contract research at the forestry schools.

The meeting laid the foundation for future discussions and co-operation between the two groups. At a meeting of the experiment station section of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities in Denver on November 12, 1957, George Jemison, Deputy Assistant Chief (for research), Forest Service, spoke about the opportunities for greater co-operation in forestry research between the agricultural experiment stations and the Forest Service and the need for strengthening the research programs in the forestry schools at the land grant institutions. At this meeting, Kaufert explored two other proposals which might enhance the possibilities for stronger research programs in forestry schools at the land grant institutions. These were (1) possible representation of forestry school heads on ESCOP (presently composed of 12 agriculturists and four home economists) and (2) the establishment of

a Forestry Division (comparable to Agriculture and Home Economics Divisions) in the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities.

It was believed that implementation of these proposals could lead to better communications between forestry school heads and directors of agricultural experiment stations and could result in giving foresters a positive voice in the policies of the agricultural experiment stations, particularly in requests for and allocations of research funds under the Hatch Act. Forestry school heads were encouraged to study the second proposal. This was done, and later a decision was reached to drop the proposal, at least temporarily.

At its meeting the Council of Forestry School Executives approved the continuation of the work of the research committee. The newly elected chairman of the Council, Henry J. Vaux, appointed the author as chairman of the committee. Serving with him during the next year were William C. Bramble, Stanley G. Fontana, Frank H. Kaufert, Walter F. McCulloch, and Hardy L. Shirley.

Late in 1957, an interest was developed by Senators Thye and Humphrey of Minnesota, as a result of conversations with Kaufert, in the possibility of having the McSweeney-McNary Act amended to make provision for earmarked funds for contract research. More or less simultaneously, Congressman Cooley of North Carolina, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, became interested, in conversations with Preston, in sponsoring a bill with a similar objective. In the judgement of Congressman Cooley, a new bill would have a better chance of enactment than an amendment to the McSweeney-McNary Act, particularly if it emphasized forest products research and training of graduate students.

The research Committee decided to explore Congressman Cooley's proposal. The committee met with V. L. Harper and Congressman Cooley in February, 1958. After full discussion of his proposal, the committee urged Congressman Cooley to proceed with his plan. On March 19 he introduced H. R. 11495 in the House of Representatives (Cooley, 1958). The bill would provide authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to make contracts with "colleges, schools, and universities and with other public and private organizations and individuals" for research on forestry and forest products and for other purposes. The bill would authorize Congress to appropriate "the sum of \$5 million for each of the five fiscal years following the date of enactment of this Act and such further sums thereafter as may be necessary." On April 24, Senator Humphrey (1958) of Minnesota introduced S. 3695 and on April 25 the late Senator Neuberger (1958) of Oregon, together with Senators Javits of New York, Morse of Oregon, Allott of Colorado, Mansfield and Murray of Montana, and Proxmire of Wisconsin, introduced S. 3709, both bills identical to H. R. 11495.

Following discussion with Westveld on this legislation, Congressman Curtis of Missouri introduced H. R. 12592 in the House. This bill differed from H. R. 11495 and S. 3709 in only one respect--it eliminated the \$5 million annual ceiling. In commenting on his action Congressman Curtis wrote: "After getting into the matter I felt that the recommended \$5 million for each of the five fiscal years contained in the Cooley bill was uneconomic in that it will take a while for the program to be set up and it is my feeling that the program would not be far enough along to merit a \$5 million appropriation during the initial stages. It is my opinion that the Secretary of Agriculture actually has by virtue of the present law the au-

thority contained in the bill, but at least this bill and the Cooley bill will focus attention on the problem and will encourage hearings which will redound to the benefit of an expanded forestry research program."

At its March meeting, the Council of the Society of American Foresters authorized the president to designate a representative of the Society to present to the appropriate congressional committee a resolution which the Council adopted endorsing in principle more widespread use of contractual arrangements between the United States Department of Agriculture and the forestry schools and other appropriate units of research as a means of strengthening the research and graduate training programs of these institutions. Forestry school heads publicized these bills in their individual states and developed considerable interest in and support for them. However, Acting Secretary True Morse advised Congressman Cooley by letter on June 6, 1958, that "This Department is sympathetic with the objectives of H. R. 11495, but we do not believe there is need for its enactment because existing authority is adequate."

Thus ended the first effort to secure enactment by Congress of legislation to strengthen research in the forestry schools. On June 20, 1958, three members of the Research Committee met with Congressman Cooley, McArdle, and Harper. (Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Peterson was to attend the meeting, but due to a last-minute call to a White House meeting he could not attend.) The purpose of the meeting was to determine the action to be taken next. Prior to this meeting, in anticipation of an unfavorable report on H. R. 11495 by the Department of Agriculture, a letter had been sent to Secretary Benson by the chairman of the Research Committee requesting that the Forest Service included in its 1959-60 budget requests funds for contract research with the forestry schools. In reply to this letter, Assistant Secretary Peterson stated: "You may be assured that your suggestion of increased funds for the Forest Service budget for forestry contract research will be considered along with other related problems and needs. Meanwhile, the Forest Service plans to continue as before its co-operative aid program³ with some institutions for special studies when it is mutually advantageous and where the research at the schools will be stimulated on forestry problems." The committee agreed to work for appropriations in the Forest Service which would adequately support effective research in the forestry schools under contract arrangements.

Termination of Work of the Research Committee,
Council of Forestry School Executives

The work of the Research Committee during the year was reported at the meeting of the Council of Forestry School Executives in Salt Lake City in September, 1958. The Council was divided in its attitude on the work of the committee, some members feeling that the committee had exceeded the authority given to it a year previously, particularly in its activities in support of the Cooley and other bills. The committee was not re-appointed. The Council did pass the following resolution, however:

"WHEREAS, the Council of Forestry School Executives recognizes that strong programs of forestry research at the schools

³Prior to 1961 the Forest Service had used annually \$100,000 to \$150,000 of its budget for this program. In fiscal year 1962 this was increased to about \$500,000.

are essential for the effective training of the research workers needed by all forestry research agencies, and

"WHEREAS, the Council of Forestry School Executives has had a Research Committee functioning during the past year (1) to consider the ways in which an expanded program of research at forestry schools can be encouraged, whether by augmented funds from public and private sources or by other means; (2) to confer with the groups on other matters relevant to this subject; and (3) to report to the Council of Forestry School Executives its recommendations as to any actions which the Council might appropriately take to further the research function at such schools, and

"WHEREAS, that Research Committee has made substantial progress in developing plans and support for strengthening federal financing of research at the forestry schools:

"The Council of Forestry School Executives recommends that the Council, Society of American Foresters, appoint a Committee on Forestry Research to encourage implementation of the Council of Forestry School Executives Research Committee's plans by (1) reporting forestry school research needs periodically to the Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy, Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities. (2) testifying in support of relevant legislation. and (3) informing members of Congress as to the nature of the problem."

The Council of the Society of American Foresters the next day authorized the president to appoint a standing committee on forestry research "to review and study research needs of concern to the Society and to make recommendations to the Council." This committee had its first meeting in November, 1959, made preliminary reports at two annual meetings of the Society and a final report at the 1962 annual meeting the full text of which appeared in the Journal of Forestry (Committee on Forestry Research, 1962).

Working Committee on Forestry in the Land-Grant Colleges Is Organized

The Council of Forestry School Executives failed to give vigorous support to its Research Committee. As a result, representatives of forestry schools at land-grant institutions agreed at an informal meeting that their goal in research might be achieved by close co-operation with the directors of their agricultural experiment stations. They appointed the Working Committee on Forestry at Land-Grant Colleges in September, 1958, with the author as chairman, Kaufert as vice-chairman, and Preston as secretary. Its immediate objective was to explore the possibilities of affiliation with the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities in the belief that this organization provided the best means of co-operation with the agricultural experiment station directors. The heads of the forestry schools were to discuss with experiment station directors, and, if necessary, with the presidents of their respective institutions, the desirability and practicability of working for a Division of Forestry in the Association. Considerable sentiment in favor of a Division developed among the forestry school heads, and no adverse sentiment was in evidence among ex-

periment station directors and college presidents during the ensuing year. Nevertheless, at its 1959 meeting the Working Committee decided to abandon temporarily its goal for divisional status, probably because of the opportunity for informal working relations with ESCOP which developed soon after the 1958 meeting as a result of action taken by ESCOP at its 1958 meeting.

ESCOP Goes All Out for Forestry Research

At its meeting in November, 1958, ESCOP voted, subject to approval of the Executive Committee of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, to ask Congress for an increase of \$14 million in the appropriation under the Hatch Act for the fiscal year 1960-61. Tentatively, \$10 million was to be allocated to forestry and soil and water conservation research. In its formal statement before the Agricultural Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the Subcommittee on Appropriations of the House Committee on Agriculture, the Legislative Committee of ESCOP designated \$3,346,000 for forestry research.

John H. Longwell (Missouri), chairman of ESCOP appointed a four-member forestry subcommittee consisting of F. Earl Price (Oregon), chairman; Dale H. Sieling (Massachusetts); J. A. Ewing (Tennessee); and W. E. Krauss (Ohio) to work with the Executive Committee of the Working Committee on Forestry (Westveld, Preston, McCulloch, Vaux, and Kaufert) to develop its case in support of forestry research. Late in April of 1959, two members of this committee met first with three members of the Forestry Subcommittee and one member of the Legislative Committee of ESCOP and later with all members of ESCOP, to develop a full understanding of ESCOP's plans for seeking an increase of \$14 million in the appropriation under the Hatch Act for the fiscal year 1960-61.

Subsequently, the Executive Committee of the Working Committee on Forestry prepared material on forestry research needs for use by the Legislative Committee of ESCOP in its report to the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of the Budget requesting the \$14 million increase. In May of 1959, the Legislative Committee and one member of the Forestry Subcommittee of ESCOP presented testimony before representatives of the Bureau of the Budget in support of its request for an increase of \$14 million in the appropriation under the Hatch Act for the fiscal year 1960-61. They also conferred with Secretary of Agriculture Benson, Under Secretary Morse, and Assistant Secretary Peterson regarding budget needs. Forestry school heads gave wide publicity to this activity among those interested in forestry research and related problems. Interested parties expressed their views to their congressmen and senators and to the Bureau of the Budget.

To develop a better understanding by the directors of the agricultural experiment stations of the needs and opportunities in forestry research, two papers were presented at the meeting of the Experiment Station Section of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities in St. Louis in November of 1959. Director F. E. Price's paper was entitled "Opportunities for the State Experiment Stations in Forest Research," and V. L. Harper's paper was entitled "Co-Operation in Forestry Research." At this meeting, ESCOP decided that an increase of \$14 million in the appropriation under the Hatch Act be requested for the fiscal year 1961-62. This was subsequently approved by the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities.

In January of 1960, President Eisenhower recommended an increase of \$1 million in the Hatch Act appropriation for the fiscal year 1960-61. In March and April of 1960, representatives of the Executive Committee of the Working Committee on Forestry appeared with members of the Legislative Committee of ESCOP at hearings of the subcommittees of the House and Senate on appropriations to give testimony in support of the request for a \$14 million increase in Hatch Act appropriations. Subsequently, Congress voted an increase of \$1 million in this appropriation.

Working Committee on Forestry
at Land-Grant Colleges
Becomes Commission on Forestry
at Land-Grant Institutions

In November of 1960, the Working Committee on Forestry at Land-Grant Colleges changed its name to Commission on Forestry at Land-Grant Institutions. The chairman subsequently appointed an Advisory Committee of four, one from each of the four ESCOP regions. The members were Walter F. McCulloch (West), Carl H. Stoltenberg (North Central), Wilbur B. DeVall (South), and Albert D. Nutting (Northeast). At this meeting the officers were urged to explore further with the Forest Service other ways and means of securing financial support for research at forestry schools. In November of 1960 the chairman of the Commission on Forestry met with the Legislative Committee of ESCOP and with the newly elected chairman of ESCOP, Earl Price.⁴ It was learned at these meetings that several of the farm commodity groups were dissatisfied with the intent of the Legislative Committee to again emphasize the need for using substantial amounts of any increases in federal appropriations to agricultural experiment stations for forestry research. A later meeting of the Legislative Committee with representatives of the farm commodity groups, attended by one of the officers of the Commission on Forestry, failed to resolve this matter.

In his budget recommendation to Congress in January, 1961, President Eisenhower recommended an increase of \$2 million in Hatch Act appropriations. This recommendation was supported by President Kennedy. The Legislative Committee of ESCOP continued to work for an increase of \$14 million in order that forestry research could be given far greater financial support and other fields of agricultural research could make normal progress. An officer of the Commission on Forestry appeared with the Legislative Committee of ESCOP at appropriation subcommittee hearings before the Senate only. Congress voted an increase of \$3 million in the appropriation under the Hatch Act.

Commission on Forestry Explores
the Possibility of New Legislation

During the hearings before the subcommittees on appropriations in 1960 and 1961 and the conferences with representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, it was

⁴In this capacity, and previously (1958 to 1960) as chairman of a forestry subcommittee of ESCOP, Director Price worked with diligence and enthusiasm to acquaint the state experiment station directors with the research needs of the forestry schools and to develop their active co-operation with forestry school heads in seeking ways of strengthening forestry research.

evident that all these governmental representatives were disturbed over the surpluses of agricultural products and that so long as these surpluses were large they would resist recommending substantial increases for agricultural research. Attempts by members of the Legislative Committee of ESCOP and of the Commission on Forestry to point out that the problem in forestry was different from that in agriculture accomplished nothing. At the appropriation subcommittee hearings in 1961, the chairman of the House committee stated emphatically that the Hatch Act formula for distribution of funds was outmoded and proposed that the Legislative Committee request special funds outside the Hatch Act formula for special lines of work which were urgently needed. In June of 1961, the chairman of the Commission on Forestry discussed independently with representatives of the Forest Service and Congressman McIntire the desirability of new legislation as a means of securing financial support for research at forestry schools. It was agreed that this approach was worthy of full exploration. He also learned that the Forest Service planned to increase its financial support of the co-operative aid grant program from about \$150,000 to \$250,000 as a minimum⁵ annually beginning with the fiscal year starting July 1, 1961. Following these conferences in a meeting with the Legislative Committee of ESCOP, the committee suggested that, in line with Congressman Whitten's suggestion, forestry might be classed as a field urgently in need of financial support by the agricultural experiment stations and proposed this approach in developing information to support its next request for funds from Congress. The relative merits of this method and of attempting to secure specific legislation to authorize the appropriation of funds for forestry research were discussed thoroughly in a conference at which the Legislative Committee of ESCOP, the chairman of ESCOP, and the chairman of the Commission on Forestry were present. It was agreed that a completely fresh approach to the problem--new legislation--was desirable.

Following this conference, the chairmen of ESCOP, the Commission on Forestry, and the Legislative Committee of ESCOP met with Forest Service representatives to discuss the details of this approach further. They learned from V. L. Harper that the Forest Service was preparing a new ten-year Forestry Research Program which had been requested by the Secretary of Agriculture. The new program was to be a revision of the Forest Service Research included in the 1959 "Program for the National Forests" and was to embrace the federal research needed on problems of private forest lands. Harper reported that current studies being made by the Forest Service to provide the basis for the newly revised program included a study of federal assistance for forestry research to universities. He was convinced from their deliberations so far that special recognition must be given to the need for institutional formula grants to land grant colleges and other state universities having forestry schools, as well as to project grants. In regard to the formula grants, he thought new legislation would be desirable--legislation that would give forestry research at state institutions a status comparable to that of agricultural research under the Hatch Act.

Later, Congressman McIntire asked the Forest Service for legislative assistance in drawing up a bill involving the principle of a formula grant to states for forestry research on a matching basis. On August 7, 1961, he (McIntire, 1961) introduced in the House of Representatives H. R. 8535 "to authorize the Secretary

⁵ A special allotment totaling \$250,000 for the specific purpose of co-operative aid grants was made by the Washington office, Forest Service, to its forest experiment stations and Forest Products Laboratory. To this amount, each "field" director was encouraged to add funds from his regular program funds.

of Agriculture to encourage and assist the several States in carrying on a program of forestry research, and for other purposes." On August 11, 1961, Senator Stennis, who also had requested the Forest Service for information on legislative requirements to assist states in a co-operative program of forestry research, introduced in the Senate S. 1403 on behalf of himself and Senators Eastland and Aiken, a bill identical to H. R. 8535. Subsequently, five other identical bills were introduced in the House: H. R. 9219 by Congressman McMillan (1961) of South Carolina, H. R. 9110 by Congresswoman May (1961) of Washington, H. R. 9274 by Congressman Grant (1961) of Alabama, H. R. 9545 by Congressman Moulder (1962) of Missouri, and H. R. 10835 by Congressman Matthews (1962) of Florida. The bills were referred to the House Committee on Agriculture and the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Congressman Cooley and Senator Ellender, chairmen of their respective committees, requested the Secretary of Agriculture for a report on the bill. On April 23, 1962, the Department recommended that the bill be enacted with certain amendments, some of which were regarded later as unnecessary when other bills covering the points in question were introduced in Congress.

The 1961 meeting of the Commission on Forestry at Minneapolis in October provided an opportunity for a full discussion of these bills. Since state-supported schools other than land-grant colleges meeting certain requirements could qualify under the bills, representatives of forestry schools at non-land-grant state institutions were invited to attend this meeting. Also in attendance were Director Price, chairman of ESCOP, and the following representatives of the Forest Service: R. E. McArdle, T. F. McClintock, H. R. Josephson, and R. G. Florance. With representation from all major groups that had a direct interest in the legislation, there was an opportunity for free exchange of ideas and to obtain authentic information. During the meeting, the members of the Commission on Forestry at Land-Grant Colleges voted to change the name of its organization to Commission on Forestry at Land-Grant and Other State Institutions in order that all institutions that might be eligible under the bills would be included. The group endorsed unanimously the principles of the five identical bills which had been introduced in Congress and authorized its officers and Advisory Committee to develop plans to secure enactment of the legislation.

Widespread interest in and support for the legislation was quickly developed. However, limited opposition also developed quickly. The following appeared in the December 1, 1961, issue of What's Happening in Forestry: "Will academic freedom be stifled if federal matching funds are provided to bolster forestry research at colleges and universities?" This question and others were raised by Hall (1962). Specifically, he had fears of federal control of state forestry research programs, he was opposed to federal subsidy, and he was apprehensive about implied administration of the bill, if enacted, by a regulatory agency of the government, the Forest Service. He concluded, however, that if certain changes were made in the bills his most serious objections could be overcome. The proposed changes included a maximum limit on the size of an annual appropriation and a cut-off date of five to eight years on federal appropriations. He proposed, also, that provision be made for an advisory council composed of representatives of forestry schools, federal agencies, state agencies, industry, and the Society of American Foresters.

The Forest Industries Council at its meeting in December, 1961, reviewed the legislation carefully and approved its enactment if certain amendments were made. Some of the amendments were for the purpose of clarification, others would

make basic changes in the provisions of the bills. The chairman of the Commission on Forestry was invited to discuss these and other proposed amendments made by the Legislative Committee of the American Pulpwood Association with the members of that committee at their meeting in New York City on February 20, 1962. This discussion developed a better understanding by representatives of the forest industries and the forestry schools of their common objectives in this legislation. The Legislative Committee of the American Pulpwood Association appointed a special subcommittee to study the bill and the amendments proposed by industry representatives. Through discussions and correspondence, certain modifications were made in some of the proposed amendments. W. C. Hammerle, Manager of Policy Programs of the American Pulpwood Association, representing the Forest Industries Council, also discussed these with Congressman McIntire and representatives of the Commission on Forestry. As a result of numerous conferences, the differences in viewpoint were resolved prior to the hearings before the Subcommittee on Forests of the House Committee on Agriculture.⁶

Clean Bill H. R. 12688
Passed by House of Representatives

Based on the testimony and the discussion during the testimony, Congressman McIntire (1962) prepared and introduced in the House on July 25 a clean bill H. R. 12688 (House of Representatives, 1962) which retained the essential features of H. R. 8535. This bill was reported favorably on July 30 by the House Committee on Agriculture. Senator Stennis, on behalf of himself, Senator Eastland, and Senator Aiken (1962), introduced S. 3609 (identical to H. R. 12688) in the Senate on August 3, 1962. On August 6, the House passed H. R. 12688 under suspension of rules (Congress of the United States, 1962 b) and sent it to the Senate, where it was referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on August 7.

Senate Action on H. R. 12688

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported H. R. 12688 out on September 7, 1962 (Senate of the United States), with two amendments and recommended that it pass with amendments. The amendments would (1) make private institutions eligible for certification by the state for grants and (2) make all officials of eligible institutions eligible for membership on the national advisory board instead of "officials of forestry schools."

When the bill was considered by the full Senate on September 28, the amendments were rejected on motion of Senator Stennis and the bill was passed and sent to the President of the United States (Congress of the United States, 1962c). He signed the bill on October 10, thus creating P. L. 87-788 (Congress of the United States, 1962 d).

⁶The following individuals or organizations testified in support of the House bills at the hearings on July 23 and 24, 1962 (Congress of the United States, 1962 a): Congressman McIntire; Senator Stennis; V. L. Harper, Forest Service, representing the Department of Agriculture; R. H. Westveld, Albert D. Nutting, Peter W. Fletcher, R. M. Kallander, and Richard J. Preston, representing the Commission on Forestry at Land-Grant and Other State Institutions; George F. Dow, representing the Legislative Committee of ESCOP; Ralph C. Wible and Austin H. Wilkins, representing the Association of State Foresters; W. C. Hammerle, representing the Forest Industries Council; John R. Meyering, representing the Society of American Foresters; and J. Walter Myers, representing the Forest Farmes Association.

Congress now has the responsibility of appropriating funds under the legislation--the McIntire-Stennis Act--which it supported so effectively.

Literature Cited

Agricultural Research Service, 1960 a. A Detailed Analysis of Research in the United States Department of Agriculture as related to the report An Evaluation of Agricultural Research. Unnumbered Publication.

Agricultural Research Service, 1960 b. An Evaluation of Agricultural Research. United States Department of Agriculture. Miscellaneous Publication 816.

Agricultural Research Service, 1960 c: An Appraisal of Agricultural Research and the Road Ahead. United States Department of Agriculture. Agricultural Information Bulletin 221.

Committee on Forestry Research, 1962. An Analysis of Forestry Research in the United States. Journal of Forestry 60:863-871.

Congress of the United States, 1962 a. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Forests of the Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, 87th Congress, 2nd Session, on H. R. 7195, H. R. 8535, H. R. 9219, H. R. 9220, H. R. 9274, H. R. 9545, H. R. 9728, H. R. 10835, H. R. 10853, H. R. 11111, H. R. 12434, S. 3064, and S. 3112. Serial LL, pp. 1-62.

Congress of the United States, 1962 b. Proceedings and Debates of the 87th Congress, Second Session. Congressional Record 108 (176): 14612-14616.

Congress of the United States, 1962 c. Proceedings and Debates of the 87th Congress, Second Session. Congressional Record 108 (176): 20021-20023.

Congress of the United States, 1962 d. Public Law 87-788. 87th Congress, 2nd Session.

Cooley, Harold D. 1958. H. R. 11495. 85th Congress, 2nd Session.

Grant, George M. 1961. H. R. 9274. 87th Congress, 1st Session.

Hall, A. G. 1962. The Joker in the Deck. American Forests 68:28-31, 38, 40, 42.

House of Representatives of the United States. 1962. Report--Co-Operative Forestry Research. Report No. 2065.

Humphrey, Hubert H. 1958. S. 3695. 85th Congress, 2nd Session.

Kaufert, Frank H. and William H. Cummings. 1955. Forestry and Related Research in North America. Society of American Foresters.

McIntire, Clifford G. 1961. H. R. 8535, 87th Congress, 1st Session.

McIntire, Clifford G. 1962. H. R. 12688. 87th Congress, 2nd Session.

- McMillan, John L. 1961. H. R. 9219. 87th Congress, 1st Session.
- May, Catherine. 1961. H. R. 9220. 87th Congress, 1st Session.
- Moulder, Morgan M. 1962. H. R. 9545. 87th Congress, 2nd Session.
- Matthews, D. R. 1962. H. R. 10835. 87th Congress, 2nd Session.
- Neuberger, Richard L., et al. 1958. S. 3709. 85th Congress, 2nd Session.
- Senate of the United States. 1962. Report--Co-Operative Forestry Research. Senate Calendar No. 1974, Report No. 2013.
- Stennis, John C., James O. Eastland, and George D. Aiken. 1961. S. 2403. 87th Congress, 1st Session.
- Stennis, John C., James O. Eastland, and George D. Aiken, 1962. S. 3609. 87th Congress, 2nd Session.
- Westveld, R. H. 1954. Forest Research in Colleges and Universities Offering Forestry Education. Journal of Forestry 52:85-89.