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## IVTRODCCTION

In September and October 1995. a team of Forest Service officials conducted a management review of national grasslands. The team visited several national grasslands in different states, spoke with Forest Service employees involved in the day-to-day administration of these areas, and met with representatives from Congress, state and local governments, other federal agencies, business interests, grazing permittees, environmental organizations, and private individuals simply interested in the management of national grasslands. In total, the team heard from more than 300 people. Some of what the team heard was positive; some was not. Some of what the team heard dealt with the administration of an individual national grassland unit; some dealt with more systemic concerns related to the administration of all national grasslands.

In December 1995, the team issued a document entitled "Report of the National Grasslands Management Review Team" (hereafter the "Report")' and, in May 1996, the Forest Service issued a followup "National Grasslands Management Review Action Plan" (hereafter the "Action Plan").' One of the principal findings in both the Report and the Action Plan was that the laws, regulations. and policy governing the administration of national grasslands were not well understood or accepted by the public. Perhaps more surprising, however. was the finding in the Report and Action Plan that the laws, regulations. and policy governing the administration of

[^0]national grasslands were not well understood or accepted by many Forest Service employees either. The Action Plan directed that a "white paper" be prepared to identify and interpret the laws and regulations applicable to the administration of the national grasslands. It was felt that such a "white paper" would assist Forest Service employees involved in the day-to-day administration of the national grasslands and improve their understanding of the laws and regulations applicable to these areas. In so doing, it would also facilitate a more consistent application of the law to similar cases arising on different national grasslands.

This is that "white paper." Section I briefly identifies the number, size and location of the national grasslands currently administered by the Forest Service. Section II reviews the significant events which led to the establishment of national grasslands. Section III examines the current statutory and regulatory authorities applicable to national grassland management. Section IV addresses a number of frequently asked questions about national grassiand administration. Section $V$ summarizes the most important aspects of this primer. Finally, Section VI of this primer contains several appendices of supplementary material that may be useful for current or future reference.

A word of caution. While this primer contains the most up-to-date information and is perhaps the most comprehensive collection of material pertaining to the administration of national grasslands. it will need to be revised and updated periodically to take into account changes in law and policy. In addition, since this primer is intended to benefit the largest possible audience. much of the analysis is necessarily somewhat generic. While this primer
should facilitate analysis of many problems which may arise from time to time on the national grasslands, the actual outcome in any given case may well depend on the specific facts of that case. Consequently, the Forest Service should. whenever feasible, consult with the Office of the General Counsel for more particular advice on how to deal with a specific problem.

```
I. SIZE. vU'MBER. A.vD LOC.atION OF .NATIO.V.4L GR4SSLA.VDS
```

By law, the Forest Service is responsible for the administration of the 191 million acres of federal land that comprise the National Forest System. The largest component of the National Forest System is, by far, the national forests. There are 155 national forests which contain more than 187 million acres of federal land. This amounts to almost $98 \%$ of the total acreage in the National Forest System.

The second largest component of the National Forest System is the national grasslands. The Forest Service currently administers twenty national grasslands consisting of $3,842,278$ acres of federal land. National grasslands are located in thirteen states. However, nine national grasslands consisting of $3,161,771$ acres of federal land are in the Great Plains states of Colorado, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming. National grasslands in these four states alone thus contain more than $82 \%$ of the total national grassland acreage.

The following table lists each national grassland, its acreage, and the state(s) in which it is located. ${ }^{3}$

[^1]| National Grassland | Acreage | State(s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Black Kettle | 31.286 | OK. TX |
| Buffalo Gap | 597.178 | SD |
| Butte Valley | 18,425 | CA |
| Caddo | 17,873 | TX |
| Cedar River | 6,717 | ND |
| Cimarron | 108.175 | KS |
| Comanche | 435,359 | CO |
| Crooked River | 111,348 | OR |
| Curlew | 47.756 | ID |
| Fort Pierre | 115,997 | SD |
| Grand River | 154,981 | SD |
| Kiowa | 136,417 | NM |
| Little Missouri | 1,028,045 | ND |
| Lyndon B. Johnson | 20,309 | TX |
| McClellan Creek | 1,449 | TX |
| Oglala | 94.480 | NE |
| Pawnee | 193,060 | CO |
| Rita Blanca | 92.989 | OK.TX |
| Sheyenne | 70.268 | ND |
| Thunder Basin | 560.166 | WY |

Although national grasslands were not officially designated as such until 1960 , the events which led to their origin are generally traced back almost one hundred years earlier. to the time of the Civil War.

In order to facilitate settlement of the Great Plains and other areas of the sparsely populated West, Congress enacted the Homestead Act of 1862 which authorized the disposition of 160 acre parcels of federal land to qualified individuals. ${ }^{\downarrow}$ To those who met the requirements, the land was free except for filing fees. Following the submission of an application, a homesteader was allowed six months to establish a residence on the land. Actual settlement and cultivation of the land were required for five years after which a patent would be issued to the homesteader.

While over 600 million acres of land was initially available for homesteading under the 1862 Act. relatively little of it was arable. ${ }^{5}$ In addition. because of the low average annual precipitation in many parts of the West, it was frequently difficult to conduct an economically viable farming operation under the 160 acre limitation imposed by the Homestead Act. Even

[^2]when Congress enacted the Enlarged Homestead Act in $1909^{\circ}$. doubling to 320 acres the amount of land that could be homesteaded west of the $100^{\text {th }}$ meridian. the farming lifestyle was still rigorous to say the least. ${ }^{7}$

Nonetheless, the lure of free land brought people to the west in droves. By 1904, nearly 100 million acres of western land had been homesteaded into 500,000 farms. Many of these farms were on submarginal lands. ${ }^{8}$

643 U.S.C. §§218-221. This law was also repealed by FLPMA in 1976.
7 In Jonathan Raban’s book, Bad Land - An American Romance, a vivid picture of the hardscrabble existence of farmers in Montana between 1917 and 1920 is chronicled.

When the thaw eventually came [in 1917], the ground was ploughed, the spring wheat planted, and, on several successive mornings, a thin drizzle, more mist than rain, coloured the soil before the sun emerged and baked it dry. In late May, the midday temperature was already in the low nineties. On the Wollaston place, the spring under the lone cottonwood tree, a quarter of a mile west of the house, dried up, and the watering hole turned white, like rutted concrete. The iron windmills that served the cattle-troughs continued to creak monotonously overhead, but produced an alarmingly feeble dribble of yellow-tinged alkali water.

In 1917, 11.96 inches of rain fell at Miles City. . . In 1918, 12.62 inches. In 1919, 11.24 inches. In 1920, 12.83 inches. Though the numbers fluctuate slightly, each year was worse than the last, with too little rain falling on ground already parched beyond hope. Fifteen inches of rainfall was the make-or-break rule of thumb. Much less than that. and the topsoil turned to dust, and the hopper squadrons darkened the sky round the edge of the sun.

8 As used in this primer. "submarginal land" will be used to refer to lands low in productivity or otherwise ill-suited for farm crops. Such land falls below the margin of protitable private cultivation.

More people flocked to rural lands from cities and towns during the Great Depression of the late 1920's and early 1930's. Unfortunately. this influx of new people often exacerbated the problems of established farmers but did little. if anything, to improve the plight of the newcomers. Foreclosures multiplied, tax delinquencies increased, and farm incomes dwindled. To complicate matters further, the economic hardships suffered by many farmers during this time were accompanied by devastating natural events like droughts, floods, insect infestations, and erosion. In retrospect, it became apparent that thousands of farm families had been living in poverty on submarginal land long before the advent of the Great Depression and the Dust Bowl. These twin events made farming, already a difficult lifestyle, that much more challenging. For many, the additional challenge was simply too much.

Beginning in the 1930's, the Government launched a large scale "land utilization program" (hereafter the "LUP") to respond to many of the agricultural problems plaguing the country. ${ }^{9}$ The LUP began as a submarginal land purchase and development program. but gradually evolved and expanded into a program designed to transfer land to its most suitable use. The LUP culminated with the passage of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of 1937 (hereafter the "BJFTA" or the "Act").

9 Many years ago. an outstanding and detailed examination of the land utilization program was prepared by the Economic Research Service. A copy of The Land Utilization Program 1934 to 1964 - Origin. Development, and Present Status, Agricultural Economic Report No. 85 (1964), is included at Appendix C.

Some of the significant events leading up to the enactment of the BJFTA in 1937
included the following:

* In 1929. Congress enacted the Agricultural Marketing Act which authorized the Federal Farm Board to investigate the utilization of land for agricultural purposes and the possibility of reducing the amount of submarginal land in cultivation.
* In 1931, a National Conference on Land Utilization was convened by the Secretary of Agriculture. The conference participants adopted a series of resolutions, many of which later became guidelines for the LUP. The conference participants also recommended the formation of a National Land Use Planning Committee.
* In 1932, a National Land Use Planning Commitee was established to study problems associated with farming submarginal lands. President Hoover acknowledged the work of the Committee and stated that the broad objective of the study of land use problems was to promote the reorganization of agriculture to divert land from unprofitable use and to avoid the cultivation of land that contributed to the poverty of those who lived on it. In 1933. the Committee issued a report concerning the need for public acquisition, retention, and management of submarginal land and the need to relocate farm families to lands based upon the land's adaptability to a particular use.
* In 1934, President Roosevelt established the National Resources Board by executive order. The Board issued a comprehensive report on the land and water resources of the United States. The report advocated, among other things, the adoption of national policies to promote land ownership and land use patterns that are in the public interest, the adoption of national policies to correct maladjustments in land use. the expansion of forest, park. and wildlife refuge landholdings by federal and state agencies, and the acquisition of 75 million acres of land.
* In 1934. the Agricultural Adjustment Administration started a submarginal land purchase program with $\$ 25,000.000$ in appropriations from the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. A total of 8.7 million acres of land were acquired under this authority.

As noted above, in 1937 at the height of the New Deal. Congress enacted the
BJFTA which provided a more permanent status for the LUP. Title III of the Act authorized the
Secretary of Agriculture
to develop a program of land conservation and land utilization, including the retirement of lands which are submarginal or not primarily suitable for cultivation in order thereby to correct maladjustments in land use. . .

Although a total of $\$ 50.000 .000$ was authorized by Congress for land acquisition in the BJFTA. only $\$ 20.000 .000$ was ultimately appropriated. The Soil Conservation Service administered the LUP from 1938 to $1954 .{ }^{10}$

A total of 2.6 million acres of land were acquired between 1938 and 1946 when purchases under Title III ceased for all practical purposes. With the lands that had previously been acquired. the Government held 11.3 million acres in the LUP. The total cost for the land acquired for the LUP under the BJFTA and the preceding authorities was $\$ 47,500,000 .{ }^{11}$

Almost immediately, intensive improvement and development activities began on the LUP lands. New roads, buildings, transportation facilities, and fences were built, flood and erosion control strategies were adopted, grass and trees were planted, water storage facilities were constructed. and stream channels were widened and cleaned. The land improvements cost $\$ 102.500 .000 .^{12}$ Not only did the improvement activities help to restore these badly damaged lands. but they also created more than 50,000 jobs at a time when the Nation was pulling itself out of the Depression. ${ }^{13}$

10 Until it found a home in the Soil Conservation Service in 1938, the LUP bounced around five different federal agencies in its first four years of existence. The agencies were the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, The Federal Emergency Relief Administration. the Resettlement Administration, the Farm Security Administration, and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

11 The average price per acre to acquire these lands was $\$ 4.40$.
12 The average price per acre to acquire and improve these lands was $\$ 13.50$.
13 Some of the projects initiated by the Soil Conservation Service were examined in more detail in The History of Soil and Water Conservation, published by the Agricultural History Society in

Much of the LUP land was transferred or sold. principally to other federal agencies. Of the total 11.3 million acres in the LUP. approximately 5.8 million acres were gradually transferred to the Department of the Interior to be administered by the National Park Service, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Fish and Wildlife Service, or Bureau of Land Management. Approximately 5.5 million acres were retained within the Department of Agriculture.

In 1954, the Secretary of Agriculture transferred the responsibility for administering the LUP from the Soil Conservation Service to the Forest Service. ${ }^{14}$ Approximately 1.5 million acres of LUP land in the South and East wound up being incorporated into new or existing. national forests. In 1960, the Secretary designated approximately 3.8 million acres of LUP land mostly in the Great Plains as national grasslands. ${ }^{15}$ The remaining approximately 200,000 acres of the LUP lands administered by the Forest Service were designated for disposal or permanent assignment.

Under its administration, the Forest Service continued and expanded upon the improvement activities that had been initiated by the Soil Conservation Service. Surveys of land.
1985. A copy of the chapter entitled "National Grasslands: Origin and Development in the Dust Bowl" is included at Appendix D.

1419 Fed. Reg. 74 (Jan. 6. 1954). See, Appendix E. For an interesting discussion of the differences in the prevailing land management philosophies of the Soil Conservation Service and the Forest Service during this transition period. see Rowley, U.S. Forest Service Grazing and Rangelands - A History, at pp. 224-230 (1985).

1525 Fed. Reg. 5845 (June 24. 1960). See, Appendix F.
water. forest. range. wildlife. and recreation resources were conducted. cooperative land management agreements were entered into with grazing associations and conservation districts. additional revegetation and reforestation measures were instituted. fish and wildlife habitat was improved, and additional recreational opportunities were provided as a result of the construction of new campsites, picnic areas, and reservoirs.

Since 1960 , the total size and number of national grasslands has remained relatively constant. ${ }^{16}$ As set out in the next section. however, the laws governing the administration of these federal lands has rapidly evolved.

16 The most recent addition to the national grasslands occurred in 1991 when the Secretary of Agriculture redesignated the 18.425 acre Butte Valley Land Utilization Project in Califormia as the Butte Valley National Grasslands. 56 Fed. Reg. 8279 (Feb. 28, 1991).

# III. ST.ATUTORY AND REGUL.ATORY ALTHORITY.APPLIC.ABLE TO NATIONAL 

## GRASSLANDS MANAGEMENT

Before examining the specific statutory and regulatory milieu under which the Forest Service administers national grasslands, it might be worthwhile to step back and review some of the fundamental constitutional and legal principles governing the administration of all federal public lands and resources.

First, the United States Constitution vests in Congress the plenary authority over all federally-owned land. The Property Clause of the Constitution, Art. IV, §3, cl. 2, specifically provides that

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States. . .

The Supreme Court has consistently recognized the expansiveness of the Property Clause, stating that "the power over the public lands thus entrusted to Congress is without limitations." Kleppe v. New Mexice, 426 U.S. 529, 539 (1976); see also, United States v. Gardner, 107 F.3d 1314 (9 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Cir. 1997). ${ }^{17}$

Second, Congress may (and routinely does) delegate its authority over federally owned land to the executive branch through the enactment of statutes. Light v. United States, 220 U.S.

[^3]523 (1911): United States v. Grimaud, 220 U.S. 506 (1911). In many instances. more than one statute will apply to the administration of the same unit of public land or to the same resource. Congress may amend statutes from time to time to respond to changing conditions or it may repeal a statute altogether if its objectives have been accomplished or if it has otherwise become obsolete. Sierra Club v. Froelke, 816 F.2d 205 ( $5^{\text {th }} \mathrm{Cir}$ 1987).

Third. agencies must administer the land under their jurisdiction in a manner that is consistent with the statute(s) by which Congress delegated them this authority. Where more than one statute applies, agencies are required. to the extent possible, to administer the land in such a way as to give effect to all of the statutes. In re Bulldog Trucking, 66 F.3d 1390 (4 ${ }^{\text {th }} \mathrm{Cir} .1995$ ); Negonsett v. Samuels, 933 F.2d 818 (10 th Cir. 1991); Blackfeet Indian Tribe v. Montana Power C0., 838 F.2d 1055 ( $9^{\text {th }} \mathrm{Cir}$. 1988). In other words, an agency must reconcile the requirements of all applicable law and may not pick and choose from only those which it wants to use in its administration of the land. Muller v. Lujan, 928 F.2d 207 ( $6^{\text {ch }}$ Cir. 1991). ${ }^{18}$

Fourth. agencies may issue regulations to resolve an ambiguity in a statute or to provide further direction on how a statute will be implemented. Virginia v. Browner, 80 F. 3 d 869 (4 ${ }^{\text {th }}$

[^4]
# Cir. 1996): Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers Int I Union, AFL-CIO v. Vational Labor 

Relations Board, 46 F.3d 82 (D.C. Cir. 1995).

Fifth and finally, an agency's interpretation of the statutes that it is charged with administering is entitled to deference. However, if a court concludes that an agency's interpretation of a statute(s) is "arbitrary and capricious," it will be invalidated. The Administrative Procedures Act. 5 U.S.C. $\S \S 701$ et seq; Marsh v.Oregon Natural Resources Council, 490 U.S. 360 (1989).

Against this backdrop, it may be easier to understand the legal environment that applies to the Forest Service's administration of national grasslands. Unfortunately, limitations of time and space do not permit an exhaustive recitation of each and every statute that applies to the national grasslands. Some of the most important statutes will be discussed, however.

Clearly. this analysis starts with the BJFTA which, as was noted in the previous section, became law in 1937. ${ }^{19}$ The preamble to the BJFTA stated that its purpose was
to create the Farmers' Home Corporation. to promote more secure occupancy of farms and farm homes, to correct the economic instability resulting from some present forms of farm tenancy and for other purposes. ${ }^{20}$

19 P.L. 75-210 (codified at 7 U.S.C. §§1010-1012). The original text of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of 1937 is contained in Appendix G.

20 In response to the oft repeated contention that the Forest Service should recognize livestock grazing as the preferred and predominant use on national grasslands because it would "promote more secure occupancy of farms and farm homes." the following should be noted. First, the

Congress was acutely aware of the many problems facing American agriculture in the 1930's. It believed that some of these problems were attributable to the difficulty associated with the purchase and successful operation of a farm and some were attributable to the continuation of poor or inappropriate farming practices on submarginal land. ${ }^{21}$ Thus., in enacting the BJFTA, Congress sought to encourage and facilitate farm ownership and to remove submarginal land from cultivation.

The BJFTA contained four titles. Title I authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to farm tenants. farm laborers. sharecroppers and others for the purchase of farms of sufficient size for a family to earn a living. Title II authorized rehabilitation loans and the voluntary adjustment of indebtedness between farm debtors and their creditors. Title IV established the Farmers Home Corporation in USDA to implement and administer the Act. ${ }^{32}$

[^5]21 The conference report on the BJFTA. and relevant excerpts from the Congressional Record concerning the passage of the BJFTA are contained in Appendix H .

22 Titles I, II, and IV were repealed by Congress in the Agricultural Act of 1961. P.L. 87-128.

Title III. as discussed previously. resulted in the formal establishment of the LUP. ${ }^{23}$
Specifically. Section 31 of Title III authorized and directed the Secretary to
develop a program of land conservation and land utilization. including the retirement of lands which are submarginal or not primarily suitable for cultivation. in order thereby to correct maladjustments in land use, and thus assist in controlling soil erosion. reforestation. preserving natural resources. mitigating floods, preventing impairment of dams and reservoirs. conserving surface and subsurface moisture, protecting the watersheds of navigable streams. and protecting the public lands. health, safety and welfare.

Section 32 of Title III authorized the Secretary to. among other things, acquire, dispose of, and administer land as well as to promulgate regulations to prevent trespasses on the land and otherwise regulate its use and occupancy. Section 33 of Title III authorized the Secretary to pay counties $25 \%$ of the net revenues received on lands acquired under this authority. Section 34 authorized the appropriation of $\$ 50$ million for land acquisition. ${ }^{2+}$

[^6]81 Cong. Rec. 6471 (June 28. 1937).

Title III has been amended several times by Congress since 1937. These amendments included:

* In 1962. Congress deleted "including the retirement of lands which are submarginal or not primarily suitable for cultivation" from the purpose of the land conservation and land utilization program in Section 31.
* In 1962. Congress added "protecting fish and wildlife." and "but not to build industrial parks or establish private industrial or commercial enterprises" to the list of goals and objectives for which LUP lands may be administered in Section 31.
* In 1962, Congress repealed the Secretary's land acquisition authority in Section 32.
* In 1962, Congress established new authority in Section 32 enabling the Secretary to award grants to assist state and local governments with their land utilization programs. ${ }^{2 s}$
* In 1966, Congress added "protecting recreational facilities" to the list of goals and objectives for which the LUP may be administered in Section 31. ${ }^{26}$
* In 1981, Congress added "developing energy resources" to the list of goals and objectives for which the LUP may be administered in Section 31. ${ }^{.7}$

Incorporating the above amendments, Section 31 today reads as follows:
The Secretary is authorized and directed to develop a program of land conservation and land utilization, in order thereby to correct maladjustments in land use, and thus assist in controlling soil erosion, reforestation, preserving natural resources. protecting fish and wildlife. developing and protecting recreational facilities. mitigating floods. preventing impairment of dams and reservoirs, developing energy resources. conserving surface and subsurface moisture, protecting the watersheds of navigable streams, and protecting the public lands, health, safety, and welfare, but not to build industrial parks or establish private industrial or commercial enterprises. ${ }^{28}$

25 All of the 1962 amendments were contained in the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, P.L 87-703.

26 The 1966 amendment was contained in P.L. 89-796.
27 The 1981 amendment was contained in the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981. P.L. 97-98.
287 U.S.C. §1010. The entire text of Title III of the BJFTA as it appears in the 1997 edition of the United States Code is contained in Appendix J.

The BJFTA originated in response to the profound agricultural problems in the Linited States in the 1930's which were brought to a head by the Great Depression and Dust Bowl. Title III enabled the Government to acquire submarginal land and take it out of production, rehabilitate and improve the acquired land which had been ravaged by inappropriate farming practices, and manage the acquired land for a mix of different uses which were more suitable than farming. There have been some major changes in the BJFTA in the intervening 60 years. most notably the repeal of Titles I, II, and IV, the revision of the goals and objectives of the LUP in Title III, and the elimination of the Secretary's land acquisition authority in Title III. The BJFTA nonetheless continues to be one of the principal laws governing the Forest Service's administration of national grasslands. Yet it is by no means the only law governing the Forest Service's administration of these areas.

In the 1960's and 1970's Congress enacted several laws in response to the gathering momentum of the environmental movement and growing dissatisfaction with national forest management. Many of these laws apply to the administration of national grasslands.

In 1969, Congress enacted the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. $\$ \S 4321$ et seq, which generally requires federal agencies to evaluate the environmental impact of "major federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment."

In 1973, Congress enacted the Endangered Species Act, 16 U.S.C. $\S \S 1531$ et seq., which generally requires federal agencies to ensure that their actions are not likely to jeopardize the
continued existence of any endangered species or threatened species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat of such species.

In 1974, Congress enacted the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, P.L. 93-378 (hereafter the "RPA") which requires the Forest Service to prepare a renewable resource assessment, implement a renewable resource program. conduct a resource inventory, and develop land and resource management plans for units of the National Forest System. ${ }^{99}$ Of particular significance for national grasslands was the definition of "National Forest System" in Section 11(a) of the RPA which encompassed all the lands under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service including national grasslands. Specifically, this provision stated that

Congress declares that the National Forest System consists of units of federally owned forest, range. and related lands throughout the United States and its territories, united into a nationally significant system dedicated to the long-term benefit for present and future generations. and that it is the purpose of this section to include all such areas into one integral system. The "National Forest System shall include all National Forest lands reserved or withdrawn from the public domain of the United States. all National Forest lands acquired through purchase. exchange, donation. or other means. the National Grasslands and land utilization projects administered under Title III of the. Bankhead-

29 In 1976, Congress passed the National Forest Management Act. P.L. 94-588 (codified at 16 U.S.C. §§ 1600 et seq.) (hereafter "NFMA"), which amended RPA and added more specific requirements to the Forest Service planning obligations. In particular, Section 6(e) of NFMA required that the land and resource management plans for National Forest System units
provide for multiple use and sustained yield of the products and services obtained therefrom in accordance with the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act of 1960 (citation omitted), and, in particular. include coordination of outdoor recreation, range, timber. watershed. wildlife and fish. and wilderness.

16 U.S.C. §1604(e).

Jones Farm Tenant Act (citations omitted). and other lands. waters. or interests therein which are administered by the Forest Service or are designated for administration through the Forest Service as a part of the system. . .
(codified at 16 U.S.C. $\$ 1609(\mathbf{a})$ )(emphasis supplied). The legislative history acknowledged that the lands administered by the Forest Service had diverse origins and that the purpose of incorporating in the law a definition of the "National Forest System" was to unequivocally declare that all lands administered by the Forest Service are part of a unitary National Forest System. S. Rep. No. 686, Comm. on Agriculture and Forestry, $93^{\text {rd }}$ Cong. $2^{\text {nd }}$ Sess. (1974)(reprinted in 1974 U.S.C.C.A.N. 4060, 4080). Thus, national grasslands, by virtue of being expressly included within the ambit of the "National Forest System." became subject to the planning provisions of RPA and NFMA as well as to a panoply of other laws that applied generally to the Forest Service in the administration of lands under their jurisdiction. Some of these laws include the Organic Administration Act, 16 U.S.C. §§473 et seq, the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act, 16 U.S.C. §§528 et seq, the Wilderness Act, 16 U.S.C. §§ 1131 et seq., the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, 16 U.S.C. §§ 1271 et seq, the National Trails System Act, 16 U.S.C. §§ 1241 et seq., the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920.30 U.S.C. §§18let seq., the Granger-Thye Act. 16 U.S.C. $\S \$ 580$ et seq, the Knutson-Vandenberg Act, 16 U.S.C. $\S \$ 576$ et seq., and others. ${ }^{30}$

[^7]In addition to the aforementioned statutory authorities. there are several regulations which apply to the Forest Service's administration of national grasslands as well. Foremost among these are the general regulations pertaining to the national grasslands set forth at 36 C.F.R. §213 (hereafter "the 213 Regulations"). ${ }^{31}$ Among other things, the 213 regulations direct that: the national grasslands be "permanently held" by the Department of Agriculture; the national grasslands be administered under "sound and progressive principles of land conservation and multiple use, and to promote development of grassland agriculture and sustained-yield management of the forage, fish and wildlife, timber, water, and recreation resources. . .";32 the national grassland resources are managed so as to "maintain and improve soil and vegetative cover and to demonstrate sound and practical principles of land use for the areas in which they are located"; and that to the extent feasible, policies for the administration of national grasslands "exert a favorable influence for securing sound land conservation practices on associated private lands." Id

31 The 213 regulations are set forth in their entirety at Appendix K.
32 The term "grassland agriculture" does not appear in the BJFTA nor is it defined in the 213 regulations. At one time, Section 1034 of the Forest Service Manual contained the following definition of "grassland agriculture" as applied to national grasslands

The management and utilization of the land resources and values within grassland biomes in harmony with nature's requirements and behavior to foster long-term economic stability and productivity of the land base and quality of life of the people and communities associated with it.

This section has since been repealed.

The 213 regulations also specifically provide that other regulations applicable to national forests are incorporated and apply to regulate the protection. use. occupancy, and administration of the national grasslands to the extent that they are not inconsistent with the provisions of the BJFTA. Id, at $\S 213.3(\mathrm{a}) .^{3 j}$ Consequently, regulations governing livestock grazing at 36 C.F.R. $\S \S 222$ et seq., regulations governing timber harvesting at 36 C.F.R. $\S \S 223$ et seq., regulations governing mining at 36 C.F.R $\S \S 228$ et seq, regulations governing special uses at 36 C.F.R. §§251 et seq., regulations governing prohibitions at 36 C.F.R. $\S \S 261$ et seq, and regulations governing administrative appeals at 36 C.F.R. §§215.217, and 251 et seq, among others all apply to the national grasslands unless it can be demonstrated that to do so would conflict with the requirements of the BJFTA.

To summarize, the Forest Service is charged with administering the national grasslands in conformance with all applicable federal laws and regulations. To be sure, one of the applicable laws is the BJFTA. However, there are many other laws and regulations that apply to the national grasslands as well. The Forest Service must take into account all of these laws in its decisionmaking process. Given the unusually expansive language of the BJFTA. it is difficult

[^8](though perhaps not impossible) to envision how its requirements might contlict with those of another applicable statute. ${ }^{\text {i }}$

34 No lawsuit has thus far challenged the Forest Service's administration of national grasslands as a unit of the National Forest System as a violation of the BJFTA. Indeed, two recent decisions simply presumed this fact. Duncan Energy Co. v. United States Forest Service, 50 F. $3 \mathrm{~d} 584,589$ ( $8^{\text {th }}$ Cir. 1995)("Under the [BJFTA], Congress directed the Secretary of Agriculture to develop a program of land conservation and land utilization. The Act directs the Secretary to make rules as necessary to 'regulate the use and occupancy' of acquired lands and to 'conserve and utilize' such lands. The Forest Service, acting under the Secretary's direction, manages the surface lands here as part of the National Grasslands, which are part of the National Forest System. Congress has given the Forest Service broad power to regulate Forest System land.")(citations omitted); see also, Sharps v. United States Forest Service, 28 F.3d 851, 852 (8 ${ }^{\text {hi }}$ Cir. 1994).

# IV. ANSWERS TO FREQLENTLY.ASKED QUESTIONS ABOLT .VATIONAL GRASSLANDS 

## MANAGEMENT

Over the last several years. many questions have arisen concerning the administration of national grasslands. The following answers may be of some assistance and provide preliminary guidance leading towards the resolution of some of these longstanding issues. However, the answers are brief and, in many instances. somewhat generic. For further assistance in the resolution of specific cases or disputes, the local OGC office should be consulted.

## A. THE BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT (BJFTA)

## 1. What was the congressional intent in enacting the BJFTA?

Though the legislative history on the BJFTA is relatively sparse, Congress apparently sought to address what it perceived to be two major problems plaguing American agriculture during the Great Depression years of the 1930's - the difficulty associated with securing the necessary capital to acquire and successfully operate a family farm and the economic and environmental harms caused by farming submarginal land. Titles I, II and IV principally addressed the former problem while Title III principally addressed the latter.

## 2. What effect. if any does the phrase in the BJFTA preamble "to promote more secure

 occupancy of farms and farm homes" have on Title III?Extremely limited. In the first place. the preamble is not a part of the statute.
Furthermore. to the extent it contributes to a better understanding of the statute. the preamble must be considered in the context of the entire statute. not just one part of it.
3. Does the phrase "to promote more secure occupancy of farms and farm homes" in the BJFTA preamble require that Forest Service establish livestock grazing as the preferred or dominant use of national grasslands relative to other permissible uses of these lands?

No. As noted in A2 above, the preamble is not part of the BJFTA and must be considered in the context of the entire BJFTA, not just Title III. Furthermore, in order to reach this conclusion, it would necessitate a finding that the only way to promote secure occupancy of farms and farm homes was by making livestock grazing the dominant use of national grasslands. There is simply no support in the BJFTA or its legislative history which would justify this leap of faith.

In fact. one might argue that inasmuch as Congress intended in the BJFTA to accomplish the twin objectives of facilitating farm ownership and curtailing destructive farming practices on submarginal lands, it was probably the loan provisions of Titles I, II, and IV which were the principal means by which Congress intended to "secure occupancy of farms and farm homes." To the extent Title III furthered the goal of securing occupancy of farms and farm homes. this was primarily accomplished through acquisition and retirement of submarginal land. In other
words. by taking submarginal lands out of production. farmers would receive better prices for crops grown on the lands that remained in cultivation and thus would be "more secure."

In summary, Congress sought to "secure occupancy of farms and farm homes" in the BJFTA through the establishment of loan programs and the retirement of submarginal land. While grazing was clearly envisioned as one of the uses to which the retired land could be put, we have found no support for the proposition that Congress envisioned grazing on lands acquired under Title III as one of the means (let alone the preferred means) by which the "secure occupancy of farms and farm homes" could be accomplished.

## B. LIVESTOCK GRAZING ON NATIONAL GRASSLANDS

## 1. What is a grazing agreement and to whom may such an agreement be issued?

A grazing agreement is a type of grazing permit which authorizes eligible grazing associations organized under state law to make a specified amount of grazing use on National Forest System lands for a period of ten years or less. 36 C.F.R. §222.3(c)(1). Grazing agreements include provisions for the association to issue grazing permits to their members. The association then assumes the responsibility for administering the permits it issues in conformance with the applicable law and regulations, allotment management plans, and rules of management.
enacted prior to the enactment of the BJFTA. Consequently, these statutes refer to purchasers of timber on "national forest" land rather than on "national grasslands" or "National Forest System" land. Nonetheless, we believe that after 1974 when Congress defined the term "National Forest System" to include, among other things, national grasslands, the objective was to make the laws applicable to national forests extend wherever practicable to all lands administered by the Forest Service.

However, it should be pointed out that the sums collected under these two authorities may only be used in accordance with the terms of the statute authorizing the collection. Thus, funds collected under the KV Act may be used to cover the cost to the United States of planting, sowing, removing undesirable trees, and protecting and improving the future productivity of the renewable resources of the land where the timber sale is located. Under the 1916 Act, the funds collected may only be used to cover the cost to the Forest Service associated with the disposal of brush and other debris resulting from the timber harvest activities.
was previously considered in a decision by the Comptroller General from 1950. B-77467 Nov.
8. 1950). A copy of the subject Comptroller General opinion and a more recent opinion from the

Office of the General Counsel on this matter is set out at Appendix P.

While the authority exists, however, we believe that there are some limitations inherent in its use. The most important of these is that there should be some nexus between the permitted use of the grassland and the conservation practice that would justify a reduction in the fee imposed for the use. The 1992 OGC memorandum on this subject addressed this matter by stating that

It is not possible to define in this memorandum the limits of the Forest Service's authority to allow for the off site expenditures by the permittee or lessee for conservation projects elsewhere on a national grassland. Suffice to say that the more remote the nexus or connection between the expenditure for off site activities and the conservation objectives for the land under permit, the more likely such conditions might be deemed void as arbitrary and capricious. An extreme case might be a requirement that the permittee construct and pave a road in an adjacent county in return for rights to graze cattle. In such a case, it would be highly unlikely the Forest Service could establish that the condition of the permit (i.e. road construction in an adjacent county) bears any relation to the management objectives for the land being permitted.

## 5. May the Forest Service collect money from the purchasers of timber on national

 grasslands pursuant to the Knutson-Vandenberg_Act (the KV Act) and the Act of August 11. 1916(the 1916 Act)?Yes. The Forest Service is authorized to require timber purchasers to deposit certain sums into a special fund in accordance with the KV Act, 16 U.S.C. 576 et seq., which was enacted in 1930 and the 1916 Act, 16 U.S.C. 490 . It should be noted that both of these laws were

No. Federal law requires that any money received by a government official or employee in the course and scope of the performance of his job must be deposited in the Treasury without deduction for any charge or claim. This would apply to fees collected from national grasslands. Furthermore, the diversion of such funds could constitute an unauthorized augmentation of appropriations. Through the appropriations process, Congress not only provides funds to administer programs but also establishes the level at which these programs are intended to operate. Utilizing funds from a source other than Congress would enable an agency to increase its program level without congressional approval.
4. May fees due from special use permits, grazing permits. mineral leases, etc. be reduced in return for the performance of conservation practices on the national grasslands?

Yes. Though similar, there is a subtle distinction from the previous question because it does not result in funds being transferred from a permittee to the Forest Service which would normally necessitate a deposit in the Treasury. Rather it involves situations in which the Forest Service agrees to charge a permittee a reduced rate in return for an agreement by the permittee to engage in certain specified conservation practices. The authority for this is located in Section 32(c) of the Act which authorizes the Secretary "[t]o sell.exchange, lease, or otherwise dispose of, with or without consideration, any property [acquired under the BJFTA]. . ." (emphasis supplied). The highlighted language authorizes the assessment of fees for the use of national grasslands but it also authorizes the assessment of no fees if the Secretary deems it appropriate. Obviously, within these limits, there is wide discretion to assess a reduced fee. This authority
$\$ \S 4321$ et seq., the National Forest Management Act (NFMA). 16 U.S.C. $\$ \$ 1600$ et seq., and the Endangered Species Act (ESA). 16 U.S.C. §§1531 et seq., Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966. 23 U.S.C. §138. and the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA), 16 U.S.C. §1323(a).

Finally, roads that predated the establishment of a national grassland may be deemed an outstanding right and would not require any authorization from the Forest Service provided that the activities occurring thereon were within the scope of the original right. In the event activities were outside of the scope of the original right, authorization under FLPMA would be necessary. Examples of activities outside scope of the right might be expanding a road from two to four lanes, paving a gravel road, or changing the road's alignment.

It should also be noted that some Great Plains states have enacted statutes which establish "section line" roads or highways. See, e.g., N.D. Cent. Code §24-07-03; Neb. Rev. Stat. §391410; S.D. Codified Laws Ann. §§31-18-1 et seq. In these states, the land on either side of a section line is burdened with an easement in favor of the public for highway purposes and are generally under the jurisdiction of a local unit of government. Thorough investigation of the applicable state law should be conducted with the assistance of OGC prior to engaging in any activity which could arguably interfere with a purported section line highway easement.
3. May fees collected for special use permits, grazing permits, mineral leases, etc, be used to fund conservation practices on the grasslands?

Generally speaking, until 1976 the BJFTA was the primary source of the Forest Service's authority to approve of the development of roads across national grasslands. Section 32(d) of the Act authorized the Secretary to "make dedications or grants, in his discretion, for any public purpose. and to grant licenses and easements upon such terms as he deems reasonable."

In 1976, however, Congress enacted the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA). P.L. 94-579 (codified at 43 U.S.C. §§ 1701 et seq.). Section 501 of FLPMA authorized the Secretary to "grant, issue, or renew rights of way over, upon, under or through National Forest System lands for roads, trails, and highways among other things. In Section 706 of FLPMA, Congress repealed all the other federal laws (including Section 32(d) of the BJFTA) under which rights of way could previously have been secured. FLPMA, did not, however, terminate any rights of way which had been previously established under the repealed statutes. Consequently, rights of way on national grasslands which had been established under the BJFTA prior to the enactment of FLPMA in 1976 remained valid. In Title V of FLPMA are listed some of the general terms and conditions that apply to the issuance of rights of way.

Roads on national grasslands may also be authorized and developed in accordance with the National Forest Road and Trail Act, 16 U.S.C. §§532 et.seq., and the Department of Transportation Act, 23 U.S.C. §317.

Of course. any actions concerning the development of roads on national grasslands would be subject to. among other things, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 42 U.S.C.

## D. MISCELLANEOUS

1. Are oil, gas, and coal development activities prohibited on national grasslands based on the provision in the BJFTA which reads "but not to build industrial parks or establish private industrial or commercial enterprises?"

No. The subject clause was added to Section 31 of Title III in the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, P.L. 87-703. In response to an inquiry in 1973, the Office of the General Counsel issued an opinion stating that this clause did not constrain development of oil, gas, and coal resources on Title III lands provided that the activities did not involve the construction of power plants or other commercial enterprises to consume or utilize the minerals extracted. A copy of this OGC opinion is set out in Appendix O .

In 1981, Congress amended Section 31 again to expressly recognize "developing energy resources" as one of the purposes for which Title III lands could be administered. This amendment further buttressed the argument that oil. gas. and coal development and leasing is a legitimate use of Title III lands.
2. Under what laws may the Forest Service authorize the development of roads across national grasslands?
was enacted by Congress in 1943 as Public Law 78-120 and is commonly referred to as "PL120." Under PL-120. the regional forester may issue a quitclaim deed to a landowner to resolve a title dispute. PL-120 may only be used in connection with acquired lands and only under a very limited set of circumstances where the United States' title claim appears to encroach upon an adjacent landowner's title claim. The regional forester must obtain a legal opinion from the regional attomey for OGC which acknowledges that the use of ALTA is appropriate in a particular case.

PL-120 may only be used to resolve title claim disputes which may arise if the title to the acquired land is deemed insufficient or if it was acquired as a result of error or inadvertence. Examples of situations where the use of PL-120 might be appropriate include the following: 1) a landowner has satisfied the adverse possession laws of the state where the property is located at the time of United States' acquisition of the land but is not identified as an owner of record; 2) a landowner and the United States hold separate deeds with overlapping land descriptions; 3) the property boundary between the landowner and the United States is inaccurate because the land was either not surveyed or was improperly surveyed; or 4) there may be an erroneous deed in which the claim of the landowner is superior to the claim of the party which sold the land to the United States. Generally, these are the only types of title claim disputes which may be resolved under PL-120.
the national grasslands must be determined by the Forest Service in accordance with the applicable statutory and regulatory authorities taking into account the condition of the grassland resources. This is reinforced by NFMA’s inclusion of grasslands in the National Forest System multiple use framework. Clearly, it would be an incongruous result if the Forest Service was required to perpetuate a specific use on a parcel of land based on the manner in which it was acquired many years ago even if the resources were inadequate or if there was no longer any interest in such a use.

## 5. What mechanisms are available to resolve title claim disputes or encroachment

 problems on the national grasslands?Most disputes concerning title to land or interests therein involving the United States are adjudicated in federal court under the Quiet Title Act (QTA). 28 U.S.C. §2409a. Under the QTA. suits may be brought against the United States within 12 years from the date the party knew or should have known that the United States was asserting ownership of the land or interests it purports to own. Although it may not initiate litigation under the QTA, the United States may bring an action in federal court under various state law causes of action like trespass. The party initiating litigation under the QTA must describe in detail the interest claimed, the basis for the claim, and the nature of the United States ${ }^{*}$ interest in the subject property.

Another. albeit more limited, option to resolve certain types of title disputes administratively is found in the Adjustment of Land Titles Act. 7 U.S.C. §2253. This statute
transferred to another federal or state agency. the clear intention was to retain these acquired lands in public ownership.


#### Abstract

4. Do the public uses for which lands were acquired through condemnation under the BJFTA and the previous authorities continue to prescribe the current legitimate uses of the national grasslands today?


No. In order to exercise the condemnation authority delegated by Congress, the Secretary must demonstrate that the land to be acquired will be applied to a "public use." 40 U.S.C. §§257, 258a. In general, the term covers a use affecting the public generally, or any part thereof, as distinguished from particular individuals. No set definition of what degree of public good will meet the requirement of a "public use" exists since in each case it is a question of public policy which depends on the facts and circumstances of a particular case. However, the meaning of the term is flexible and is not confined to what may constitute a public use at any given time. The term must be applied in the light of what the legislature seeks to accomplish and what it may properly consider to be a public use at the time.

Thus, the fact that lands now comprising national grasslands may have been originally purchased in order to establish a "demonstrational area for the public grazing of livestock" is significant in that it proves that the land was acquired for a "public use" and that the Secretary thus had the authority to acquire it through condemnation. It does not obligate the Forest Service. however. to maintain that use in perpetuity. The appropriate mix of permissible uses of
authorities and agencies and only on condition that the property is used for public purposes." 7 U.S.C. §10II(c). While this provision of the BJFTA authorizes land exchanges with private individuals under certain conditions, it does not authorize outright sales of national grasslands to private parties.

However. limited authority for the sale of small parcels of national grasslands for land adjustment purposes may exist under the Small Tracts Act, 16 U.S.C. §§521c et seq. In addition, if property is deemed "surplus," it may be subject to disposal pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, 40 U.S.C. §§471 et seq. Finally, Section 206 of the Federal Land and Policy Management Act (FLPMA), 43 U.S.C. §1716, also provides independent authority for the exchange of National Forest System lands (including national grasslands) under certain circumstances.

## 3. Was the intent of BJFTA to dispose of the acquired lands after they have been

 stabilized?There is no indication in the BJFTA or its legislative history to suggest that Congress intended the Secretary to dispose of the lands acquired once they had been stabilized. However. given that the BJFTA authorized the sale. exchange, or grant of acquired land only to public authorities and only on the condition that the land be used for public purposes. it is logical to presume that regardless of whether the land was retained by the Secretary of Agriculture or was

# C. ACQUISITION, DISPOSAL AND OTHER CONVEYANCES OF NATIONAL GRASSLANDS 


#### Abstract

1. May the Forest Service enter into land exchanges involving national grasslands under the BJFTA and, if so, what limitations apply?


Yes. Section 32(c) of Title III authorizes the Secretary to "sell, exchange, lease. or otherwise dispose of, with or without a consideration, any property [] acquired" under the Act. 7 U.S.C. §1011(c). Under the BJFTA, land exchanges with public agencies may only occur if the public agency agrees to use the land for a public purpose. Additionally, land exchanges with private individuals may only occur if the exchange does not conflict with the purposes of the Act and if the value of the property received is substantially equal to the value of the property conveyed. Id.

In addition. the exchange provisions of Section 206 of FLPMA and Section 17 of NFMA should be considered when proceeding with an exchange involving national grasslands.

## 2. May the Forest Service sell national grasslands and, if so, what limitations apply?

Yes. Section 32(c) of Title III authorizes the Secretary to "sell, exchange. lease. or otherwise dispose of. with or without a consideration. any property [] acquired" under the Act. 7 U.S.C. $\$ 1011$ (c). Under the BJFTA. sales. exchanges. or grants may be made "only to public
enhancement. However. under FLPMA. the RBF only applies "on lands in National Forests in the sixteen contiguous Western States." 43 U.S.C. $\$ 1751(b)(1)$. Consequently. the RBF does not extend to national grasslands. Conservation practices are an alternative to the RBF and are permissible under the BJFTA. A copy of the January 22. 1993 USDA memorandum is included at Appendix N .
15. Is the direction in a January 22. 1993 USDA memorandum (see 13 above) which authorizes the allocation to administrative costs of up to $6 \%$ of the $50 \%$ reduction in grazing fees associated with the implementation of conservation practices on national grasslands still in effect?

Yes. However, it is important to clarify that the $6 \%$ figure pertains only to the administrative costs associated with the implementation of conservation practices on the national grasslands. Therefore. of the $50 \%$ reduction in grazing fees which may be authorized in return for the implementation of conservation practices. $6 \%$ of that amount may be allocated to administrative costs. This does not apply to other routine business expenses incurred by a grazing association in conjunction with its administration of the grazing permits it issues pursuant to a grazing agreement. These are referred to as "administrative practices" which are different from "conservation practices" and were not covered in the subject memorandum.

No. In the past. exchange of use grazing permits were utilized where private lands were interspersed within a logical grazing allotment of National Forest System lands. Through an exchange of use permit. the landowner authorized the Forest Service to include his or her private property within the grazing allotment while the Forest Service authorized the landowner to graze on National Forest System lands elsewhere. Since such an arrangement was considered an even exchange, no fee was assessed to the landowner for grazing on the National Forest System lands. Exchange of use permits are no longer issued by the Forest Service. As noted above. where mixed land ownership patterns exist, the Forest Service may issue only grazing agreements, on-and-off grazing permits, and private land grazing permits. The type of permit that would be issued depends upon the facts of each case and the relative amount of federal and non-federal land within the area to be grazed.


#### Abstract

14. Is the direction in a January 22, 1993 USDA memorandum which authorizes reductions in grazing fees of up to $50 \%$ in return for performance of conservation practices on national grasslands still in effect?


Yes. Conservation practices provide for the development of structural and non-structural improvements on the national grasslands which lessen the detrimental impacts of grazing. This program is similar to Range Betterment Fund (RBF) under FLPMA which authorized the establishment of a separate account in the Treasury into which $50 \%$ of all grazing fees are deposited. These monies are then returned to the forest for such activities as seeding and reseeding, fence construction. weed control, water development, and fish and wildlife

# 12. Mav the Forest Service include private land within a national grassland as part of an 

## allotment to be grazed under a Forest Service grazing permit?

Yes. provided that the landowner consents to the use of his or her land for such grazing purposes subject to the terms and conditions prescribed by the Forest Service. Grazing agreements. on-and-off grazing permits, and private land grazing permits are the only instruments issued by the Forest Service which recognize and authorize grazing on commingled federal and privately owned land.

In the event that the landowner does not consent to the use of his or her land for grazing purposes, the Forest Service may not include it as part of the allotment and cannot issue a permit authorizing grazing on it. This could lead to a debate over which party - the Forest Service. permittee, or private landowner - is responsible for ensuring that the permitted cattie do not stray from the permitted federal land onto the nearby private land which is not under permit. Though the answer may vary from state to state (or perhaps even within a state), in the West the general rule is that the state "open range" laws impose the burden on the private landowner to construct an exclosure if he or she does not want livestock to stray onto their private property.
13. May the Forest Service issue "exchange of uses" grazing permits to individuals who desire to graze cattle on their private land and adjacent federally owned national grassland?
authorizing decision. Generally. the issuance of a grazing agreement by the Forest Service merely implements a decision authorizing grazing that has previously been made.
10. Must the Forest Service comply with NEPA when it issues a new grazing agreement to replace a previous grazing agreement that has expired even though the terms and conditions of the two instruments are the same?

Yes. See B9 above.
11. What if the agency is unable to complete the environmental analysis required by NEPA before the grazing agreement expires?

Pursuant to Section 504 of the Rescission Act, P.L. 104-19, the Forest Service is required to issue a new grazing agreement to the holder of an expired or expiring grazing agreement if the only reason for not issuing the new agreement is due to the fact that the required environmental analysis has not been completed. In those instances. the agency must issue a new grazing agreement with the same terms and conditions as the expired grazing agreement. The terms and conditions may be modified by the Forest Service upon the completion of the environmental analysis. An October 4. 1995 letter from the Chief to the Regional Foresters explaining the effect of the Rescission Act on the grazing program is included at Appendix M .
8. What process does the Forest Service use to modifv the terms and conditions of grazing agreements?

Because a grazing agreement is a type of grazing permit. the Forest Service uses the same procedure to modify the terms and conditions of a grazing agreement as it does to modify the terms and conditions of a grazing permit. Grazing agreements may be modified to conform to current situations brought about by changes in law, regulation, executive order, development or revision of allotment management plan, or for other management needs. 36 C.F.R. §222.4(a)(7). The season of use. numbers, kind, and class of livestock, or the allotment specified in a grazing agreement may also be modified based on the permittee's request or due to resource conditions. Id. at §222.4(a)(8). However, modifications made pursuant to 36 C.F.R. §222.4(a)(8) require one year's advance notice unless there is an emergency.

## 9. Must the Forest Service comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) prior to issuing a grazing agreement?

Yes. Before a decision to authorize the use and occupancy of national grasslands for livestock grazing purposes can be made, the Forest Service must evaluate the environmental impacts of that decision pursuant to NEPA. An allotment management plan (AMP) is prepared based on the management direction in the decision to authorize grazing and becomes a term and condition of the grazing agreement. The grazing agreement and the AMP must comply with the

When a member of a grazing association waives a permit back to the grazing association. allocation of the waived permitted use is governed by the associations rules of management. Generally. a new permit would be issued by the grazing association to the party which acquires the base property from the association member who waived the permit. This is similar to Forest Service practice for term grazing permits.
6. Who is responsible for ensuring that the holder of an association grazing permit issued complies with the terms and conditions therein?

It is the responsibility of the grazing association to ensure that permittee complies with the terms and conditions of the grazing permits it issues. In those instances where a permittee violates the terms and conditions of the association permit, the association may cancel or suspend the permit or take some other form of permit action.
7. What recourse does the Forest Service have if a grazing association fails to take action or has taken inadequate action against a permittee who has violated the terms and conditions of his grazing permit?

The Forest Service may cancel. suspend. or modify the grazing agreement if a grazing association fails to properly enforce the terms and conditions of the permits it issues.
terms and conditions of the grazing agreement which may result in cancellation. suspension. or some other form of sanction. FSM 2232.05.
4. Are there any circumstances under which a rancher can lease base property and be eligible for a grazing permit on national grasslands?

Yes. Forest Service grazing regulations state in relevant part that
Except as provided for by the Chief, Forest Service, paid term permits will be issued to persons who own livestock to be grazed and such base property as may be required. .

36 C.F.R. 222.3(c)(1)(i) (emphasis supplied). In the chapter of the Forest Service's Grazing Permit Administration Handbook dealing with grazing agreements, the Chief has expressly provided that base property may be leased and that share livestock operations may be approved "under certain conditions." FSH 2309.13, ch. 23. These provisions were originally developed as a means to promote family ranching operations and to provide for new operators to become established in the ranching business. Today, they are most commonly employed to further one of these two objectives. It should be emphasized that this provision is discretionary and has generally been construed as a limited exception to the rule requiring that ranchers must own base property and livestock in order to be eligible for a grazing permit.
5. If a grazing association member waives a grazing permit. how is the permitted use allocated?
the Office of the General Counsel explaining the legal relationship between grazing associations and the Forest Service in greater detail is set out at Appendix L.

Forest Service regulations at 36 C.F.R. §222.7 authorize the agency to "recognize, cooperate with, and assist" local livestock associations in the administration of grazing on National Forest System lands. However, in order to be recognized, a grazing association must satisfy certain requirements set forth in the regulations. These regulations further specify that a grazing association must provide the means for its members to manage their permitted livestock, meet with Forest Service officials. work through the association to address their concerns and desires, share costs for handling livestock. construct and maintain range improvements, and other projects necessary for proper range management, and formulate special rules to ensure proper resource management. Many of the specifics regarding how a grazing association is to interact with its members are spelled out in the "rules of management."

## 3. What are rules of management?

Rules of management are a set of policies. procedures. and practices, including eligibility requirements, which govern the grazing use both on public lands covered by the grazing agreement and private or State lands under the jurisdiction of the association. The association recommends rules of management which are approved by the Forest Service authorized officer. The rules of management are incorporated into and become a term and condition of the grazing agreement. Thus, violations of the rules of management are also considered as violations of the

In order to qualify for a grazing agreement. a grazing association must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Forest Service that: 1) it is qualified and competent to manage grazing of livestock on lands to be placed under its control: 2) it is a bona fide mutual benefit or cooperative organization incorporated or otherwise established in conformity with the law of the state or states where the lands under its control are located; 3) it is empowered under state law to engage in activities contemplated by the grazing agreement for mutual benefit of its members or other permittees; 4) it has authority under state law to acquire real and personal property or interests therein by sale, lease, permit, or otherwise for the purpose of carrying out requirements of the grazing agreement: 5) it has power to collect assessments or has other means to defray expenses of conducting business contemplated by the grazing agreement; 6) its charter or bylaws provide for one vote per member and prohibit voting by proxy. FSM 2232.1.

## 2. How are grazing associations established? What is the responsibility of a grazing association that has been issued a grazing agreement?

A grazing association is organized under state laws of incorporation and/or cooperatives and is considered to be a separate legal entity from its members who have limited liability for the debts and obligations of the association. Management and control of a grazing association is centralized in the board of directors and officers who are subject to certain fiduciary duties owed to the association and its members. Limits on the authority of the board of directors are usually spelled out in the articles of incorporation and bylaws. A January 21,1983 memorandum from
6. Support 5he continued use and Eundirg $c=$ a Inreatened and Endangered Specres (TES) Coordinator to provide Great Plains leadersnip to management of TES.

WHO: Regional Foresters with national Erasslands WHEN: 7/1/96
7. Evaluare and prioricize implementation cools, for example habicat capability models.

WHO: Regional Foresters
WHEN : 6/1/97
8. Provide appropriace wildijfe, bocanical, paleoncological, range and ocher skills to national grasslands units.
wHO: See action item C2..
WHEN: " " n n
7. Revision of Forest Plans is coordinared across regions and forests. Standards and guidelines are consistent across administrative boundaries for similar ecological situations. . Coordination will provide consigtent difection. while allowing Elexibility in meeting local neads.

## Actions

1. The Rocky Mountain Forest Experiment Stacion, in collaboration wich FER/wo and RGE/WO, will take the lead in organlzing and conducting a workshop co develop an assessment of research needs associaced with the narional grasslands. A steering commitree comprised of Larry Bryant. PNW; Deborah Finch and Dan Uresk, RM; Mike Lennarcz, FER; a NFS field represencanive an a NFS RGE/WO representative will develop a proposal for the workshop and submit ic co Directors of RM STH; RGE/WO; and FER/WO by Seprember 30 , 1996. The workshop will be held in $F Y 1997$ and parcicipants will be selecred to represent FS management and research, ocher Federal agencies (e.g., NBS, NRCS, and ARS), university researchers, state agencies, livestock and oil and gas industry, tribal nations, and conservarion groups. customers, and pareners.

WHO: Director, RGE; Director, RM STN; and Director, FER
WHEN:Seprember 30, 1996
2. Design a multiple stracegy to improve monitoring efficiency and consistency, and to develop effective monitoring methodology for the national grasslands.

WHO: National Grasslands Council and Research WHENT: 6/1/97
3. Develop and implement an achievable monicoring and evaluation plan and provide anmul monitoring and evaluation reports as part of national grassland plan revisions or amendments.

WHO: Forest Supervisors Whris: As Forest Plans are revised or amended.
4. Revise and/or amand Land and Resource Management Plans to reflect the variety of interests inherent to the National Grasslands. Develop
management direction that is specific to National Grasslands.

Wifo: Forest Supervisore
Whast:As Plans are revised or amended.
5. Coordinate planning units to iaprove consistency of direction acrose unit with similar ecological unics, while allowing flexibility to meet local needs.

WHO: Forest Supervisors
WHEN:As plans are revised.

Finding 1: Grasslands units currently rely on a number $\sigma z$ ialversities and on Forest Service Research for she science reoriired to understand and manage grassland ecosystems. However, $\ddagger$ here are opportunities 50 expand cooperation and collaboration with more universities and with researchers with orher agencies.

Finding 2: Although managers are using current information and are, in most cases, working in close collaboracion with researchers, some grazing interests are suspicious of or disagree with Forest service technical conclusions. ( $R-3$ )

Finding 3: Threatened, endangered and sensitive (TES) species are emerging as a Critical concern on national grasslands, and additional information and monitoring are needed for effective management.

Flnding 4: Monicoring and evaluation have not been used effectively to detemine whether our managemenc decisions have been inplemented or to evaluate what is or is not working.

Finding 5: Current land and resource management plans for the national grasslands focus primarily on coumodicy issues, such as grazing and huncable wildiffe, and have not fully incorporated more recent importent isaues.

## Denirad Future

1. Porest Service Research, in collaboration with managers of the national grasslands and westezn universitien, develops an agenda and priorities fo. research on the national grasslandm and prairie acosystame.
2. Rcological claseitications are completed for all riparian and upland aites on the grasslands.
3. Refised Forest plans provide a comprehnasive assement of resource capabilities, damads, and isaves associated with atational graselands, as wil as acientifically creduble standards and guidelines for maeting 5esource managemant policies and objectives.
4. Reasomble wildilfe and botanical expertise is provided to each of the graseland unite.
5. Soaitoring progran are designed and implenanted to provide periodic asserments of resource conditions and trands and the eltectiveness of prescribed managament activities. The reaults of monitoring prograns are used to adapt managemant activities to changing or unanticipated coaditions.
6. Revised Forest plans provide a comprehanaive assesamant of resource capabilities, denands, and lasues astociated with national grasslands, as woll as credible standards and guidalines for meceting resource managamant policies and objectives.
leadership evaluates budget allocations between naticnal forests and natione grasalands and directs a shtft in resources where it is needed to provide Organizational or resource support to meet critical seeds on the national grasslands.
7. An interragional structure, such as a grasaland council." exists to: -provide leaderahip to national grasaland management; -facilitate coordination and consistant management for national grasalands while at the same time providing for local flexibility; - coordinate decisionmaking at appropriate line officer levela; -achieve coordinated ismues resolution and implementation of management decisione:
-addreas grassland policy, budget. and organizational isaues; - coordinate grassland aseesments;
-coordinate with other Government interetits
-ansure coordination of, and involvament in, current and future grassland or Great Plains initiativeas
-assure quelity resource managemant of the national grasslands; and
-Increase organizational support (national and regional level) to the national gresslands.
8. Regriar Natiomal Grassland Conferences are held to strengthen communcations between national grassland unit managers and ťo give managera increased opportunities to work together.
9. National Grassland Centers of Excellance are functioning to provide a concentrated focus on (a) quality ranource planning and managament; (b) consistency across unit boundaries; and (c) efficiant une of personnel to accomplish program goals.

## Action응

1. Establish a charter for a National Grassland Council. The focus will be coordination, communication, and partnernhip: to make efficient use of resources to achteve desired fucure conditions. Council will include represencation from National Forest System, Research, state and Private Forestry, and Natural Resources Conservation Serrice.

WhO: Forest Service Washingeon Office
WHEN : 6/1/96
2. Evaluate organizational effectiveness and the equity of funding and skili between national grassland and national forest units and implement inter/intra unit adjustments to improve management efficiency and coordination.

WHO: National Grassland Council with representation from each Region. WIERN: 6/97
5. Zevelop a mechanism in coordination with ocher agencies and native american coordinators for collaborating with tribal goverments across administrat:ve icoundaries.

सHO: National Grassland Council WHEN : 12/1/96
6. Host an annual rational grasslands tour for interest groups and agencies to promote uncerstanding of on-the-ground management and to encourage formation $=$ common ground parenerships.

WHO: National Grassland Council
WHEN:Sumer 1997
7. Develop and implement a commaications plan that insures that all interests and other agencies are given the opportunity to be involved in the Norchern Great Plains plan revision process including data collection, interpretation and use.

WHO: National Grassland Council
WHEN : Ongoing
8. Expand the use, beyond the Northern Great plains, of an interagency working group to coordiaate collection, sharing and interpretation of resource data in the Great plains.

WHO: National Grassland Council
WFIEN: 6/15/97
9. Each national grassland identify locel Resource Conservation and Developmane projects to strengthen ties and inprove efficiency among Natural Resource Conservation Service, national gramslanda, and local coumunitien and offer appropriate Forest Service aseistance.
WhO: Forest Supervisors
WHERN: 1/1/97

## C. EPFECHIYE ORGNMIRATIOAS

Flnding 1: Mamy people expressed the concern that national grasslands are treaced disparately with national forests in terme of enphasis, human resources, skill levels, budgets, and regional assistance.

Finding 2: The national grasslands in the Great Plains arw not collaborating to the degree necessary to resolve current grassland issues.

## Dentrad Futyre

1. Grassland units are effectively collaborating and partnering with othar agencies. Cost-sharing, volunteers, and partnerships with state agencies provide opportunities for needed skill levels and expertise. porest Service
2. Written commitment(s) are developed with appropriate Federal and State agencies and others to achieve specific outcomes, including Eimeframes and strategies to be employad.
3. A management environment where all grasaland interests believe that thair views and concerns ara considered in natural rasource decisions. National grassland leadership creatas a forum or procesa to utilize public input into grassland policies, programs, and projects. Other Federal agancies. States. local govermments, and grassland interests are utilized in the development and assessment of grassland policies.
4. National grasslands skills are acquired from a variety of external sources including Nacs and are available at the right place and the right time.
5. USDA agencien clearly understand each other's missions and can articulate these missions within the community of interests. It is readily apparent to local rasidants that the agencies are mutually supportive and work in a complomentazy Eashion.

Actions

1. Develop a coordinated stakeholder list and assign responsibility for contacts.

WHO: Forest Supervisors
WHEN: $1 / 1 / 97$
2. Designate a Regional Forester to participate as part of the Great plains Partareship of the western Governors' Conference.

WHOO: Calef
When: 6/1/96
3. Appoint a representative to appropriate Western Governors' Conference working group(s).

WHO: Chlef
When: 6/1/96
4. Develop a mechanism for coordinating work, sharing personsel and equipman with associaced USOA and other agencies, which will improve management efficiency and promote interagency underetanding of agency missions.

WHO: All Regional Foresters.
WHEN: 12/1/97
5. National Grasslands Rangers and Forest Superfisors meet annually $=0$ coordinate understanding of policy, share strategies E== zesolving issues, and other matters. Provide approprıate opporcunities 末vr external incerests to be involved.

WHO: National Grasslands Council
WHEN: 12/1/96 and annually thereafter with periodic evailuation of the need for continuation.
6. Develop the criteria for an orientation pacieage for employees on the national grasslands and a general information package Eor other employees to promote understanding of laws, regulations, history, and processes.

WHO: National Grassland Council
WHEN: 1/1/97
7. List potential areas and projects for opportunities to demonstrate sound land stewardship and ecosystem management principles for each national grassland.

WHO: FOrest Supervisors
WHEN: 1/1/97
8. Initiate a coordinated environmental education program for national grasslands highlighting their origins, purposes, resources, usen, and importance to bio-diversity.

WHO: National Grassland Council
WIEN: 1/1/97
B. WOREIMG WITH OMEPR

Determine the extent and effectiveness of involvement of users, state and local governments, tribal governments, other partners, and the public.

Finding 1: The Forest Service needs to exert greater leadership in interagency, inter-governmantal, and Tribal government collaboration.

Finding 2: The Forest Service is not an effective as it could be in bringing varied interests together, providing opportunities for imput, and involving Chem in solutions. In som cases, our coordination and collaboration are too narrowly focused.

Finding 3: The Forest Service needs to be more active in coordinating and sharing resources with other USDA agencies and doing more to support common USDA goals.

## Dentrad Future

1. The Forest Service is seen as axercising a greater level of conservation leadership in the area of the national grasslands.

## Desired Future

1. Creation of a commonly understood vision for the national grasslande. vision is available for implementation in the revision of land and resour management plans applicable to the national grasslands.
2. A comonly understood vision is used as a foundation for making adjustmen as needed $i=$ regulation and national. regional, and local policy.
3. Grasslands are considered showcases for demonstrating sound land manageme practices.

## Actions

1. Identify legal issues and clarify the intent of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (BJFTA) as originally passed and with subsequent amendments av related legislation, including a statement of applicability of other lawa (i.e.. Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act, Endangered Species Act, National Forest Management Act, and other environmental laws) to the national grasslands. Prepare a white paper to be used in gaining consistent interpretation.

WHO: Forest Service Washington Office and Office of General Counsel WHENT $10 / 1 / 96$
2. Develop a commor national grasslands vision.
who: Forest Service Washington Office and National Grassland Council WHEN: 03/01/97
3. Articulate and implement the vision through a coumunication plan directe at gaining a clear and comon understanding of direction applicable to t netional grasslande.

WHO: Forest Service washington Office and National Grassland Council WHENT : 03/01/97
4. Based on A1. and A2 --

Determine need for updating Forest Service Manual, including Comervation practice guidelines.

Determine whecher changes are needed in Code of Federal Regulatione be consistent with items A1. and A2

WHO: Forest Service Washington Offtce and National Grassland Council WHESN: 07/01/97

NATIONAL GRASSLRANS<br>MANAGENENT REVIEN ACTION ELAN<br>USDA - FOREST SERVICE<br>APRIL 1996

INIRODOCTION: This action plan was prepared in resposse to a management review of the national grasslands conducted on October 30 through November 7, 1995. . The review team was interdisciplinary and made up of forest Service employees from the Washington Office and the field as well as a representative from the Natural Resources Conservation Service. The team was led by the Associate Deputy Chiaf of the Forest Service for National Forest System.

The actions contained in the plan are those which affect more than one forest Service region. Other actions, as needed, which apply to specific units and programs will be contained in action plans prepared by individual forest Service regions and research stations.

The findings and desired futures listed in the action plan are caken from the "Report of the National Grasslands Management Reviow Team, USDA Foreat Service, October 30 - November 8, 1995." The report is dated December 26, 1995.

The review team or subsequently designated representatives will assess overall progress in meeting action plans and file a report with the Forast Service Chief on or before January 1, 1997 and 1998.

Representatives from the review team will make a series of small group visits to a cross section of nacional grasslands to intaract further with employees and users in a field enviromment to demonstrate increased emphasis and commitment to national grassland management, and to make continual adjustmant in management actions.

## A. POLICY ERNDTORX

Fimding 1: Legislation and policy applicable to the national grasslands are not uniformiy understood or accepted intemally or exteramly. A common and shared vision tor managemant of the national grasslanda is lacking.

Flading 2: Policy direction specifically relaced to managing the natiomal graselands needs strengthening.

Flnding 3: The national grasslands need to be used more frequently and effectively to demonetrate and influence sound and practical management of grassland ecosystems.

NATIONAL GRASSIANDS

## MANAGEMENTE REVIEW ACTION PLAN

## USDA - FOREST SMRICR

## APRIL 1996



## APPENDIX B

## REVIEW TEAM MEMBERS

Janice McDougle, Associate Deputy Chief of the National Forest System, Team Leader
Bertha Gillam. Forest Service. Director of Range Management. Washington Office (WO)
Deen Boe. Forest Service. Deputy Director of Range Management, WO
Tom Darden. Forest Service. Wildlife Program Leader, WO
Michael Lennartz. Forest Service. Forest Environment Research WO
Walt Schlumpf, Forest Service, Assistant Director, Minerals and Geology, WO
Mary Peterson, Forest Service, Forest Supervisor. Nebrasica National Forest
Rod Baumberger, Natural Resources Conservation Service, South Dakota

Information Manager.
Rita Beard. Range Management. Fort Collins. CO

## PLANNED FOLLOW.UP

1. The resuits of the review will be presented to the Forest Service National Leadership Team in January 1996, at their winter meeting.
2. The review report will be sent to all applicable regions and stations in December with a request to prepare draft action plans by February 10. 1996.
3. A mechanism will be established to coordinate the development of action plans between regions, stations, and the Washington Office.
4. The review team or subsequently designated representatives will assess overall progress in meeting action plans and file a report with the Chief on or before January 1, 1997 and 1998. *
5. Representatives from the review team will make a series of small group visits to a cross section of national grasslands to interact further with employees and users in field surroundings, to demonstrate increased emphasis and commitment to national grassland management, and to make continual adjustment in management actions.

- In addition. compeung issues and values and tradeoffs have not been fully analyzed.
- There is wide variation in land and resource management plans for the national grasslands. There is a lack of consistency in standards. guidelines. and management strategies for similar issues.


## Desired Future

1. Forest Service Research, in collaboration with managers of the national grasslands and western universities. develops an agenda and priorities for research on the national grasslands and prairie ecosystems.
2. Ecological classifications will be completed for all riparian and upland sites on the grasslands.
3. Revised forest plans provide a comprehensive assessment of resource capabilities, demands. and issues associated with national grasslands, as well as scientifically credible standards and guidelines for meecing resource management policies and objectives. Desired Future: Habitat Conservation Assessments. conservation pians, and recovery plans will be developed for TES species, paricularly idenified key species.
4. Reasonable wildlife and botanical expertise is provided to each of the grassland units.
5. Monitoring programs are designed and implemented to provide periodic assessment of resource conditions and trends and the effectiveness of prescribed management accivities. The results of monitoring programs are used to adapt management activities to changing or unanticipated conditions.
6. Revised forest plans provide a comprehensive assessment of resource capabilities, demands. and issues associated with national grasslands, as well as credible standards and guidelines for meeting resource management policies and objectives.
7. Revision of forest plans will be coordinated across regions and forests. Standards and guidelines are consistent across administrative boundaries for similar ecological situations. Coordination will provide consistent direction while allowing tlexibility in meeung local needs.

- Program funding has been nadequate to support needed surveys, monitoring, and assessments for threatened. endangered. and sensitive species.
- Remaining natural habitats and some grassiand communities within the Great Plains are largely confined to extremely limited public lands. National grasslands will play an increasingly important role in providing critical habitat for TES species.
- The geographic isolation of many of the grassland units makes it difficult to share expertise among units.
- Of the threatened, endangered, or sensitive species or candidates in the Great Plains, the Forest Service has worked only on the prairie fringed orehid, greater prairie chicken, blacttailed prairie dog, black-footed ferret swift fox, ferruginous hawk, blowout penstemon, and mountain plover-iewer than a dozen.

Finding 4: Monitoring and evaluation have not been used effectively to determine whether our management decisions have been implemented or to evaluate what is or is not working.

- Forest plans should be reviewed to detemine if appropriate standards and guidelines have been established for all imporiant resources and issues.
- Lackof-monitoring or monitoring reports has diminished public credibility.

Finding 5: Current forest plans for the national grasslands focus primarily on commodity issues, such as grazing and huntable wildlife, and have not fully incorporated more recent important issues.

- Management direction. standards, and guidelines are lacking for many significant resources, values. and issues outside of commodity issues.
- Direction provided in iorest pians is generally inadequate to address changes in resource demands and public uses of grasslands that have occurred since the first generation of plans.
- Issues lacking adequate management direction, standards, or guidelines in many forest plans include:
- The ecological role of prairie dogs.
- TES species.
- Desired vegetation conditions for management objectives other than grazing.
- Recrearional vehicles.
- The role of fire.
- Noxious weeds.
- Woody draws and riparian communities.
- Substantial effor in both research units is iocused on plants and animals that are endangered. threatened. or declining, suci as prairie dogs, the black-footed ferret. the prairie fringed orchid. and neotropical migratory birds.
- Managers have identified a number of major information needs where research information is lacking or inadequate:
-Prairie dogs, prairie chickens. sharp-tailed grouse. and other threatened, endangered, or senstive wildlife species.
- Rare plants.
- Residual cover for neouropical migratory birds and other wildlife.
- Controlling invasive exotic plants and restoring native plant communities.
- Managing woody draws and riparian communities.
- Prescribed tire.

Finding 2: Although managers are using current information and are, in most cases, working in close collaboration with researchers. some grazing interests are suspicious of or disagree with Forest Service rechnical conclusions.

- Allegations were made that the Forest Service relies too heavily on Forest Service research and ignores research conducted by land grant and other western universities.
- One grazing association is funding a technical consultant for the expressed purpose of discrediting Forest Service technical conclusions.
- Controversy over uchnical conclusions is due. in part. to resistance to new vegetation - standards to meet resource goals other than grazing.

Finding 3: TES species are e.nerging as a critical concern on national grasslands, and additional information and monitoring is needed for effective management.

- Federal classification currenuly lists 59 grassland species as threatened or endangered. and the number is increasing.
- Another 728 species are listed as candidates for threatened or endangered status.
- Grassland bird species have shown more widespread and steeper declines than any other group of birds in North Amenca.
- Information on distribution and abundance is lacking for many TES species.
- There is insufficient information to develop conservation strategies for many of the currently listed species, and the forests and districts are ill-equipped to comply with the requirements of the Endangered Species Act
- A threatened and endangered species coordinator position has been established for the Great Plains to coordinate assessments of threatened. endangered, and sensitive species and to establish management and research priorities.
expertise. Forest Service leadership evaluates budget allocations between national forests and national grasslands and directs a shift in resources where it is needed to provide organizational or resource support to meet critical needs on the national grasslands.

2. An interregional structure. such as a "grassland council," exists to:

- provide leadership to national grassland management:
- facilitate coordination and consistent management for national grasslands while at the same time providing for local flexibility:
- coordinate decisionmaking at appropriate line officer levels;
- achieve coordinated issue resolution and implementation of management decisions;
- address grassland policy, budget, and organizarional issues:
- coordinate grassland assessments:
- coordinate with other Govemment interests:
- ensure coordination of, and involvement in, current and future grassland or Great Plains initiatives:
- assure quality resource management of the national grassiands; and
- increase organizational support (national and regional level) to the national grassiands.

3. Regular National Grassland Conterences are held to strengthen communications between national grassland unit managers and to give managers increased opportunities to work together.
4. National Grassiand Centers of Excellence are functioning to provide a concentrated focus on:
(1) quality resource planning and management; (2) consistency across unit boundaries; and
(3) efficient use of personnel to accomplish program goals.

## Rewource Stewnrdship and the Scientific Bace

Determine whether the necessary research base is available and whether the right kind of activities are occurring on the ground, including resource management and demonstration.

Finding 1: Grasslands unies currently rely on a number of universities and on Forest Service Research for the science required to understand and manage grassland ecosystems. However. there are opportunities to expand cooperation and collaboration with more universities and with researchers with other agencies.

- The Rocky Mountain Research Station is a major source of information on vegetation classification, vegetation monitoring, and the ecology of selected TES species.
- The Rocky Mountain Research Station Center for Great Plains Ecosystem Research at Rapid City, SD, cooperates with 11 universities as well as other State and Federal agencies to develop research information for land managers in the northem Great Plains.
- The Station's Grassland Research Unit in Albuquerque, NM, investigates ecosystems in the southern Great Plains.
- The research priorides for the two units, developed in cooperation with land managers, include ecological classification, rangeland restoration, monitoring, and the response of plant and animal communities to fire and grazing.

Finding 2: The national grasslands in the Great Plains are not collaborating to the degree necessary to resolve current grassland issues.

- Communications. collaboration. and cooperation among grassland units of the Great Plains are not occuring to a level that permits increased efficiency or etfectiveness.
- Currentiy, the 20 national grasslands under Forest Service stewardship are managed by 7 different regions of the Forest Service and 10 different national forests.
- Most grassland rangers are isolated from each other. They generally do not have much interaction with their national forest ranger counterparts.
- The Forest Service has been underrepresented in liaison with the Great Plains Partnership or other multistate, multiagency efforts in the Great Plains.
- Management of TES species between regions of the Forest Service could be improved within the Great Plains.
- Coordination among grassland units and between grassland units and research units is not as frequent or as effective as it could be.
- Great Plains national grasslands share many of the same constituents and may be duplicating or missing opportunities to effectively coordinate with these constiments.

Similar issues on national grasslands are dealt with differently on individual units (e. g., grazing association rules, prairie dog management, mountain plover management, and so forth), creating confusion with users and interests.

- Ecosystem-level assessments need to be coordinated between the four regions within the Great Plains.
- Interagency coordination within the Great Plains is occurring, but there is not as much interregional coordination of these efforts as there should be.
- There is a lack of inventory information and consistent processes for completing ecological or social assessments between regions within the Great Plains.
- There is a difference in emphasis in grassland land adjusments between regions of the Forest Service.


## Desirced Future:

1. Grassland units are effectively collaborating and partnering with other agencies. Cost-sharing, volunteers, and parmerships with State agencies provide opportunities for needed skill leveis and

## Desired Future

1. The Forest Service is seen as exercising a greater level of conservation leadership in the area of the natoonal grasslands.
2. Writen commitment(s) are developed with appropriate Federal and State agencies and others to achieve specific outcomes. including uimetrames and strategies to be employed.
3. A management environment where all grassland interests believe that their views and concerms will be considered in natural resource decisions. National grassland leadership creates a forum or process to uulize public input into grassland policies, programs, and projects. Other Federal agencies, States. lucal govemments, and grassland interests are utilized in the development and assessment of grassland policies.
4. National grasslands skills are acquired from a variety of extemal sources. including NRCS and are available at the right piace and the right time.
5. USDA agencies cleariy understand each other's missions and can articulate these missions within the community of interests. It is readily apparent to local residents that the agencies are mutually supportive and work in a complementary fashion.

## Effective Organizations

Determine to what extent we huve the people and resources in place, to deliver sound programs within the mission and objectives. $\square$$\rightarrow ?$

Finding 1: Many people expressed the concern that national grasslands are treated disparately with national forests in terms of emphasis. human resources, skill levels, budgets. and regional assistance.

- Some nacional grasslands lack suificient staff experise to accomplish our muliple-use mission and to carry out the intent of laws and regulations in an eificient and effective manner.
- Some believe there is an inequity in funding between national forest and national grassiand units. Particular areas of concern are recreation. range, wildife, threatened and endangered species, fisheries. and heriage resources.
- Grassland units and their associated national forest headquarters do not have all the necessary expertise and skills to adequately address the issues and management needs of the national grasslands.
- There is a need for additional selected skills available at the grassland level., particularly in rangeland ecology; wildife management; TES species management: botany; archeology; and paleontology.
- Grassland managers realize that as budgets decline, it will be more difficult to obtain the necessary skills for the local/field level of the organization. There will be a greater need to collaborate and parner with other agencies to obtain some experise.
- Some grazing associations and permitrees expressed interest in an information network from which they could become better informed about natural resource issues affecting them.
- In its long-range planning and environmental education efforts, the Forest Service needs to porray the "interdependence relationship" between public and private land more effectively. Some believe that too litule recognition is given to natural resource contributions of private grazing lands. such as for gamebird or big game habitat.

Finding 2: The Forest Service is not as effective as it could be in bringing varied interests together, providing opportunities for input, and involving them in solutions. In some cases, our coordination and collaboration are too narrowly focused.

- There is a perceived lack of Forest Service emphasis on local working relationships with new land users. grazing associations, and other groups.
- Concern was expressed that in requesting involvement in our issues, the Forest Service has too litule regard for ranching time consuaints. such as during livestock markeuing.
- Some perceive that environmental groups can influence management issues on the national grasslands by "talking generalities," while the Forest Service requires the rancher to always talk specifically in terms of animal units.
- Grazing associations believe that the Forest Service does not give permittees enough credi: for good range management and flexibility in grazing management.
- Sooperacive efforts, such as watershed planning and wildlife habitat management, should include more agencies and groups that could make valid contributions.
- The South Dakota State Department of Resource Conservation and Forestry and the North and South Dakota Natural Resource Conservation Service offered to become invoived in resolving Forest Service iandownership adjusunent and use issues.

Finding 3: The Forest Service needs to be more active in coordinating and sharing resources with other USDA agencies and doing more to support common USDA goaks.

- Active relationships with U.S. Deparment of the Interior and State agencies appear to be more common than with USDA agencies.

The Forest Service does not routinely include the NRCS in range allotment planning between the agency and the grazing associations and other permitrees. The NRCS could assist both groups with inventory, engineering, planning, and grassland agriculture.
2. A commonly understood vision will be used as a foundation for making adjustments as needed in regulation and national. regional. and local policy.
3. Grasslands will be considered showcases for demonstrating sound land management pracrices.

## Working With.Others

Determine the extent and effectiveness of involvement by users, State and local governments. Tribal governments. other parmers, and the public.

Finding 1: The Forest Service needs to exert greater leadership in interagency, intergovernmental, and Tribal government collaboration.

Following are exampies of potenial opportunities for beter natural resource management While these items are specific to the northem Great Plains. they are believed to be indicative of the kinds of opportunities that exist in and around the national grasslands generally.

- The Forest Service does not have a line officer with the delegated authority to be part of the Great Plains Partnership of the Western Govemors Conference-a different person shows up for each meering.
- The BLM and others in North Dakota strongly encouraged the Forest Service to participate with them in meetings of their resource advisory councils.
- The Nawral Resources Conservacion Service (NRCS) in both North and South Dakota expressed strong suppor for so-cailed "seamless nawural resource management." and a willingness to be used more than they cumently are in cooperative conservation effors.
- In Wyoming, the BLM took a positive view of a possible regional reassessment of the Forest Service/BLM interchange proposal. In North Dakota. the BLM expressed a willingness to move ahead with land interchange or outright shift of suriace responsibilities to the Forest Service where feasible.
- Opportunities for better naurral resource management exist at the State level as weli. For example, the Abandoned Mine Land Fund in Wyoming ( $\$ 16-18$ million annually) managed by the State Deparment of Environmental Quality, currently funds a variery of public works projects. Yet there is still mine reclamation work to be done, including projects on Federal land. One element that appears to be lacking is a coordinated approach by the Federal land management agencies.
- The National Park Service indicated an interest in interpretive signing and beter public accommodations on national grasslands in the vicinity of Badlands National Park. This could both lessen recreation pressure in the park and increase national grassland prominence at the same time.

Finding 2: Policy direction spectifically related to managing the national grasslands needs strengthening,

- Conservation and wildlife interests have a common perception that the interests of livestock operators are overemphasized.
- In the mid-1980's. a Forest Servicewide effor was implemented to condense policy direction for all resources. During this time, some of the manual direction specific to the national grasslands was deleted.
- For the last 15 years. grazing interests have been urging the Forest Service to develop separate regulations and policy for the national grassiands.
- Existing direction for the national grasslands was developed during an era when there were fewer multiple-use demands than now.
- New information indicates the growing importance of grassland ecosystems to biodiversity.

Finding 3: The national grasslands need to be used more frequently and effectively to demonstrate and influence sound and practical management of grassland ecosystems.

- A variety of interests advocated a stronger leadership roie for the Forest Service in demonstrating sound land management.
- National grasslands form a significant portion of the public land base on the Great Plains. but their existence or purpose is not well understood by broad segments of the public.
- National grasslands and interretated private lands have demonstrated a significant conservation success story since the Dust Bowl era.
- National grasslands offer substantial opportunities to demonstrate livestock grazing management, minerals development, threatened and endangered species conservation. wildife management and shared management between Federal and State agencies. organizations, and individuals.
- The multiple-use mandate applicable to the national grasslands provides flexibility to demonstrate a broad array of management approaches in an ecosystem management context.


## Desired Future

1. Creation of a commonty understood vision for the national grasslands. The vision will be available for implementation in the revision of land and resource management plans applicable to the national grasslands.

## FINDINGS AND DESIRED FUTURES

## Introduction

Findings of the review team are grouped under each of the four major objectives of the review. The objecuives are interrelated. as are the tindings.

Desired furures are designed as targets for the agency to aim at when designing management actions. They are writen to provide a substantial degree of management flexibility to meet local situations, while at the same time addressing national interests. One coordinated action plan will be developed that includes all of the affected regions and the Washington Office. Actions can address more than one finding and desired future. They can also be adjusted as time passes to meet changing conditions.

Follow-up will be scheduled to monitor progress on action planned during meetings.

## Policy Framework

Examine the missions, goats. und direction of the grasslands, particularly in relation to today's issues and climate.

Finding 1: Legislation and policy applicable to the national grasslands are not uniformly understood or accepted internally or externally. A common and shared vision for management of the national grasslands is lacking.

- Grasiland interests offered widely varying views of what existing legislation and regulations mean in today's economic and social environment.
- Ranching interests frequently cite the preamble of the Banichead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. which states in part "...to promote more secure occupancy of farms and farm homes..." as providing a basic direcuon that gives livestock grazing preterence over other uses.
- Current legislative attempts are directed, in part. at reinforcing the emphasis on grazing and ranching stability within the national grasslands. They further autmpt to remove the grasslands from planning and other procedural requirements common to NFS lands today.
- National grasslands are perceived by many as being managed for grazing as a dominant use. Conversely, the perception exists, particularly by grazing permittees, that other interests such as wildlife. recreation, and conservation of biological diversity dominate management decisions.
- Many ranching interests icel that the Forest Service has moved away from the intent of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

Lyndon B. Johnson, Caddo. Black Ketle, McClellan Creek, Kiowa, and Rita Blanca National Grasslands. Crooked River. Curlew. and Butte Valley National Grasslands submitted writen comments.

The team spoke with employees: individual permittees; grazing associations; congressional statifs: govemor's representatives; local mayors: bankers; Chamber of Commerce members: rural development representatives; environmental organizations; sporsmen; outfiters and guides; oil. gas. and coal interests: the National Park Service: the Bureau of Land Management (BLM); the Fish and Wildlife Service; the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS); State tish and game deparmens: county commissioners: paleontological interesss; heritage resources; and other partners and interests. In all. the team had a dialogue with over 300 people.

## HIGHLIGHTS OF SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS—WHAT IS WORKING WELL

- The overall dedication. spirit and protessionalism of Forest Service employees on the national grassiands is very high.
- National grassland grazing permittees should be recognized for their devotion to and care of rangelands.
- The process for revising the land and resource management plans for the northem Great Plains in the Northerm and Rocky Mountain Regions is a good example of boundaryless collaboration between units.
- Mineral development and reclamation is a demonstration of sound land use practices.
- Model community involvement and economic development processes on some units have contributed to local economic diversification.
- Formal collaborative research between the Rocky Mountain Research Station Center for Great Plains ecosystem research at Rapid City, SD. and several Forest Service units demonsrates sound ties between the NFS and Research.
- Local relationships with congressional staffs were strong on most ranger districts.
- The National Grasslands Visitor Center at Wall. SD, is serving as a model for education and interpretation of the national grasslands and grasslands in general.
- State agencies consistently complimented Forest Service stewardship and improvements in range conditions. They noted that Forest Service management has favorably influenced management on neighboring lands.
- Some grassland districts are developing seed sources of native prairie plants to use in revegetaing oil and mineral development sites. Seeding with locally adapted native species makes a positive contribution to maintaining the biodiversity of grassland ecosystems.

The national grasslands are beginning to experience similar changes in resource demands and values that have been occurring on national forests over the last decade. Long-standing uses such as livestock grazing, mineral development and hunting have to be managed within an environment of increasing demands for wildlife viewing, photography, rock hunting, and other diverse interests. One of the most imponant emerging issues is the crucial role of the national grasslands for maintaining biological diversity within the Great Plains prairie ecosystems.

The largest vegetative province in North America is the nacive prairie. Some states have had declines in tallgrass pairie of 99.9 percent. It is estimated that less than 34 percent of true mixed grass prairie and less than 23 percent of true shortgrass prairie still exist in native vegetation. This loss of native vegetation is due primarily to conversion to nonnative crops; damming of major river systems for flood control and irrigation; and draining of wetlands for crop production. Overgrazing by livestock, suppression of fire. invasion of exotic plants, and fragmentation of native grassiands continue to have negative impacts on the remaining native grassland ecosystems.

There are currently 59 listed threatened or endangered species in the Plains, with another 728 candidates for listing. Of the 435 bird species that breed in the United States, 330 have been documented to breed in the Great Plains. Most of these species show declines of 14-91 percent due to losses of habitat crizical for nesting and wintering. Prairie dog populations currently exist in less than 5 percent of their historic range. Species associated with the prairie dog are declining, and many are listed as threatened, endangered. or sensitive species.

As the Forest Service recognizes and responds to these new demands on the national grasslands,
some changes in management will resuit. Tradivional users are becoming concerned that meeting
demands for these multiple uses and values will be at the expense of more traditional uses and
dependent livelihoods. These potentially contlicting interests have resulted in polarization of users
of the grasslands. Inadequate communications between these interests and divergent demands for
management of the national grasslands have further increased the level of concem and lack of trust
in Forest Service management. Livestock grazers are concemed that grazing will be further
resuricted on the national grasslands as competing in:zrests such as wildlife and recreation become
more vocal.
There is substantial opportunity for future management on the national grasslands to forge new parmerships with State and Federal agencies. Tribal governments. the academic community, organizations. and individuals. They can well serve as a model for enhancing ecosystem management a base for demonstrating sound land use practices. and a catalyst for improving the efficiency of govemment.

## Review Approach

The team examined stewardship achievements and the unique characteristics of the national grasslands. They gained a sense of the scope of issues and current activities, and improved agency understanding of the significance of national grasslands within the NFS and relationships with stakeholders.

The national grasslands units that were visited include: the Buffalo Gap and FL. Pierre National Grasslands and National Grasslands Visitor Center on the Nebraska National Forest (SD); the Litule Missouri National Grassiand on the Custer National Forest (ND), the Thunder Basin National Grassland on the Medicine Bow-Rour National Forest (WY); and the Comanche National Grassiand on the Pike-San Isabel National Forest (CO). The team also met with Forest Service, other agency, and public representatives from the Sheyenne, Oglala, Pawnee, Cimarron,

## The Setting

The national grasslands had their origin in the dust bowl years of the 1930's. Basic legislation leading to establishment of the national grasslands was the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of 1937 (BJFTA). BJFTA was "An act to create the Farmers' Home Corporation, to promote more secure occupancy of farms and farm homes, to correct economic instability resuling from some present forms of farm tenancy, and for other purposes." Tite III of the act authorized the federal govemment to purchase or otherwise acquire submarginal famlands. The purchased areas were designated Land Utilization Projects (LUP's).

In 1954 the Forest Service assumed administration of about 3.85 million acres of LUP's from the Soil Conservation Service ( now Natural Resources Conservation Service). The remainder of the origina 3.85 million acres was transferred to other agencies such as the National Park Service, the Bureau oftand Management, and the Fish and Wildife Service. The lands administered by the Forest Service were designated as national grasslands in 1960 by the Secretary of Agriculture.

There are many characteristics that together make management of the national grasslands unique within the National Forest System (NFS).

- The national grasslands. for the most part were acquired under the purchase authority of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of 1937 (BJFTA).
- The BJFTA directs the Secretary of Agriculure to "...develop a program of land conservation and land uilization, in order thereby to correct maladjustment in land use..."
- By regulation, he national grasslands have a mission "...to demonstrate sound and practical principles of land used for the areas in which they are located..."
- The national grasstands comprise 3.85 millions acres or about 2 percent of the land base managed by the Forest Service.
- There are 20 national grasslands scawered in 12 different States and 7 regions of the Forest Service. Seventeen grasslands are located in the Great Plains.
- The agricularal sector is imporant to local economies.
- Substantial energy and other mineral development is occurring on the grasslands returning about $\$ 150$ million annually to the Federal treasury.
- Highly intermingled landownership patterms are the norm.
- Grassiand ecosystems dominate.
- Management by grazing associacions is a foundation for implementing grazing practices on a majority of national grasslands acreage.


## BACKGROUND.

## Introduction

The National Grasslands Management Review Report covers broad policy issues that influence the eifectiveness of national grasslands management. The report assesses the current siuxation with an eye to meeuing needs of the future. The tindings and desired fuares are a foundation tor tuture action.

The review team did not try to address specific operational issues or provide a long list of suggested actions. They concenurated on what they felt to be the most important issues. It is important that the USDA Forest Service field organization. in concert with its parners, have substantial latiude to design accions that fit local conditions. At the same ime. these actions need to contribute to a broad ecosystem approach to management.

## Reasons for the Review

The 1995 National Grasslands Management Review was conducted for a number of reasons. including:

- Increased intemal and excermal debate about the current mission and direction for national grasslands.
- Questions about whether the national grasslands are organized to best meet today's challenges.
- Increased efforts by a varietv of agencies and organizations to address issues characteristic of the Great Plains.
- Proposed national legislation specific to the national grasslands.
- Substantial time has passed since the last review in 1982.


## Review Objectives

The Policy Framework: Examine the missions. goals. and direction of the grasslands, particularly in relation to the issues and climate of today.

Working With Others: Determine the extent and effectiveness of involvement by users. slate and local govemments. Tribal governments, other partners. and the public.
Effecrive Organizations: Determine to what extent the Forest Service has the people and resources in place to deliver sound programs wichin the mission and objectives.

Resource Stewardship, the Scientific Base, and Effective Implementation of Programs: Determine if the necessary research base is available and whether the right kind of activities are occurring on the ground, including resource management and demonstration.
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## APPENDIX A

VI. APPENDICES

The second myth is that the BJFTA established livestock grazing as the preferred or dominant use of the national grasslands. This too is plainly incorrect. There is simply nothing in the BJFTA, its preamble or legislative history to corroborate such an assertion. Grazing has been and will continue to be an important use of the national grasslands. But it is just one of many recognized uses and it is within the discretion of the Forest Service to determine through the planning process how those uses should be managed and where they should occur.

Fortunately, the combination of events which led to the enactment of the BJFTA are not likely to be repeated and the lands acquired under Title III in the 1930's and 1940's have made a remarkable recovery. In large part, the recovery of the land was due to the concerted and cooperative efforts of many people from different backgrounds working together towards a common goal. While the national grasslands have, for the most part, been restored, challenges remain for the Forest Service in its administration of these areas.

Today, the challenges are different. The Forest Service must be able to identify, consider, and harmonize all the applicable laws, not just the BJFTA, in its administration of the national grasslands. The Forest Service must educate the public about national grasslands, solicit their input and consider their views as part of the decisionmaking process. And ultimately, the Forest Service must make management decisions which are in compliance with the law and which provide for the wise use and sustained productivity of the grassland resources. This process takes time and can often be frustrating. But it is what the law requires. And it is what the public has a right to expect.

## V. SUMMARY

The Forest Service currently administers 3.8 million acres of national grasslands as part of the 191 million acre National Forest System. These lands were originally acquired under the authority of Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of 1937 and were assigned to the Forest Service for administration in 1954. In the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, Congress specifically included national grasslands as a unit of the "National Forest System." National grasslands therefore are subject not just to the requirements of the BJFTA but also to the requirements of other laws generally applicable to the rest of the National Forest System. Although the revelation that national grasslands are subject to the BJFTA and other laws applicable to the National Forest System may not seem especially startling, it should help to dispel certain myths that have been perpetuated over the years about which laws apply to national grasslands and how those laws should be interpreted.

The first myth is that the only law which the Forest Service should consider in its administration of national grasslands is the BJFTA. This is plainly incorrect. The Forest Service must consider the BJFTA but it must equally consider other laws applicable to units of the National Forest System. Until there is a conflict between the requirements of the BJFTA and one or more of these other laws, the Forest Service is obliged to manage the national grasslands in conformance with all of the applicable laws. To date, no such conflict has manifested itself.
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# The Land Utilization Program 1934 to 1964 

## ORIGIN, DEVELOPMENT, and PRESENT STATUS

## FOREWORD

The proper use of our land resources is of great importance to the Nation and should have a high priority in Government policy--local, State, and national. It is of great significance to the individual citizen, no matter where he lives, or what his occupation may be. Land, and the resources of the land both directly and indirectly affect our lives and living every day. The misuse of land resources often expresses itself in poverty, low productivity, unemployment, poor schools, and a generally unsatisfactory way of life. As we gain a better understanding of the productive possibilities and limitations of various land classes, we find that much land could be used more advantageously than at present.

It was often said 50 years ago that we were beginning to see and understand the need for conservation and land use planning but that not much would be done about it by Government or individuals until a national consciousness and a state of public opinion were developed which would support action by Congress and State legislatures in the fields of research, public education, and action projects. The White House Conservation Conference in 1908 called by President Theodore Roosevelt was one of the first of a series of events which started the movement which has gone steadily forward ever since.

A number of events since World War I have been responsible for the progress made in all aspects of the land utilization prob. lem. In response to the depressed situation in agriculture during the 1920's and 1930's, a national conference on land utilization was held in 1931 which laid the
foundation for a land utilization program. Under the leadership of the National Resources Planning Board, action programs based on a planned attack on all aspects of land use problems began to appear. Many of us who were involved in the events of the 1930's and 1940's have felt the need of a look at the movement and the im. portant events in it from the beginning up to date.

It is for this reason that this report on the origins and development of land utilization projects is of great importance at this time. This study is a milestone in the march of progress in land utiliza. tion. The findings are clearly stated and evaluated. The report covers a program that encompassed some 250 projects and over 11 million acres of land, each project serving both as a test and a demonstration. The projects were well distributed in relation to geography and the principal problem areas of the United States. A question may be asked, "Well and good, but 11 million acres is but a drop in the bucket as far as the total national land problem is concerned; what about the large amount of work yet to be done?" In answer to this reasonable question, we can say that we hope each project acts as a leaven to induce future planning. We can have hope and confidence that we have passed the pioneering phase of the work and that there will be an expansion of land utilization planning and development in the United States under pending river basin and regional development programs.

## PREFACE

The information in this report was obtained from many sources. Records of the land utilization program in the files of both State and Federal agencies were consulted. In addition, a number of individuals who had a special interest in the land utilization projects because of active participation in the research, planning, acquisition, and management phases of the program provided valuable information from memory and from personal papers.

The history of a number of land utilization projects was reviewedin 1963 and 1964. Twelve projects under Federal administration and 17 projects under State ade ministration were visited, records and reports studied, and persons consuited who were familiar with the use of the land and its management. The visits to projects and the discussions with professional workers and people of the project areas gave an insight into some of the problems, policies, and accomplishments not fully revealed in written records and reports. Reports and publications covering some phases of 35 additional projects in different parts of the country were read. Several of the 60 or more projects reviewed had been observed firsthand in their early stages by the writer, who was assigned to the land utilization research and appraisal staff during the first stages of acquisition and development in the l930's.

The author wishes to give special acknowledgement to the following people for their helpfulness in providing suggestions and materials: Ernst H. Wiecking, Harry
A. Steele, Mark M. Regan, Norman E. Landgren, and Robert W. Harrison, Economic Research Service; Edward G. Grest, Fred W. Grover, Howard E. Smith, John S. Forsman, and Lawrence $S$. Newcombe, Forest Service; Claude F. Clayton, William A. Hartman, Elmer Starch, and Carl C. Taylor, Resettlement Administration and Bureau of Agricultural Economics; Glad. win E. Young and Roy D. Hockensmith, Soil Conservation Service; Virgil Gilman and Phillip K. Hooker, Federal Extension Service; all of the Department of Agriculture; and Karl A. Landstrom, Department of the Interior.

Valuable aid was received from Loyd Glover, South Dakota State University; George H. Aull, Clemson College; William T. Fullilove, Georgia State Agricultural Experiment Station; and many others associated with the land use research and action programs of the 1930's and subsequent land management and research ac. tivities.

Especially useful sources were the papers, files, reference lists, and publications of L. C. Gray, Bureau of Agricultural Economics and Resettlement Administration, 1920.40; Carleton E. Barnes, Bureau of Agricultural Economics and Resettle. ment Administration; Margaret R. Purcell, Bureau of Agricultural Economics and Economic Research Service; O: E. Baker, Francis J. Marschner, Howard Turner, Bureau of Agricultural Economics; and Philip M. Glick, Solicitor's Office.

August 1965
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Among the critical agricultural problems of the-1930's was the cultivation of a large acreage of submarginal farmland--land that could not profitably grow crops. Mortgage foreclosures, tax delinquencies, and personal hardship were commonplace in areas where large acreages of submarginal land were being farmed. Severedroughts, floods, erosion, poor cultivation practices, neg. lect, and, frequently, abandonment were causing heavy damage to the land.

Recognizing the magnitude of the submarginal land problem, the Secretary of Agriculture summoned a National Conference on Land Utilization in 1931, to study these problems and to make reports and recommendations. One result was the creation of the National Resources Board, which assembled data and prepared maps showing submarginal land areas. This Board recommended in 1934 that the Federal Government purchase and develop 75 million acres of submarginal farmland in the various regions to serve the public and relieve the distress of the occupants of the submarginal land and of nearby areas. An Executive Order late in 1933 already had established funds to buy land, retire it from cultivation, and develop it for pasture, forest, range, park, recreation, wildlife refuge, and similar uses. The program devised was based on research, and on the cooperation of professional organizations, State agricultural experiment stations, land management and research agencies of the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, and local governments, grazing associations, and soil conservation districts.

Some 250 land utilization projects, totaling 11.3 million acres in 45 States, were acquired for $\$ 47.5$ million (about $\$ 4.40$ an acre exclusive of public domain land as signed) between 1933 and 1946. More than four-fifths of this total acreage-- 9.5 million acres-is now used chiefly for range and forests and related multiple uses, such as wildife protection, watersheds, and recreation. Over one-sixth--1.8 million acres--is used for wildife refuges and parks.

All sales made to the Federal Government were voluntary. Title to the land was obtained under provisions of the emergency relief and industrial recovery acts,
and the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, all passed in the 1930's. Parts of the 11.3 million acres are now managed by 7 Federal agencies, and 2 or more State agencies in some 30 States. Up to 1954, when arrangements were made for permanent land assignments, the costs of developing the land were about $\$ 102.5$ million (about $\$ 9$ an acre). So the total cost for land and development was approximately $\$ 150$ million. Much of the labor of developing the land was done by persons who would otherwise have been jobless.

Nearly 25,000 families occupied the acquired land. More than 8,000 needy families were helped to relocate. Over 16,000 families relocated by their own efforts. In some cases, families could remain in their homes and work on the development or maintenance of projects.

The land utilization projects were not uniform in nature, size, use, or management; no 2 projects were exactly alike. They ranged in size from less than a thousand acres to more than a million. Some 100 Federal and State projects are now in forests; about 30 are in Federal grassland pasture and range; about 70 are in parks and recreation areas; and 50 are in wildlife refuges and management areas. Multiple use is a practice common to all projects. Many projects have good buildings, roads, water supplies, and other facilities for management, fire control, timber processing, grazing, fish and wildlife production and management, experimental demonstrations of good forest and grassland practices, and recreational sites.

Most of the agricultural projects have been under the administration and management of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management since 1954, and now are in National Forests, National Grasslands, and Federal grazing districts. Cooperative grazing associations have an important part in use and management of these lands.

Comparative studies of the project land in the 19301 s , and in the 1960 's after 30 years, show much change and improvement. Useful purposes are served by providing rural recreational areas, wildife refuges, and supplemental incomes to local people from grazing and forestry, from employment in maintenance and operation, and
from related private enterprises. The Federal Government and the States receive fairly substantial payments for use of land now in forest and grass, as a result of improved management, restoration, and development. Counties where these lands are located receive 25 percent of the income from the land for the support of schools and roads.

An outstanding feature of these land utilization projects is that they give people a chance to observe good land use practices and efficient management of forests, grasslands, and recreational and wildlife areas. The projects are proving grounds for social, economic, and educational programs.

The Nation was made aware that poor agricultural land should not be allowed to suffer from misuse, or to absorb the unemployed during depressions. The land utilization program helped reverse U.S.
policies encouraging settlement and de. velopment of land whether or not it was suited to cultivation. The program as a whole put much land to more profitable uses.

Considered as a whole, much of this land has been developed into useful units and has become an important factor ir the local and regional area's life and wel. fare. The land utilization program of the 1930's bears a close resemblance to the 1964 plans to aid in the alleviation o rural poverty and distress.

Case studies of 12 projects illustrate the wide diversity of land use problems in different regions of the country--the past ill-adopted use for agriculture, anc the shift to use for parks, wildlife refuges forest, and grasslands. How better usage has been brought about is shown by de. scription of improvement and manage. ment.

# THE LAND UTILIZATION PROGRAM, 1934 TO 1964 Origin, Development, and Present Status 

by
H. H. Wooten, Economic Research Service
Resource Development Economics Division ${ }^{1}$

## I. ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT

## INTRODUCTION

The nationwide economic depression of the late 1920's and early 1930's awakened public interest in rural land use problems and policies. Thousands of persons no longer able to find work in towns and cities tried to make a living by farming. This back-to-the-land movement intensified the problems of established farmers and rarely solved the problems of the unemployed from urban centers. Farm foreclosures multiplied, tax delinquencies increased, farm incomes dwindled, and in many areas the land resources were damaged by drought, floods, erosion, poor cultivation practices, and neglect. It became increasingly evident that thousands of farm families had long been living in poverty on poor land, and that the depression and weather weremerely aggravating their problems.

The land utilization program of the 1930's was one of the methods by which the Nation attempted to deal with these problems. This program began as a submarginal land purchase and development program, but was gradually expanded to include the briader aim of transferring land to its most suitable use. ${ }^{2}$

Public policy and plans seldorn spring full-grown into being, but develop gradually as the result of public support of certain programs and public rejection of others. So it was with the land utilization program. Until the beginning of the 20th century, the sentiment of the country had been that land had little value until it became settled and

[^9]placed in agricultural production, thereby ceasing to be undeveloped public domain. Unsettled land, even though not well adapted to cultivation, was generally considered a hindrance to full development of the Nation. But by the 1920's, it was beginning to be recognized that efforts to develop quickly all land for agriculture without careful appraisal of its suitability for such use had led to cultivation of much poor land, or land unsuitable for sustained production of crops (50, 57, 72). ${ }^{3}$

One of the most obvious problems in the 1920's and 1930's was the damage to natural soil and water resources from continued cultivation of unproductive farms, which were often eventually abandoned (fig. 1). In several areas of the Southern Piedmont and Appalachian Regions, for example, the almost continuous cultivation of steep slopes in row crops had resulted in serious erosion, stoppage of stream channels by sedimentation, damage to reservoirs, low crop yields, and depletion of large areas of land (fig. 2). But despite the unsuitability of much steep hill and mountain land for food and feed crops, many families remained dependent on it for a living ( 3,55 ).

In the drier portions of the western Great Plains, wind erosion damaged not only cultivated land but the adjoining overgrazed pasture, range, and other land as well. Soil particles in the form of dust and fine sand, blown from cultivated fields, fallow land, and overgrazed range during the prolonged drought of 1933-36, covered and destroyed the crops and sod on nearby land (figs. 3 and 4). Untended fields, held under uncertain tenure, contributed heavily

[^10]

SCS GA-D5-9
Figure 1.--Party idle farmland in Greene County, Ga., showing dilapidated houses on land grown to sedge and scattered pine.


SCS Md-495
Figure 2.--Idle farm in Washonton County, Nd. Fifty Years aro, this land produced 25 bushels of whear per acre. When the picture was taken, bluegrass grew naturally where erosion was not serious.


SCS Kan-535
Figure 3.--Typical Morton County, Kans., homestead when it was optioned for purchase under the land utilization program.


SCS Okla-350-A
Figure 4,--Part of the land utllization purchase area in Cimarron County, Okla. The family that occupled the home was relocated outside the area.
to the dust storms. Here again, economic pressure of crop and pasture failures and the resulting damages to the land, coupled with other influences such as the early homestead laws and their application, which had permitted development of too-small farms on semiarid land, caused these conditions to develop and grow worse with the passing years.

The cutover lands in the Lake States also became a center of trouble. These lands, ill-suited to farming, tended to become tax delinquent soon after the forests were removed. But the scattered families living on these submarginal lands continued to need roads, schools, and other public services, thus requiring public expenditures of many times the amounts they contributed in taxes. Many rural counties faced heavy deficits.

Congress recognized the growing need for action on the problem of submarginal land and provided in the Agricultural Marketing Act of June 15, 1929, authorization for the Federal Farm Board to investigate the utilization of iand for agricultural purposes and the possibility of reducing the amount of marginal land in cultivation. This was the beginning of an increasingly serious study of the land problem in America and of the steps required to bring about a better adjustment between the use of land and the natural character of the Nation's land resources. Some of the forerunners of the land utilization program are described below.

## National Conference on Land Utilization

Aware of mounting distress among farmers, Secretary of Agriculture Arthur M. Hyde arranged a National Conference on Land Utilization in Chicago, in November 1931. The Conference adopted a series of resolutions (144), many of which werelater to become the guidelines for a Federalland program. The conference was attended by representatives of the U.S. Departments of Agriculture and the Interior, State agricultural colleges, farm organizations, and others interested in land use problems.

In 1932, a National Land Use Planning Committee, made up of representatives of Federal bureaus and land-grant colleges, was created. The organization of this Committee was one of the important results of the National Conference on Land Utilization. From the time of its organization, the National Land Use Planning Committee
gave a great deal of attention to the prob. lem of areas not cleariy adapted to use for farming, generally referred to as "marginal" or "submarginal" areas.

The Committee prepared a report in 1933 directed primarily to the concept of public acquisition, retention, and management of submarginalland (145). The physical and economic principles governing land classification were outlined. The major problems found in submarginal areas were reviewed, and adjustments were recommended. The need for acquisition of land by public agencies and for relocation of rural families in accordance with the adaptability of land to various uses was outlined. Principles upon which a public acquisition program might be based were set forth.

In a June 1932 address at Des Moines, Iowa, President Hoover cited the work of the National Land Use Planning Committee and stated that the broad objective of the study of land use problems was to promote the reorganization of agriculture to divert land from unprofitable use, and to avoid the cultivation of land that contributed to the poverty of those who lived on it. Early in 1933, President Hoover asked Congress to implement Secretary of Agriculture Hyde's recommendation that the Government lease submarginal farmland and convert it to other uses-a program that Hyde regarded as an emergency effort which could lead to a program of systematic land utilization.

## National Resources Board

A National Planning Board was established in the Public Works Administration in July 1933. This Board was in turn succeeded by the National Resources Board, created by Executive Order of President Roosevelt on June 30, 1934. The latter Board took as one of its first tasks the preparation of a comprehensive report on the land and water resources of the United States, in cooperation with the U.S. Departments of Agriculture and the Interior, State planning boards, agricultural experiment stations, and other interestedagencies and individuals (146).

The report, issued by the Board's Land Planning Committee in December 1934, suggested that national policies should actively seek to bring about thoselandownership and land use patterns found to be clearly in the interest of the general public welfare, as contrasted with purely
individual or group interests. It inventoried land resources and estimated future land requirements for various uses; it identiried maladjustments in land use and recommended public policies for correcting them. It also recommended increasing the areas in Federal and State forests, public parks, recreation areas, Indian reservations, and wildlife refuges.

The most significant policy recommenda tion, however, concerned the marginal and submarginal land and its occupants. The Board recommended that the Federal Government carry on a long-term policy
of land acquisition, and acquire some 75 million acres of land, to "supplement the assistance to private forestry, and erosioncontrol work" already underway. The Board suggested that the way to begin such a program would be to acquirecarefully selected areas of submarginal land and demonstrate how it could be used to serve the public. It was recognized that it would, at the same time, be necessary to relocate the occupants or regroup them in suitable areas, taking into account the possibilities for employment afforded by the land utilization projects.

## FORMATION OF THE LAND UTILIZATION PROGRAM

Late in 1.933, a Speciz.l Board of Public Works with members from several Federal departments passed a resolution calling for establishment of a submarginal land purchase program by the Government. In February 1934, such a program was instituted by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration with $\$ 25$ million provided from Federal Emergency Relief Administration appropriations. This program was to include four types of projects: (1) Agricultural adjustment, (2) Indian land, (3) recreation, and (4) wildlife refuge. With the initial allotment of $\$ 25$ million, supplemented by transfers from Work Relief funds to employ labor for development, it was proposed to acquire approximately 10 mil lion acres of land located in 45 States. The overall purpose of the program was to carry out an important land policy function not duplicated by any other Federal program.

Details and requirements of the first allotment of $\$ 25$ million for land purchase have been summarized as follows (70):

1. That the lands purchased shall be such as in general to fall under subsection (c) of Section 202 of the National Industrial Recovery Act in that they shall be lands of the character heretofore purchased by the State of New York under the program developed (1928-32) by Governor Roosevelt (President-elect in 1932) for the withdrawal of submarginal lands from cultivation.
2. That they shall be lands that in total amount balance against the lands, the reclamation or improvement of which has been provided for under the comprehensive program of public works on condition that counterbalancing lands be withdrawn from cultivation.
3. That they shall be lands which are now in cultivation, producing agricultural crops at a rate of production which the Department of Agriculture specifies as submarginal, that is, giving a return that is less than is to be properiy expected from the labor
expended with the result that the owners remain impoverished while working them.
4. That they shall be lands avallable for or suitable for development as forests, or as parks or recreation spaces, or as grazing ranges, or as bird or game refuges or as additions to Indian reservatons or such that their development through planting of forests and ground cover will serve as a protection against soil erosion or for other specific public works and benefits to the people of the United Srates.
5. That it shall be possible to work out a definite plan of resettlement or employment of the population at present living on such lands so that they may not become stranded or transient.

Every project accepted under this program shall meet the conditions specified in the five points mentioned above. The method of operation shall be the following:

Projects will be presented through any interested department, bureau, or section, such as the Indian Service, Biological Survey, Relief Administration, or otherwise. They will be examined by the several governmental departments concerned to determine whether or not they can be handled in full satisfaction of each of the five points specified above.
it is the intention to turn the land over to a Federal Department for its operation for the purpose of which it is best adapted--forests, range or park--these in charge of Forestry Service, Indian Office, or Park: Service, and so on.

## The Agricultural Adjustment Administration

The administration of the agricultural adjustment projects, as well as the general direction of the whole land utilization program, was the immediate responsibility of the Land Policy Section of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. The responsibility for plamning, and in specific cases, for acquiring land for other types of projects was assigned as follows: Indian lands projects, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; parks, the

National Park Service, Department of the Interior; wildlife areas, the Bureau of Biological Survey, Department of Agriculture. Organized technical direction of the land retirement funds and programs was to be the joint responsibility of Agriculture and Interior.

The primary interest of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration was in the original purpose of the land program: Retiring submarginal land from agricultural use, principally for demonstrational purposes, and developing it for uses to which it was better suited. To it was allotted twothirds of the $\$ 25$ million available. Such allocation of public works money for farmland retirement was justified in part to offset the effect of development of land by reclamation projects with public works funds. The other agencies involved in the program were interested primarily in acquiring land for special purposes.
L. C. Gray, Director of the Land Policy Section, Agricultural Adjustment Adminis tration, wrote (55, 56) that as the land retirement program progressed, it took on increasingly the aspect of a "land-use adjustment' program, because ''...areas were placed in public ownership which, even though not outstandingly submarginal for agriculture, were nevertheless devoted to some use other than that for which they were best suited." Hence it was often difficult "to reconcile the needs of specified areas for recreation, wildife conservation, or Indian rehabilitation with the basic planning of a submarginal land retirement program....' (52).

According to Dr. Gray, a project was considered worthwhile when it could be satisfactorily shown "that public acquisition of lands in the selected area, coupled with resettlement of the present residents on better land, will provide an effective demonstration of one means whereby these problems can be solved."

In the Plains States, where by far the largest acreage was to be purchased, the purpose of the land program was to see that semiarid land used for wheat or other arable farming was used for grazing instead. This involved both increasing the size of farms and resettling low-income families where they would not be dependent upon arid land unfit for cultivated agriculture.

Land purchased in the Northeast was to be converted to forests, game refuges, and recreational areas. In the South, on land
that had been depleted by years of l-crop cotton or tobacco farming, the projects were intended to restore soil fertility, timber, and game. Scattered farms isolated in Lake States forests imposed heavy burdens on local governments for services and facilities; these farms were to be purchased and assistance given the farmers to resettle in developed communities.

Agricultural adjustment projects were to comprise approximately 7 million acres of uneconomic farmland, together with adjacent tracts, to be acquired for forestry, grazing, and other extensive conservational uses. Major problems to be attacked were (1) damage of soil and water resources, forest, and grass cover through erosion and the improper use of land; (2) waste of human resources through dependence of rural people upon land physically unfit for agricultural production; and (3) loss of financial resources by State and local governments through excessive costs of public services in submarginal areas where tax returns were too meager or uncertain to cover the costs.

Some 1,500,000 acres of marginal farm. land were to be purchased for use by Indians. Most of this land was to be used for grazing. Recreational projects planned under the supervision of the National Park Service were to consist of some 500,000 acres of poor farmland and other unproductive tracts located largely within 50 miles of industrial centers, to be developed primarily to provide recreational facilities for low-income families. These projects varied in size from small picnic grounds to 10,000-acre preserves.

Approximately 750,000 acres were to be included in migratory waterfowl and other wildlife projects. They were largely areas that could be partly flooded and used as resting and breeding areas for migratory waterfowl.

## Project Planning and Development

Procedure followed in carrying out the land-acquisition program was outlined in a report to the U.S. Senate from the Secretary of Agriculture (152):

The initial step in the selection of a project is the definition of a "problem" area--that is, an area in which the conditions of land use demand readjustment. To facilitate the definition of such "problem" areas, land use specialists attached to the regional offices cooperate closely with the agricultural experiment station in each of the States as well as with State planning boards, State conservation commissions, and
other agencies concerned with land. Before final decision on the development of a project is made, the present economic status of the occupants of the land, the condition of the soil and native vegetation, including forest resources, and the need of the land for public purposes must be considered. With the ultimare use of the land in mind, it is necessary to explore its relationship to nearby towns and cities, to local opinion, and to the attitude of vartous State official agencies. Special Consideration is given to the cost of the land and to the possibility of relieving unemployment by the development work on such a project. After it is decided to proceed, the boundaries of the project are carefully defined and proposals to sell land within the purchase area are secured. The solicitors of the proposals are instructed as to the probable values of the various properties. After a sufficient number of proposals have been obtained to Insure that the project can be completed, the individual tracts are appraised by expert appraisers, and the owners are then asked to sign a formal offer to sell land to the Federal government on the basis of the appraised value. When a sufficient number of such formal offers are available, they are submitted to the Washington office for acceptance.

It is then necessary to determine whether the dite is sufficiently clear to permit the transfer of the land to the United States in tee simple. This process has been found to require a considerable period of dime. The Federal Government has never before undertaken to acquire so large an amount of land in so short a period, and the volume of work involved has placed an unusual burden on the various administrative agencies affected. Three major departments of the Federal Government are concemed: Namely, the Department of Justice, the Comptroller General, and the Treasury Department. The Department of Justice must be sadisfied that the dille is free from defects. The Comptroller General must be satisfied that the authority at law exists for the acquisition of each tract, that the money is being spent for a title that is free from sertous defects, and that the various reservations such as mineral reservations which may have been stipulated in each transaction not only are legally justified, but also are consonant with the purpose of each project and the interests of the United States. Such requirements have naturally caused considerable periods of delay in payment.

From the beginning of the program, land acquisition was based on voluntary sales. Standard procedures were used in estimating the value of land offered for sale, optioning land, clearing titles, and closing sales. Experienced local and State people were assigned to this work. Condemnation was resorted to only where necessary for title clearance and related legal purposes.

In its earlier stages, the land program was intended as a demonstration to help
distress ed rural people. But as the program developed the emphasis changed somewhat, and much of the acreage optioned for purchase included parts of large tracts and land adjacent to or within farm areas, which no one had ever cultivated, although much of it was forest or had been used for grazing. To some degree, these changes in objective reflected limitations placed on the use of funds made available for this program by the Congress and the executive departments.

## Problem Land Area Classification

At the outset of the program there was the need to find the extent and location of poor farmland. Much information was available from previous research. For 10 years or more, the Bureau of Agricultural Eco= nomics and cooperating Federal and State agencies had been studying rural land use problems and the means for their solution. In the course of their studies, they had assembled and analyzed valuable data on land uses, productivity classes, values, and requirements. The findings were used in a map, "Natural Land UseAreas," byCarleton P: Barnes and Francis J. Marschner (11).

In 1932, the Bureau of Chemistry and Soils, at the suggestion of the National Conference on Land Utilization, undertook a nationwide classification of land according to its physical adaptability for various uses. This was the first productivity classification undertaken on a national scale (144, 145).

Each soil type, in counties for which soil surveys were available, was classified into 10 grades. These ranged from the best to the poorest, as judged by the adaptability of the soil in its natural condition, without improvement or serious impoverishment, to the kinds of crops grown in the area. For the main crops that could feasibly be grown on each soil type, the soil type was rated in comparison with the type physically best adapted to the given crop. The general rating for a particular land type was obtained by combining the ratings for individual crops according to relative acreage. Eventually, the areas in each productivity class were determined.

The poorer grades of land were found to comprise about 22 percent of the land in farms. They naturally contributed proportionately much less to the total production than a corresponding acreage of good land.

In addition to the information available from these earlier studies, a currentstatistical picture of the land in the different
land use problem areas was needed. In 1934, land planning specialists in each State, soils technicians, geographers, and economists, working with the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and the National Resources Board in cooperation with other State and Federal agencies, classified land in each of the 30,000 townships or corresponding minor civil divisions of the Nation according to land use problems and desirable adjustments.

In the classification, particular attention was paid to the adaptability of that part of the area employed for cultivation. Soil surveys were used for the classification when available; rating was on the basis of judgment for areas not covered by soil surveys. Data by minor civil divisions available from the 1930 census were then tabulated and the poorer areas identified with the help of local people informed on land quality and other characteristics. The procedure was rough, but provided a quick means of determining in a general way the extent and geographic location of the poor land used for agriculture, a basic need in planning a land use adjustment program. Soil survey maps and land classification have substantially improved since the 1930's.

A United States map (fig. 5) showing these land use problem area classifications was published in the National Resources Board Land Planning Committee Report of December 1934 (146).

Estimates made in this brief survey showed that there were probably 454,000 or more farms in the problem areas that were on land too poor to provide a living for their operators through crop farming. These farms covered about 75 millionacres, of which about 20 million acres were in cropland, 35 million in pasture and range, and 20 million in forest (table 1).

The total value of these very poor farms was estimated at about $\$ 682$ million in 1934. It was estimated that the total value of production on these farms in 1929 was $\$ 204$ million. A large proportion of this.45 percent- - was consumed on the farm, and 55 percent was sold. These percentages, compared with those for all farms, showed that the farms in the extremely poor farming areas produced fewercrops for sale than the farms of average and above-average quality in the country as a whole (146).

Areas where crop farming needed to be replaced by less intensive uses (grazing, forests, recreation, and wildlife protection) were widespread, but were found chiefly

TABLE l.--Number of farms classiffed as unsuitable for arable farming, and acreage of cropland; pasture, and other land

| Land use | Acreage unsuitable for arable farming | Percentage of U.S. total for specified items |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent |
| Farms. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 454,200 | 7.2 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { acres } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Cropland: |  | 4.9 |
| Harvested. | 16,590 | 4.0 |
| Not harvested or pastured. $\qquad$ | 3,573 | 0.9 |
| Total. | 20,163 | -- |
| Pasture (grassland)....... | 34,884 | 9.2 |
| Woodland and other land in farms. | 20,298 | 10.4 |
| Total area ${ }^{1}$. | 75,345 | 7.6 |

${ }^{1}$ More than $1 / 3$ of the total acreage was in the western Great Plains, more than $1 / 4$ in the South, about $1 / 8$ in the Northeast and the Lake States cutover region, and the remaining $1 / 4$ in other regions of the country.

Source: (146, 147.)
in the Great Plains, the Southeast, and the Great Lakes Regions. The physical and economic factors that led to unsuitable land use varied greatiy from place to place and in relative importance. The more important of these factors in the 1920's and 1930's were:
(1) Inadequate understanding of the character and productive capacity of the land;
(2) Stimulus of exceptional prices for certain products at times of high demand;
(3) Availability of low-priced land as a means of subsistence to those without resources, information, or inclination to live elsewhere:
(4) Shifts in comparative advantage through settlement of new and more productive areas, and through development of mechanized production; and
(5) Shifts in comparative advantage through damage of land by erosion.

## Transfer to Resettlement Administration

Thus, in 1934 and 1935, a new Federal land use adjustment program was planned,


Figure 5.--From National Resources Board, Supplementary Report of the Land Planning Committee, Vol. 1, Pt. 6, Sec. 1, p. 1.
involving the purchase of $20,552,000$ acres at an estimated cost of $\$ 104$ million. At this time, negotiations were in progress for acquisition of 9 million acres of land on 206 of the 250 projects that had been proposed.

Administrative responsibility for all projects was not yet fixed, however. Working under the Public Works Administration grants, the Land Policy Section of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, the National Park Service, the Bureau of Biological Survey, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs were responsible for selecting and planning the projects and optioning the land. The Federal Emergency Relief Administration managed financial and legal matters and had the responsibility for resettling families under its Division of Rural Rehabilitation. This separation of responsibilities, the fact that the Federal Emergency Relief Administration and the State Rural Rehabilitation Corporations were falling behind in providing assistance in relocation and employment of families whose land was purchased, and the withdrawal for drought relief of a substantial portion of the funds allotted to the program, brought on many difficulties early in 1935.

On May 1, 1935, a change came with the transfer of responsibility for the land utilization program, including the completion of the 206 land utilization projects already begun, to the Resettlement Administration, established by Executive Order, and transferred to the Department of Agriculture, in December 1936.

The Resettlement Administration was to complete the work begun by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and its cooperating agencies. For this purpose, it was given an initial allotment of some $\$ 48 \mathrm{mil}-$ lion, supplemented by $\$ 18$ million from Work Relief funds to employ labor for development. Within the agency, all land purchase and land use planning work was assumed by the Land Utilization Division.

Of the land utilization program, the Resettlement Administration reported (153):

The program of land use adjustment is the most extensive one yet undertaken by the Federal Government for the acquisition of lands now in private ownership. It is the only program motivated primartly by the aim of employing public land acquisition as a means of implementing a comprehensive program of land use planning in the interests of the general welfare. It includes the most comprehensive provision for wildlife conservation that has ever before been made by the Nation; and it will afford, for the first time, a well-planned system of recreational areas so
located and of such character that they may serve to a maximum degree the principal centers of population, particularly those classes of the urban population which are not in a position to travel far to enjoy opportunities for outdoor recreation. The program embodies an extensive process of reforestation, which will supplement materially the programs of the Federal Forest Service, and the States. It is checking or preventing erosion on millions of acres, and providing methods of land use which will conserve soll resources. The program is allowing many thousands of families to escape from locations where it is impossible to maintain a decent standard of living, and is bringing relief to many thousands of other families by providing employment in the development of the lands being acquired.

In December 1935, a separate Division of Rural Resettlement was set up in the Resettlement Administration to care for families whose land was purchased. In this connection, the Subsistence Homesteads Division of the Department of the Interior, whose program included the resettlement of families, was transferred to the Resettlement Administration.

## Resettlement Program

Resettlement of families wasa necessary corollary of and supplement to land purchase and retirement in order to hasten adjustments in land use and to improve the well-being of the displaced families. As L. C. Gray put it (53), "A marginal land program without an associated program of resettlement would be largely futile; a program for establishing new communities or holdings unrelated to a laxim planning and land adjustment program would be meaningless."

Most families occupying purchased land were obliged to resettle elsewhere. Because the land they owned was usually poor and the market value consequently low, and because mortgage debts and taxes due had to be paid before a sale could be consummated, the proceeds from sales were usually insufficient to enable the families to reestablish themselves satisfactorily without assistance. Without help, it was likely that they would purchase poor land, again drift into poverty, and repeat the cycle of ownership, debt, losses, failure, and public relief.

The selection of good land on which to resettle people was essential. Also, farms needed to be of sufficient size to provide adequate incomes. This phase of the land program was of vital importance.

# LAND UTILIZATION AND RESETTIEMENT PROJECTS 
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Figure 6

Projects Established and Land Acquired, 1934-37

In the 4 years ended June 30, 1937, land had been purchased or approved for purchase for 98 agricultural adjustment projects, 30 Indian land projects, 32 migratory waterfowl projects, and 46 recreational projects. Of the total of $9.149,000$ acres, purchase had been completed on 5,478,216 acres. Changes in project plans and problems of title clearance were partly responsible for the time required for completion of purchase. Figure 6 and table 2 show the location and types of the 206 land utiliza. tion projects and the resettlement projects. The figure and table illustrate the 2 major activities--acquisition of land and resettlement of rural families from submarginal land.

Many projects initiated during this phase of the program were best adapted to administration by agencies other than those

TABLE 2.--Land utilization projects planned and approved for acquisition, by type, June 30, 1937

| Type of project | ```Number or projects``` | Land to be purchased |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { acres } \end{aligned}$ |
| Agricultural adjustment | 98 | 6,806 |
| Recreational ${ }^{\text {b }}$. ${ }^{\text {a }}$...... | 46 | 402 |
| Mildiffe ${ }^{\text {a }}$... | 32 | 723 |
| Indian ${ }^{1}$ | 30 | 1,218 |
| Total. | 2206 | 29,149 |

[^11]responsible for setting them up. By September 1, 1937, approximately a million acres had been transferred to other agencies responsible for administering parks, wildife programs, and other resource uses.

The 98 agricultural adjustment projects that were started in 1934-37 may be divided into 4 land use groups. Although different from each other in many respects, the projects within these groups had in the 1930's, and still have, several common problems relating to use and occupancy of land:
(1) Eighteen of these projects, many of them small, werelocated in the northeastern States and southern portions of the Corn Belt in hilly areas of poor soil, gradual farm abandonment, stranded families, and burdensome public costs for maintenance of roads, schools, and other public services.
(2) Ten of the projects, generally of moderate size, were located in the isolated and thinly settled areas of the cutover regions of the Lake States. The poor soils and isolation contributed to low incomes, low standards of living, and inadequate public services, often at high costs, for the scattered rural residents.
(3) Thirty-five of the projects, generally small to moderate in size, but including a few large projects, were in the badly eroded, poor farmland, and cutover areas of the southern States from Virginia to Arkansas and Louisiana. Improper farm practices, cultivation of land of low productivity, land too steep or too dry for production of cultivated crops, small farms, and a fairly dense, low-income population dependent upon the land, made adjustments in use and conservation of land and relocation and rehabilitation of population difficult to achieve.
(4) Twenty-six moderate to large projects, formed before 1938, were in the Northern Plains and the Southwest, and 9 projects were in the Central Mountain and Pacific States. Insufficient rainfall, low production, and small private holdings--generally too small for either crops or live. stock farming and interspersed with public lands-owere common problems in these projects. A basic problem in many areas was the need to adjust the use of rangeland to its grazing capacity, and to provide for its restoration and conservation.

## CHANGE OF STATUS OF THE PROGRAM UNDER THE BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT

A more permanent status for the land utilization program was provided with the passage of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act in 1937. Under Title III, the Secretary of Agriculture was directed "'to develop a program of land conservation and land utilization, including the retirement of lands which are submarginal or not primarily suitable for cultivation in order thereby to correct maladjustments in land use. ${ }^{1 / 4}$

Land to be acquired was limited to poor land used in agriculture, except that intervening or adjoining land could be purchased in order to allow efficient conservation and use of the area as a whole. Arrangements had already been made for transfer of Indian, recreational, and wildlife projects to other agencies, and no more land was to be acquired for these purposes.

The projects authorized were defined in 3 major groups:

Agricultural Projects: Purchase and improvement of land which is submarginal in its present use as a means of developing an economically sound pattern of land use for a maximum number of families.

[^12]Isolated Settler Projects: Purchase of scattered farms on submarginal land to permit the effectuation of certain economies in public administration and adjustment to some better adapted use such as forestry, game conservation, grazing, recreation, or a combination of such uses.

Water Conservation Projects: Purchase of land and construction of water developments in areas where the conservation of water is essential to proper land use.

Under the broad powers of Title III, the reestablishment of a large-scale Federal acquisition program was possible. Section 34 provided that:

To carry out the provisions of this title, there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $\$ 10,000,000$ for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and not to exceed $\$ 20,000,000$ for each of the two fiscal years thereafter.

Actually, the funds appropriated did not equal the authorization and thus the program fell short of the original intent. Ten million dollars was made available for the first year, but in the following years the appropriation was cut to $\$ 5$ million.

Approximately 80 percent of the money available in the first year was allotted for land purchase in the Great Plains area for
projects planned and options taken during the 2 preceding years, and about 20 percent was allotted for blocking in existing projects in other parts of the country and completing projects already started, Nearly all new projects were similar to the agricultural adjustment projects established prior to fiscal year 1938.

In the year ending June 30,1938 , the acquisition of $2,464,673$ acres was completed by clearance of titles and payments for land. This brought the total actually bought and paid for since the beginning of the land utilization program to $7,942,889$ acres. In addition, plans were approved for acquisition of $2,192,742$ acres at an estimated cost of $\$ 8,111,540$-approximately $\$ 3.70$ an acre. By far the largest acreage planned for purchase was in the northern and southern plains.

## Assignment to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Secretary's Memorandum No. 733, of September 1, 1937, provided for the transfer of the land utilization program, as continued and revised by Title III of the BankheadJones Farm Tenant Act, from the Farm Security Administration ${ }^{5}$ to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics 'as rapidly as may be administratively feasible."

Since the Farm Security Administration had an existing organization for land purchase and development, it seemed desirable to allow the transfer of the program to take place gradually. Memoranda of understanding outlined the responsibilities of the 2 agencies in conduct of the program from September 1, 1937, to July 1, 1938, including administration and acquisition of land, and relocation of families on old projects and assistance to families on new projects established under Title III.

In this connection, the Bureau was assigned administrative responsibility for 131 projects involving an area of 8,142,666 acres. This included 25 projects scheduled for transfer as of June 30, 1938, to other agencies. By June 30, 1938, a total of 2,147,000 acres in recreational, wildlife,
${ }^{5}$ The Farm Security Administration was formed September 1, 1937, as successor to the Resettlement Administration, to administer Titles I and II and related sections of Title IV of the Act authorizing resettlement aid to farmers in submarginal areas, and farm loans for purchase of farms by tenant farmers.
and Indian grazing projects had beentransferred to cooperating Federal agencies for management in these special uses (table 3). Acquisition of some of this land had not been completed, but commitments had been made for its purchase. A few of the agricultural adjustment projects were consolidated and some transferred to other agencies, reducing the number from 145 (table 3), to 128 (fig. 7).

## Transfer to Soil Conservation Service

In October 1938, submarginal land ac. quisition, development, and management functions provided for under Title III were transferred by the Secretary of Agriculture to the Soil Conservation Service, to be administered as a part of its program for conservation and improved use of agricultural land. 6 Land use adjustment projects that in 1937 had been placed under the administration of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics were also assigned to the Soil Conservation Service.

Land that had been acquired in cooperation with other Federal agencies--Bureau of Indian Affairs, National Park Service, and Bureau of Biological Survey (now the Fish and Wildlife Service)--was virtually all transferred to theseagencies by October 1938. Transfers of a number of projects to other Federal and State agencies had already been made by this date. This left the Soil Conservation Service responsible for administration of some 7.1 million acres of land in 105 projects, developed mainly as agricultural land use adjustment projects.

Approved project plans for acquisition of about 2.2 million acres, chiefly in the Great Plains States under the new authority of Title III, also were transferred. A considerable number of options on land had already been taken. Part of this land was for enlargement of projects started before 1937. Consolidation of projects in the interest of more efficient management later reduced the number of projects in the inventory of 1938.

## Land Acquired Under Title III of the Act

In the eastern, southern, and midwestern regions, the land acquisition program under Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant

[^13]TABLE 3.--Status of land utilization projects planned and approved for acquisition, June 30, 1938

| Iters | Reassigned or to be reassigned to other agencies |  | Remaining under progran agency for administration |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Projects | Acreage | Projects | Acreage | Projects | Acreage |
| Projects Established as of June 30, 1937, under Emergency Acts of 1933-35: | Number | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { acres } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Number | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { acres } \end{aligned}$ | Number | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { acres } \end{aligned}$ |
| Agricultural adjustment | 0 | 0 | 98 | 6,807 | 98 | 6,807 |
| Indian land. | 23 | 934 | 7 | 284 | 30 | 1,218 |
| Recreational | 46 | 401 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 401 |
| Yildife | 32 | 723 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 723 |
| Total. | 201 | 2,058 | 1105 | 7,091 | 206 | 9,149 |
| Projects Established as of June 30, 1938, under Title III: ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agricultural and other.. | 6 | 89 | 41 | 2,104 | 347 | 2,193 |
| Grand total. | 107 | 2,147 | 146 | 9,195 | 253 | 11,342 |

[^14]Act was directed to a large extent toward completing projects established before the passage of the Act. However, in the West, chiefly in the Great Plains, several large new projects were started as well as large additions being made to old projects.

The practice in the east, south, and midwest was to have more and smaller projects; farther west there was a tendency to concentrate on acquiring larger areas and enlarging established projects. One reason for this was that submarginal lands were acquired in the west mainly for conservation purposes, including the restoration to grassland of cropland unsuited to cultivation. In other areas, the acquisition program was directed more toward the establishment of demonstrational and other multiple-use areas.

Through February 1943, 2,439,511 acres were acquired under the new authorization in Title III. In all, about 2.6 million acres, or about 22 percent of the total land utilization project acreage, were acquired under this authority. In addition, title clearance was completed under the Soil Conservation Service for about a million acres
for which commitments were made under the original program after the transfer in 1938. Acquisition had ceased by 1943, except for small areas in process of acquisition for blocking in existing areas.

Ownership and occupancy data on tracts purchased under Titie III show the following breakdown of ownership at time of purchase:

Percent
Individuals . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 76.1
Estates, trustees, or guardians. . . . . . . . . . 10.0
Commercial banks . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1.5
Federal and joint stock land banks. . . . . . . . 4.1
Insurance companies. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 0.9
Other corporations . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 3.7
County and State Governments . . . . . . . . . 3.7
The percentage of tracts occupied by owners was 14.5, and ranged from 6.7 percent in the Southern Plains Region to 35.2 percent in the Northeastern Region. Tenants occupied 13.8 percent of all tracts, and showed the greatest percentage in the Southeastern and South Central Regions,
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and the smallest in the Mountain and Pacific Regions. Squatters occupied only 0.7 percent of all tracts ( 170 ).

Owners of 30 percent of the purchased tracts resided outside the State in which
the land was located. Out-of-State ownership was relatively low in the 3 eastern regions, and relatively high in the northern plains and the southwest.

## LAND UTILIZATION RESEARCH

## Background Studies

Many of the basic ideas of the land utilization program grew out of research work in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the Forest Service, the Bureau of Chemistry and Soils, and a number of State agricultural experiment stations and universities.

## Cropland Requirements

Research in the 1920's and 1930's to furnish estimates of current and prospective
cropland acreages and to determine the relation to acreage requirements of such factors as population trends and changes in production techniques, consumption, and foreign trade was done by O. E. Baker (9, 10). Similar work was done by the Forest Service in estimating prospective requirements for forest products.

The average acreage requirements for harvested crops used for domestic consumption and export in 1930-32, including maintenance of draft animals, were estimated to be only about 15 million acres
less than the average of 352 million required in 1925-29, a period of general prosperity; most of this difference was due to reduced exports. Measured in terms of the amount of reduction necessary to absorb accumulated carryovers quickly, and to restore a price parity in the early 1930's, cropland harvested in 1930-32 was estimated to greatly exceed normal requirements, possibly by as much as 50 to 60 million acres. In 1932, 361 million acres of cropland were harvested. In 1933, largely as a result of crop-acreage-control programs, the acreage of crops had dropped 30 million, to 331 million acres.

For use in planning land purchase and crop-acreage-control programs, the Land Planning Committee of the National Resources Board projected acreage needs of crops harvested in the future for domestic consumption and exports as follows (146):
Year Million acres

| 1940. . . . . . . . . . . | 351 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1950. . . . . . . . | 372 |
| 1960. . . . . . . . . | 380 |

State and Local Land Use Surveys
Another type of research consisted of intensive qualitative local surveys to analyze and appraise problems associated with poor-quality farmland. Examples are the economic studies in regional, State, and local areas made by the Division of Land Economics, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, in cooperation with various States. Among the important early studies were those by John D. Black, University of Minnesota; George S. Wehrwein, University of Wisconsin; Gladwin T. Young, Purdue University; and David Weeks, University of California.

There were also the early studies of land utilization and settlement by the Division of Land Economics, Bureau of Agricultural Economics. These studies had an important part in laying the foundation for improved land use by some 30 or more State, regional, and local land utilization, settlement, and land acquisition projects from 1919 to 1939. More men were influential and helpful in the development of the program than can be named in a limited space.

The problems created by land sales and development of poorly adapted cutover farms received early attentionin Minnesota
and other Lake States (15, 66). In Wisconsin there was the rural zoning program which was a forerunner of land classification, and a necessary foundation for the land utilization program. This work helped initiate needed action.

## Studies of Land Classification and Values

In addition to the growing recognition of the existence of subrnarginal land and rural slums, there were 2 significant attacks on the problem of land values. One was a study of sales prices as a basis for farmland appraisal undertaken in 1922 (60). The other was a study of the relation of income to land value (21). These 2 studies were useful in understanding land valuation, productivity, and related economic questions in the 1920's and 1930's. Significant work in land classification, types of farming, and land utilization analysis was done in the Northern Great Plains Region by M. L. Wilson and associates, Montana State Agricultural College (171).

Many settlers in the western Great Plains lacked the background and experience to judge the adaptability of land for crop farming or to follow the dryfarming practices that would work most efficiently in the semiarid regions. In a 1923 study of land use and settlement on 550 farms of the Triangle area, north-central Montana (171), persons classified as farmers on 58 farm homesteads in a typical township listed some unusual former occupations. There were 2 deep sea diyers, 6 musicians, 2 butchers, 2 milliners, 2 draymen, 2 wrestlers, 2 blacksmiths, 2 schoolteachers, 2 physicians, and 1 bartender.

An outstanding study of 6 communities in selected counties of different regions was made in 1940 and 1941. Results were published as separate bulletins in 1942 and 1943 under the general titles of "Contemporary Culture of Rural Communities." The study included counties representative of the lower Piedmont of Georgia and western Kansas, both of which had developed great agricultural instability (12, 169). Land utilization projects were later established in each of these areas.

## Research as a Part of Project Planning and Development

The project formation phase of the land utilization program was carriedout with the
help of continuing studies of specific land use problems and the means for their solution. Research in land utilizationduring this period became less academic and of greater practical use and importance. This changed emphasis brought the researchers face to face with both opportunities and perils, as is apparent from a review of the many publications on land classification, economic area analysis, rural development, and land use planning that resulted (51, 118).

In all, some 500 or more such studies were made in the period 1933-42. Many land classification and other economic studies made by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the Resettlement Administration, and other Federal and State agencies served as a basis for developing detailed plans and proposals for projects. An example is the land use survey conducted by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the Bureau of Chemistry and Soils, and the Forest Service in cooperation with the Georgia Agricultural Experiment Station in 1932-34 (67). Data and maps assembled in this survey were basic to the selection and planning of 6 land utilization projects in Georgia in the years 1934-38--Piedmont, Northeast Georgia, Coastal Flatwoods, Lakeland Flatwoods, North Central Georgia, Limestone Valleys, and Uplands. In addition, data from this survey were used in the planning and development of 4 recreational and park.projects in Georgia.

Land classifications and forest maps were made on the basis of field work for 4 counties in Georgia (Jasper, Jones, Madison, and Putnam), and for sample blocks and strips in other counties. Methods developed were used in the extension of such whirk to other areas. Soil-survey maps and air photographs were available for part of the 4-county area, and were used as a base for recording field observations.

The procedures developed by Glen L. Fuller, W. T. Fullilove, A. H. Hasty, and other associates of the Bureau of Chemistry and Soils and the Georgia Experiment

Station, 1932-34, in classifying and mapping land use, soils, slope, erosion, and other physical and economic factors marked one of the beginning stages in land capability classification. The forest land inventories made in 1932-34 by A. R. Spillers, W. E. Bond, and others of the Forest Service under the leadership of I. F. Eldridge likewise aided in the refinement of timber resources surveys, then in the initial stages in the southern States.

Other examples of research basic to the program were the studies of the Lake States cutover region, in cooperation with the universities and agricultural experiment stations of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin; and various investigations in Indiana, Missouri, the Great Plains (including Montana), California, and other western States. Among the projects resulting from prior research were those in New York, New England, Georgia, Minnesota, Michigan, Wisconsin, Indiana, South Dakota, Kansas, Montana, and New York. This list is only partial, because complete records of project planning and selection for all States are not a vailable.

A few States had started buying poor, unused, and abandoned farmland and converting it to forest, recreation, wildlife, and conservation uses. Other States had projects for setting aside State-owned land for parks, wildife refuges, and forests. Among these States were New York, Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, California, Michigan, and Wisconsin.

The emphasis in the program on improving the general pattern of land use and of life in rural areas required determination of where and how the pattern might be improved. Here again, preliminary research was required for the better orientation of later, more intensive land use adjustment work. Land use surveys, made with the cooperation of local committees and officials, aided in the selection of suitable land areas for land purchase projects and in plans for development and use.

## EXTENT AND COST OF LAND ACQUISITION AND PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

## Land Acquisition

Acreage acquired under the land utilization program from 1933 to 1946 totaled 11,299,000 acres (table 4). This included over 37,000 individual properties.

Slightly over 2.6 million acres were acquired directly under Title III of the Bank-head-Jones Farm Tenant Act at a cost of $\$ 11.1$ million, and nearly 8.7 million acres under preceding authority at a cost of about $\$ 36.4$ million (table 5). Total cost, exclusive

TABLE 4.--Number of acres and percentages of land acquired, fiscal years ? $935-46$

| Fiscal year ${ }^{1}$ | Amount ${ }^{2}$ | Percentage of total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1,000 acres | Percent |
| 1935.. | 368 | 3.2 |
| 1936. | 1,374 | 12.2 |
| 1937. . . . . . | 3,736 | 33.1 |
| 1938. | 2,465 | 21.8 |
| 1939....... | 652 | 5.8 |
| 1940. | 1,467 | 13.0 |
| 1941 | 822 | 7.3 |
| 1942. | 267 | 2.4 |
| 1943. | 127 | 1.1 |
| 1944. . . . . . . | 15 | 0.1 |
| 1945. | 5 | (4) |
| 1946. | 1 | (4) |
| Total.. | ${ }^{3} 11,299$ | 100.0 |

[^15]Sources: Annual Reports of the Chief, Soil Conservation Service, 1935-46.
of public domain and of appraising, negotiating, and title clearance, was $\$ 47.5$ million, or an average of about $\$ 4.40$ per acre for the land purchased.

Land value accounted for over threefourths of the cost and, as was to be expected, was the largest single cost item in each region of the country. Value of improvements accounted for less than onefifth of the cost, and merchantable timber and minerals for the remainder, or about 5 percent. Average cost per acre washighest in the Upper Mississippi Valley and lowest in the Pacific Northwest.

The total acreage included about 480,000 acres of public domain land, which was transferred to projects for the purpose of blocking in their areas. These transfers were not included in calculating the average cost per acrefor the total area acquired.

Between 1943 and 1946, 148,000 acres were acquired. This land had been optioned before 1943, but final acquisition was delayed by title clearance problems andother factors.

The policy of acquiring land by voluitary sale was continued throughout the program. Friendly condemnations and court actions were required to clear only a limited number of land titles, and were not used as a means of forcing owners to sell.

## Project Development

Land improvement and development included general land treatment, structural improvements, provision of transportation facilities, control of erosion, flood control, waterstorage, and development for forestry, recreation, and wildife. Buildings and fences were removed; old roads no longer needed were blocked up; new roads were built where needed; suitable areas were seeded to grass or planted in trees; forest stands were improved and protected from fire; gullies were stopped; terraces, stock ponds, and dams were built; and stream channels were widened and cleaned. (See appendix C.) All of this work required much labor and equipment.

Virtually all of the development work was accomplished with labor from the vicinity of each project; a large number of workers were furnished by the Works Progress Administration. Many of the workers had to be trained as they worked. As these men acquired skills, many were able to find private employment (130, 153, 156). Employment was provided in the first few years for 50,000 or more workers on relief, and for 13,000 men whose farms had been purchased. By June 1939, $\$ 67$ million had been spent from relief allotments for land improvement and development, plus about $\$ 5$ million from public works funds.

Additional development costs, up to the time of transfer of all remaining projects to regular Federal and State public land management agencies in 1954, are estimated to have been approximately $\$ 30$ million, making a total development cost of $\$ 102.5$ million. With the purchase cost of $\$ 47.5$ million, this brought the total cost to $\$ 150$ million, or about $\$ 13.50$ per acre.

Field, regional, and Washington staffs were employed to carry on all phases of the program, and considerable sums were paid for office rental, transportation and travel, equipment, supplies, salaries, and other items. These administrative costs of the agencies guiding the program could not be allocated among the various activities.

TABLE 5.-Acreages and cost of land acquired under the land utilization program, 1335-46

| Type of program | Number of cases or tracts | Acreage acquired | Total cost of land purchased |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | 1,000 acres | 1,000 dollars |
| Original or emergency program 1935-37 | 27,199 | 8,676 | 36,382 |
| New or Title III program 1938-46. | 10,147 | 2,623 | 11,075 |
| Total 1935-46. | 37,346 | 111,299 | 247,457 |

${ }^{1}$ Final reports on land acquisition under the land utilization programs in 1946 show that the total acreage acquired was $11,298,537$ acres.

2 The average cost per acre for the total acreage acquired to 1946, excluding 480,000 acres of public-domain land transferred to land utilization projects, was about $\$ 4.40$ per acre.

Sources: (156) and mimeographed reports of the Soil Conservation Service as follows:
Status of Title Clearance Under the 'Old" Land Utilization Program, Dec. 31, 1942.
Soil Conservation Service, Jan. 15, 1943. (Mimeographed.)
Status of Title Clearance Under Title III Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, Feb. 28, 1943. Land Acq. Div., Soil Conservation Service, Mar. 4, 1943; and Reports of June 30, and Oct. 23, 1943. (Mimeographed.)

An Analysis of the Land Acquisition Program Under Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. Soil Conservation Service M. P. 26, Aug. 1942 (172); and Type, Use, Previous Ownership and Tenure Status of Land Acquired Under Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, Apr. 1942. (Mimeographed.)

The portion allocable to the land utilization program could not be precisely determined, and is not all included in the totals given here.

Costs of land development and of shifts in use of land may be considered to be limited to a few items, or may encompass many direct and indirect outlays in addition to the actual development of the land, depending upon the purpose for which costs are determined. Expenditures incident to retiring and developing submarginal land, relocating families, administration, supervision, and maintenance are costs not formally accounted for.

## Location of Projects

The largest acreages of submarginal lands acquired were in the Northern Plains, Southwest, and Southern Regions (table 6). These regions contained the largest areas of poor or submarginal cropland. Fifty percent of the acreage acquired was in the Northern Plains. The Southern Region ranked next with almost 20 percent, and the Southwest with about 15 percent. Average acreage per tract in the Southwest
table 6.--Location of land acquired, by general geographic regions, 1934-46

| Region ${ }^{2}$ | Acreage | Percentage of total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1,000 acres | Percent |
| Northern. | 986 | 8.7 |
| Southern | 2,187 | 19.4 |
| Southrest | 1,681 | 14.9 |
| Northern Plains ${ }^{2}$. | 5,620 | 49.7 |
| Central Mountain. | 212 | 2.9 |
| Pacific... | 613 | 5.4 |
| Total. | 11,299 | 100.0 |

${ }^{2}$ Northern Region: Northeastern, Corn Belt, and Lake States.
Southem Region: Appalachian, Southeastern, and Delta States.
Southwest and Southern Plains: Arizons, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas.
Northern Plains: North and South Dakota, Nebrasks, Kansas, Montans, Wyoming, and Colorado.
Central Mountain Region: Idaho, Nevada, and Utah.
Pacific Region: Callformia, Oregon, and Washington.
${ }^{2}$ Most of the land acquired in the Northern Plains was east of the Rocky Hountains in the dryland plains portions of Colorado, Kanses, Montana, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, and Wyoming.

Note: Tables in Appendix a group acreages by the 10 farm production regions instead of the 6 geographic regions. By using the State acreages in the appendix tables; totals for the geographic regions may be readily assembled.
was over 650 acres, more than double the average for the entire country. Two large tracts in New Mexico (originally Spanish land grants), one containing 86,205 and the other 49,940 acres, contributed substantially to the large average size per tract in the Southwest. Average acreage per tract in the Northern Region was less than half the 300 -acre average for all regions.

## Use of Project Land

Agricultural land use adjustment projects made up roughly 9.5 million acres of the 11.3 million acres acquired by the Federal Government under the land utilization program. The remaining 1.8 million acres were used for wildlife areas, parks. recreational areas, and Indian land projects (161). It is estimated that at the time of purchase 2.5 million acres of this land were in cropland, 6.1 million acres in
pasture and rangeland, and 2.7 million acres in forest land. Much of the cropland was idle, or practically so, especially in the Southeastern States.

At the beginning of World War II, several large areas were transferred to defense agencies for military training and other related purposes. Most of this land was later returned to the management of the civilian agencies.

The primary uses of the project land in 1961 are estimated to have been: Grazing (including Indian range), 7 million acres; forest, 2.5 million acres; and special uses, such as parks and wildlife areas, 1.8 mil lion acres. Many recreational and wildlife areas are forested, but are in a reserved status and not used for commercial timber production. The large areas used primarily for grazing and commercial forests have many improved recreational sites set aside within them. Wild game preserves are used extensively for seasonal hunting, fishing, and other uses.

## RELOCATION OF FAMILIES RESIDING ON LANDS ACQUIRED7

Of the 24,148 families initially residing on land purchased for the land utilization program, 87 percent were relocated by January 1, 1942 (138). Three-fourths of these families relocated without Governmentassistance. A more striking fact is that only 9 percent of those relocated were resettled on the farms
or resettlement homesteads created for this purpose. The otherfamilies received helpin the form of loans, relief grants, and advisory service in getting reestablished on land more suitable for farming than that from which they moved. The situation is summarized in the following tabulation:

Old program, prior to Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act: ${ }^{1}$
Total number initially residing on projects . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 15,634
Total number relocated. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 13,719
By own efforts . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 10,497
By resettlement on farms or
resettlement homesteads . . . . . . . . . . . 1,237
With loan or rehabilitation grant only. . . . . 993
Other aid and guidance . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 992
To remain. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
Life leases . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 134
Permanent maintenance personnel. . . . . . . 230
Substrute occupancy privileges. . . . . . . . . 33
Other . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 200
To be relocated . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1,318
By own efforts . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 372
By resettlement on farms or resettlement
homesteads . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 32
With rehabilitation loan or grant only. . . . . 73
By transfer to other agencies . . . . . . . . . . 29
--Continued

[^16]With guidance or other ald ..... 74
Ald not yet determined ..... 738
New program, after Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act:
Total number of familles initially residing on 151 projects ..... 8,514
Total number relocated ..... 7.296
By own efforts. ..... 5,608
By resettlement on farms or resettlementhomesteads574
With rehabilitation loan or grant only ..... 585
By transfer to other agencles ..... 261
With Farm Security Administration guidance only ..... 189
With other ald ..... 79
Number to remain ..... 275
With life leases ..... 36
As permanent maintenance personnel ..... 171
With substrute occupancy privilege ..... 11
Other ..... 57
To be relocated ..... 943
${ }^{1}$ Data from mimeographed annual reports no longer readily avallable in libraries and files.

Compensation and assistance for persons affected by real property acquisition has remained a continuous problem in agricultural and other programs. The 88th Congress, 2nd Session, made a new study of this problem in 1964, the results of which are summarized in Committee Print No. 31, House of Representatives Committee on Public Works.

## Relocation Under the Resettlement Administration

Many factors were responsible for the small proportion of families who moved to government-sponsored resettlement farms or homesteads. A number of families from submarginal land purchase areas used their payments from the sale of land to buy farms or homes elsewhere, and required no Government assistance in relocating. Some others, in areas wherealternatives to farming were available, as in the New England and Middle Atlantic States, found jobs in urban areas. And throughout the country, some elderly people retired from farming altogether when bought out, and went to live in town or with relatives elsewhere.

But Federal land purchase was a slow process, with final closing of the sale and payment frequently long delayed. Many of the displaced families were not assisted because of delay in completing the resettlement farm projects, and because of strict rules for selection of families.

In Wisconsin, for example, eligibility for a full-time commercial farm in a resettlement project was limited to normal families
(husband, wife, and children), of which the head was over 21 and under 50 years of age, with farming experience. The family had to give evidence of resourcefulness and ability to enter into community life, and give reasonable assurance of meeting the costs of resettlement. Of the 147 families in the central Wisconsin purchase area, only 58 met the conditions. Farmers eligible for part-time subsistence farms were required to have the same general qualifications as those for full-time farms except that the head could be as old as 55. Eighteen families met these qualifications. Aged people unable to provide for themselves, and old-age and public relief cases permanently in need of aid were eligible for retirement homesteads. Nine families qualified. This left 85 families who were not qualified to remain in the project area. Many that could otherwise meet all requirements for full-time farms or subsistence homesteads had family heads above the age limit of 50 years. Others who needed retirement homesteads were not eligible $(68,69)$.

Similar situations in other parts of the Lake States, especially in the isolated settlements of the cutover areas (94, 99), in the South, and in the Great Plains suggest that resettlement qualifications may have been too high. While resettlement projects at the outset were planned to assist families moving from submarginal land, objectives of the program became much broader as time went on. The large numbers of eligible applicants competing for relatively few resettlement units led
project managements to be selective, perhaps to the detriment of former occupants of submarginal land.

Many resettlement projects in the Appalachian States were established primarily to care for special groups strandedin rural areas by the closing of depleted mine and forest industries. However, large areas of land purchased under the land utilization program had not been used primarily for farming, and their purchase for forest and recreational purposes displaced relatively few farmers. Also, many of those who were displaced had been squatters during the depression years, and thus were not eligible for resettlement farms. Others could not qualify because of age or physical condition.

Although the greatest acreage of submarginal land acquired was in the Plains States. only 15 percent of all families whose land was bought resided there. Of these families, only 5 percent were relocated on resettlement farms. Some 73 percent relocated by their own efforts, and the rest received some Government assistance. As the land utilization program did not get underway in the Plains until 1934, after drought and dust had already disrupted much of the region's economy, it is likely that many of thoserelocating by their own efforts moved out of the Plains area entirely. Consideration was given to the establishment of subsistence homestead communities in the Mississippi Delta specifically for victims of the Dust Bowl. Large acreages of Delta land were purchased for resettlement purposes, but the resettlement of Great Plains farmers was not attempted on this land, although a few did move to the Delta area.

In other instances, farm operators who had lived for years in the same neighborhood did not wish to break their old associations and move to new communities, or to take up a different type of farming. Some of these farmers made arrangements to remain near their former farms, occasionally becoming workers on land use projects, or moving to nearby towns.

Approximately 30 percent of the 58 families bought out in California, Arizona, and Utah were moved to resettlement farms or homesteads. Alternative opportunities were apparently available for those not assisted by the Federal Government.

It was in the 3 Lake States that the greatest proportion of families resettled on Federal projects afterselling theirsubmarginal land to the Government. This is explained partly by the fact that rural zoning programs were already in operation in these States. Reloca-
tion of farmers whose land had been zoned as unsuitable for farming had been going forward before initiation of the Federal land program. The submarginal and resettlement programs thus were desirable supplements to the State programs for blocking in publicly owned areas, and helping scatteredsettlers to relocate.

It should be stressed that a large proportion of the families on the lands being bought for land utilization projects had wholly inadequate incomes. The average gross cash income of these families in 1934 was only about $\$ 300$, including an average of $\$ 72$ obtained from relief and other outside payments. Forty-seven percent of the families were on relief. The land utilization program was essentially a humanitarian program, since one of its aims was to help families to make transition from a hopelessly unfavorable environment to one offering promise of a more adequate livelihood.

## Relocation Under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act

In 1937, the farm tenant purchase program was established under the Farm Security Administration to handle settlement and farm tenant purchase programs authorized by the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. This was a type of resettlement program, providing individual tenant farmers and farmers displaced by Government land acquisition programs with supervised credit for buying and developing farms. Rural resettlement and subsistence homestead projects already begun were also assigned to the Farm Security Administration for completion and management. For several years, especially from 1937 to 1941, assistance was given to families from submarginal land projects who were seeking to relocate on farms.

Since usually a year or more elapsedbetween Government purchase of submarginal land and the relocation of families, the number of families relocated by January 1942, as shown in the tabulation on pp. 20-21, indicates satisfactory progress. However, nearly all data describe resettlement projects according to function, such as rural resettlement, stranded group, etc. It is difficult to pick out the data applying only to those people who came from submarginal land, especially in the earlier years (134, 138, 142).

The Farm Security Administration provided advice and such financial assistance as budget and eligibility restriction allowed to families displaced by the purchase program
carried out by the Soil Conservation Service under Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

In the Northern Plains, the Farm Security Administration provided a full-time, experienced specialist to assist families in finding suitable new locations. In Greene County, Ga., the Farm Security Administration and the Soil Conservation Service cooperated in working out an adjustment in the pattern of land use and occupancy. The Farm Security Administration purchased land in the project area that was suitable for continued farming, and the Soil Conservation Service purchased the land that was unsuitable for cultivation. Adjustment was accomplished
with the displacement of a minimum number of families from the project area ( 30,156 ). In this project and other projects in Georgia, a number of families whose land was bought were permitted to retain title or lifetime rights to the improvements, such as build. ings and fences, and a small amount of land for subsistence purposes, thereby eliminating their need for relocation.

A study made by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics indicated that families displaced by this phase of the land purchase program in the Southeast were as well or better off then before (134). A survey in the Northeast led to similar conclusions (42).

## RELATION OF LAND UTILIZATION PROGRAM TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

As a result of the purchase of land and the resettlement in other areas of many of the people living on the purchased land, many institutional adjustments were required. The easiest of these adjustments to identify were those in local government financing. Information on that phase is available from records, reports, and publications.

In areas where road and school services were costly because of sparse rural popula. tion, and where during the thirties the property tax was diminishing because of tax delinquency and reversion to public ownership, Federal acquisition of land took away still more of the taxbase. Offsetting factors were the scaling down of total costs of public services in purchase areas and improved incomes of persons remaining in the area.

In addition to these measurable and wellrecognized influences of submarginal land purchase and the attendant resettlement, there were many intangible values involved. Long-established relationships of families to particular tracts of land were altered and entire communities were sometimes dis rupted. While most of these changes were voluntary and clearly had beneficial effects, there was considerable personal loss and social cost in the uprooting of families and their movement to new and often unfamiliar places where different historical backgrounds prevailed, and where the social patterns were sometimes difficult to become used to. New methods of farming sometimes had to be learned, both by those who moved and those who remained. These disadvantages must be weighed against the advantages in appraising the program, and while the advantages in most instances
were clearly greater, the reality of the disadvantages, though often intangible and therefore difficult to measure, should not be ignored. It should be remembered that most of the problems of this period could betraced to the depletion of land resources. This fact made changes inevitable. The role of the Government in the land utilization program was to make these changes orderly and as productive as possible, causing the least disadvantage to individuals who had to move from their land and homes.

## Examples of the Impact of Land Purchase on Local Farming and Government

Some of the social changes brought about by the land utilization program are illustrated by the land use shifts which took place in the Great Plains States, where drought and dust storms in the 1930's had aggravated longstanding land use practices and where the greatestacreage was acquired under the Federal land program. In western North and South Dakota, the Federal purchase of several hundred thousand acres of land resulted in the retirement to grass of cash-crop land that was no longer suitable for cultivation, and in a general shift from cash-crop farming to a combination of livestock and feed-crop farming. The Government-purchased land was made available to ranchers through cooperative grazing associations, making it possible for the operators remaining in the area to enlarge their units to a point where more adequate levels of living could be maintained.

An idea of the magnitude of the land shifts involved and of the social adjustments required can be obtained from research work of Hansen, Haggerty, and Voelker in Billings County, N. Dak., in 1939 (63). The Commissioners from this County proposed that the Federal Government purchase certain county-owned land and tax delinquent land in order to block in areas already in Fed. eral ownership. The need for development of areas of sufficient size for effective grazing and livestock operations was apparent from the facts that the population of the County had declined 20 percent since 1930, and that taxable values had declined 66 percent since 1930. Tax delinquency had also grown, until in 1939 it was nearly 50 percent of the total levy.

At the time the above-mentioned research was undertaken, the Federal Government already had under option nearly 150,000 acres of land, and although the taxing units would collect delinquent taxes at the time of completion of purchase, permanent withdrawal of this land from the tax rolls made it desirable that local governments be reorganized to meet the conditions which would follow.

As a result of the research into land use adjustments and resulting county fiscal problems, it was recommended that the Federal Government purchase 65,000 additional acres to round out the Billings County adjustment area and to make possible adjustments in size and use of operating units, and that the County lease such tax-delinquent land as was not acquired by Federal purchase on long-term leases, thereby assuring a flow of revenue to meet local government needs. Following these recommendations, additional land was purchased and steps taken for improved management and leasing of Billings County, N. Dak., land.

In the case of the Milk River Project in Valley, Phillips, and Blaine Counties, Mont., some 953,000 acres of low-grade farmland and grassland were purchased and 672 isolated residents resettled on 3 irrigation projects within the purchase areas. Alterations of this magnitude naturally led to many local problems which required collective action (62). In Phillips County, the purchase of 301,500 acres led to a loss of taxable value of $\$ 375,628$, or 7.5 percent of the county tax base. The importance of this loss is emphasized by the fact that the reduction in the taxable value of 14 school districts ranged from 10 to 50 percent. While the problems growing out of Government purchase cannot be minimized. this Countyhad
long had severe financial problems. The average taxes annually collected in the County from 1926 to 1934 on lands purchased amount to but $\$ 24,500$. Appraximately 30 percent of each annual levy after 1929 became delinquent. Upon Federal purchase, a total of $\$ 95,000$ in delinquent taxes was paid.

Population changes after purchase affected many school districts, decreasing costs in some, and increasing the burden in others. Consolidation of all districts in Phillips County into a county unit system was recommended, in order to equalize school burdens and facilitate improvement of schools. Closing of some schools threw an additional burden on those left open, but by closing 8 schools in 7 districts, it was estimated that annual school costs would be reduced by approximately $\$ 5,000$.

Approximately 849,000 acres of public domain land were included in grazing districts in the Milk River Project Area, in addition to the land purchased. In 1939, it was estimated that the total grazing land in the project would yield about $\$ 33,000$ (at $\$ 0.20$ per forage acrel, compared with annual tax returns on purchased land of $\$ 24,500$.

Experience in the Morton County land use adjustment area in southwesternKansas was similar. There the Government purchased 107,000 acres of farmland for return to grazing, its original use. The purchased area represented 20 percent of the total taxable land of the county, and 9 percent of the taxable valuation of $\$ 4,653,000$. Valuation of land purchased was $\$ 415,000$. Of the 5 townships involved, 4 had their tax bases reduced by 2 to 14 percent. Forty percent of the acreage purchased lay in Jones township where purchases amounted to 65 percent of the taxable acreage, and 50 percent of the tax base. Revenue losses in 1936 to local governments as a result of purchase were estimated at about $\$ 7,000$. But these losses were more than offset by reduction in cost of public services ( 160 ).

The annual sums received, even after the years of development, were regarded by many local governments as inadequate. One suggested plan for adjusting the matter on a uniform basis to the satisfaction of local units was a flat-rate annual contribution of 0.5 to 1 percent on the acquisition price of the land as a minimum guarantee (121, 122).

A study of the adequacy of payments on purchased lands to local units of government was made by the Federal Real Estate

Board in 1940. Efforts were made to estimate more accurately the effects of land purchase on the ability of local governments to supply needed services and to pay off indebtedness.

Purchase of land did not always bring reductions in costs of county government. Projects were not coterminous with county boundaries, areas were not completely blocked in, and someresidents wereallowed to remain in project areas. Only a few attempts were made to reorganize local governmental districts to take advantage of possible savings. In the case of certain grazing projects, the fewremaining resident operators in the area continued to cause high per capita public costs.

The record of high tax delinquency on land purchased may be accounted for in part by the fact that serious depression and drought had reduced incomes in many areas before the program was started. Thus, some underestimation as to tax revenue over a more normal period of years may have been made in justifying the program. The requests for more adequate reimbursement $?$ tax loss in the years of recovery were significant.

As a result of land purchase there was an extensive consolidation of school districts. The number decreased approximately 50 percent in certain instances. The number of schools in operation in the Great Plains decreased throughout areas where land was purchased, although not as rapidly as school enrollment decreased. Many miles of roads were officially closed, and maintenance was discontinued on many more.

Experience from 1935 to 1940 showed that adjustments involving local government and finance were needed to accompany changes in land use or occupancy. Field studies during 1940 showed that while
some adjustments had been made in local government to reflect changes resulting from the land utilization program, more were needed. Studies made it possible to outline these needed adjustments, to appraise the effects of the program on local government units and services, and to provide a basis for discussion with county officials of further steps that would be desirable. Needed adjustments, however, were matters of State and local action; they were outside the scope of Federal authority.

## Federal Payments to Local Governments

Section 33 of Titie III of the BankheadJones Farm Tenant Act provided that, for all land that the Federal Government purchased for public purposes under this program, it must pay annually to the county in which the land was located 25 percent of the revenues received for its use for support of roads and schools.

Since much of the farmland purchased under this program was submarginal, revenues were small in the first few years after purchase, while the land was being developed for other uses. Recreation areas in the l930's rarely returned significant cash profits. Income from many poorly stocked forest areas did not start accruing for some years after improvement had placed them on a sustained-yield basis. Land in grazing projects was more readily prepared for leasing, and regular returns were obtained fairly soon. Moreover, when land was developed for grazing purposes, not only was there some revenue available for sharing with local governments, but also the taxable value of ranchers'property in the area usually increased.

## MANAGEMENT AND USE OF THE LAND UTILIZATION PROJECTS

## Relationship of Land Management and Transfers

From 1936 to $1953,2.5$ million acres of the 11.3 million acres acquired under the land utilization program were transferred, chiefly to other Federal agencies outside of the Department of Agriculture, including the National Park Service, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and Fish and Wildife Service. Assigned for management within the De-
partment of Agriculture for administration or custodianship were approximately 8.8 million acres as of January 2, 1954. Approximately 1.3 to 1.8 million acres were managed under long-term agreements with State and other agencies, leaving 7 to 7.5 million acres managed from 1938 to 1953 directly by Department of Agriculture agencies.

An additional 3.3 million acres were transferred, granted, exchanged, or sold
from January 2, 1954, to May 15, 1961, leaving 5.5 million acres assigned to the Department of Agriculture, with the major part going to the Forest Service. A large part of the acreage transferred was assigned to the Bureau of Land Management and other agencies in the Department of the Interior. Sizable acreages, however, were transferred or granted to State agencies. Limited acreages were exchanged for other land and small acreages sold to public agencies and private parties under special rules or authorizations for such actions (table 7).

## Management by the Soil Conservation Service, 1938-53

The Soil Conservation Service managed from 7 to 7.5 million acres of land utilization project land for 15 years--1938-53 (table 8). The acreage varied somewhat from year to year as land was transferred between Federal and State agencies.
.By the end of 1940, most of the initial acquisition and development work had been completed on all projects started before passage of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. These projects had reached the stage at which the problems had shifted from the developmental to the managerial field.

Projects managed by the Soil Conservation Service from 1938 to 1953 under authority of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act were used mainly for grazing, forests, hay, recreation, wildife, and watershed and water supply protection. During the period after World War II, especially, additional improvement and development work was carried out over large areas, including building stock-water ponds, reservoirs, fire towers, and erosion control works; seeding grasslands; planting trees and forest thinning; and construction of fire-control lanes and access roads. A big job of rehabilitation was done from 1946 to 1953 (figs. 8, 9, and 10).

During these years many bare, idleareas were planted to grass and trees. Grassland and grazing yields increased with seeding and grassland improvement. Sustained forest yields also increased as time passed and growth progressed under a management and protection program.

Much of the land was managed by local grazing associations and soil conservation districts and other State agencies under long-term agreements, but the Soil Conservation Service had administrative and
custodial responsibility and the United States retained title to the land.

For the 12 years 1942 to 1953 , revenue from land utilization project land averaged $\$ 918,852$ per year (table 8 ). Lumber production averaged 28 million board feet per year. An average of nearly $1,579,000$ animal-unit months of grazing a year was provided local stockmen and ranchers. The major sources of public income were from sales of forest products, grazing fees, and mineral royalties.

During the war years 1941-45, the land utilization projects made significant contributions to needed production. During 1944, over 6.1 million acres were used for grazing, furnishing 1.6 million animal-unit months of grazing. Around 22 millionboard feet of timber products were harvested in 1944 to help fill the tremendous war needs. This represented a 10 -percent increase over the previous years.

In 1945, the War and Navy Departments used nearly 300,000 acres of land utilization land for training camps, ordnance depots, and bornb, gunnery, rocket, and rifle ranges. More than 33 million board feet of timber products were harvested from land utilization lands in 1945, and land in agricultural land use adjustment projects supplied nearly 1.7 million animal-unit months of grazing. Seven thousand farmers and ranchers made use of the land each year during World War II.

Timber harvested in 1946 totaled more than 32 million board feet of all types. Nearly 2 million acres wereclassed as commercial forest, including both federally and State administered projects. Collections in 1946 were $\$ 728,341$. This was an increase of nearly one-third over 1945, due to higher returns per acre.

In 1946, over 4 million acres of project land in Montana, North and South Dakota, Wyoming, Nebraska, Colorado, and Kansas were managed cooperatively by grazing associations. Grazing associations were organized in the late 1930's in Montana, Wyoming, and North Dakota. Soil conservation districts began operations about 1940. Their purpose was to assist in planning and carrying out county and district agricultural conservation and land use programs.

The districts were organized by farmers and ranchers and are managed by them through elected boards of directors and supervisors. The grazing associations, likewise, were organized and operated under State laws to plan for group management

TABLE 7.--Sumary of acquisition, disposal, and administration of land utilization project land by U.S. Department of Agriculture, by periods, 2935 to 1961

| Period ${ }^{1}$ | Acreage for which titles were obtained in the period | Transferred cutside Department of Agriculture | Administered in the Department of Agriculture at the end of period |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Million acres | Million acres | Million acres |
| 1935-38. | 27.9 | 21.7 | 6.2 |
| 1939-46. | 3.4 | . 3 | 9.3 |
| 1947-53. | 0 | . 5 | 8.8 |
| 1954-61. | 0 | 3.3 | 5.5 |
| Total (1961) | 11.3 | 5.8 | 5.5 |

${ }^{1}$ Periods are from July 1 to June 30, except for 1947 to 1953 when the period ends Dec. 31, 1953, and for 1954 to 1961, when the period begins Jan. 2, 1954 and ends May 15, 1961.

2 Omits approximately 350,000 acres for which options were accepted but for which titles were not obtained, or acquisition of which had not been completed at the time of transfer. Includes approximately 500,000 acres transferred prior to authority given by Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act in July 1937, and 1,200,000 acres transferred after July 1937.

Sources: Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Land Policy Section; Resettlement Administration; and Bureau of Agricultural Economics: Annual and other reports, 1933 to 1938.

Soil Conservation Service, Annual Reports of the Chief and other reports, 1938 to 1953.

Forest Service: Annual Reports of the Chief and other reports, 1954 to 1961.
House of Representatives, 84th Cong., lst Sess., Rpt. No. 1296, July 20, 1955.
TABLE 8.--Agricultural land utilization program of the Soil Conservation Service under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act: Use and income of lands managed, by years, 1942-1953

| Year | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { area } \\ \text { managed } \end{gathered}$ | Grazing |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Use for }{ }^{2} \\ & \text { crops } \end{aligned}$ | Lumber production | Recreation | Total ${ }^{2}$ <br> revenue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Acreage | Amount |  |  |  |  |
|  | Acres | Acres | Animal-unit months ${ }^{3}$ | Acres | Board-feet | Person-days | Dollars |
| 1942. | 7,184,018 | -6,000,191 | 1,229,688 | 35,944 | -- | -- | 293,700 |
| 1943. | 7,143,474 | 5,889,056 | 1,447,591 | 38,557 | -- | -- | 450,399 |
| 194. | 7,141,027 | 6,131,710 | 1,553,330 | 36,728 | -- | -- | 482,702 |
| 1945. | 7,151,810 | 6,237,413 | 1,664,373 | 50,388 | -- | -- | 549,120 |
| 1946..... | 7,178,157 | 6,373,449 | 1,672,983 | 29,264 | 32,013,000 | 1,136,039 | 728,341 |
| 1947..... | 7,121,139 | 6,436,135 | 1,680,565 | 42,981 | 31,337,224 | 1,156,162 | 833,756 |
| 1948..... | 7,111,683 | 6,454,355 | 1,172,434 | 45,180 | 26,657,864 | 700,959 | 995,793 |
| 1949..... | 6,970,469 | 6,386,159 | 1,706,803 | 45,609 | 30,619,567 | 860,668 | 925,820 |
| 1950.. | 6,946,761 | 6,336,916 | 1,608,690 | 38,005 | 33,088,809 | 714,078 | 1,021,430 |
| 1951..... | 6,902,438 | 6,308,529 | 1,698,572 | 30, 130 | 28,590,238 | 777,877 | 1,187,267 |
| 1952..... | 6,912,307 | 6,330,075 | 1,751,745 | 25,157 | 22,672,147 | 848,221 836,438 | $1,752,455$ $1,805,446$ |
| 1953. | 6,917,508 | 6,440,731 | 1,757,272 | 38,345 | 19,409,369 | 836,438 | 1,805,446 |
| Average | 7,056,733 | 6,277,060 | 1,578,670 | 38,024 | 4 28,048,527 | 4 878,305 | 918,852 |

[^17]
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Figure 9.--Thinning inferior trees for pulpwood on a land utilization project in Georgia. The remaining trees grow faster, and the pulpwood crop earns income.
and use of intermingled blocks of public and private grazing land. Permits and leases were obtained on public land and arrangements made for cooperative use of private range in the district. Directors were elected and supervisors and technicians employed or assigned for planning and management. Project managers and grazing associations worked together to allot grazing permits and to improve the range.

The work on Title III lands was of considerable productive value; educational value also was significant. Farmers and ranchers, after observing the results of conservation practices on Government land, more readily applied the practices on similar land used by them.

In addition to direct public income and use of land for State and Federal purposes, the public and local people benefited from the income of workers and operators who bought timber on the stump and processed it for market, the income of farmers and stockmen who used large acreages for grazing, and the employment of mineral and oil workers and operators who worked leases. The workmen employed in improvement, maintenance, and management of the property also benefited, as did those who used the areas for recreation, hunting, and fishing. Annually, there were about 879,000 days spent by people in recreational activities on the land utilization areas. By the end of 1953, the land resources had increased in value because of the improvements, growth of timber, development of recreation facilities, gains in wildlife, and better and more plentiful water supplies.

## Management by the Forest Service, 1954-63

As of January 2, 1954, a total of $8,847,000$ acres in land utilization projects had been assigned by the Secretary of Agriculture to the Forest Service. This included 6,958,000 acres assigned on this date from the Soil Conservation Service, 1,062,000 acres earlier assigned from the Soil Conservation Service and predecessor managing agencies, and 827,000 acres under Forest Service custodianship that were being managed by State agencies under long-term lease or sales contracts (table 9).

About $1,460,000$ acres have been incorporated into 28 National Forests, and 161,000 additional acres are managed by the Forest Service pending disposal or permanent assignment. In addition, 19 National Grasslands, comprising about $3,804,000$ acres, have been established by Secretarial order for permanent retention and management as part of the National Forest Systern. With the exception of 161,000 acres, the rest of the assigned acreage was transferred to other Federal and State agencies for ad. ministration, except for small acreages exchanged in order to block in areas, and limited acreages sold under special conditions as provided by law.

The Forest Service has continued and expanded the improvement of project lands in their custody. Surveys have been made of the land, water, forest, range, wildlife, and recreational resources in order to keep abreast of changes in these resources,
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Figure 10.--A 4-year-old stand of loblolly pine on Singletary Lake Game Sanctuary, N.C. The road serves as both fireguard and vehicle trall.
changes in the need for their use in terms of markets and incomes, and increases in local and regional rural and urban population. Cooperative arrangements with grazing associations and conservation districts for management of land, installation of measures for revegetation and maintenance of range, and reforestation and protection of forest areas are active. Special attention has been given to recreational needs by creation and development of campsites, picnic areas, and reservoir fa'cilities for boating and swimming in sections previously lacking these amenities. Wildlife and game management also have beenimproved to meet demands for hunting and preservation of wildlife.

Total income from land utilization projects transferred to the Forest Service ranged from $\$ 1,610,410$ in 1955 to $\$ 2,290,775$ in 1958 (table 10). The average income for the 5 years $1955-59$ was $\$ 1,953,429$. The receipts, in order of size, were from grazing permits, mineral leases, and sale of forest products. Rental of hay lands, sale of grass seed, and recreation permits brought in smaller amounts representing about 5 percent of the cash receipts.

Increased sales of timber, more mineral leases, and improved grasslands have brought an upward trend in income. As a result of 30 years of good management
practices, timber growth has been large, resulting in a greater volume of merchantable timber. Income has generally ine creased, even though acreages under Forest Service management have declined because of transfers to other agencies and uses.

## National Forests

Four new National Forests were formed from 6 of the 40 land utilization projects assigned to the Forest Service--the Tuskegee in Alabama, the Oconee in Georgia, the Tombigbee in Mississippi, and the St. Francis in Arkansas. The remaining 34 or more projects were added to 24 existing forests. The largest acreages incorporated into National Forests were in the southern States, from Virginia to Arkansas and Louisiana.

The National Forests serve many uses and many people. Multiple use is a standard policy and practice. Not only do the National Forests produce timber, but, in addition, they provide grazing for livestock and places for wildlife to grow, and afford hunters at State-prescribed seasons the use of publicly owned open space for hunting. Use for recreation is in great demand, especially for camp and picnic sites and for fishing, hiking, skiing, studying nature, and enjoying beautiful scenery.

TABLE 9.-Status of land utilization projects transferred to the Forest Service, or placed under its custody, as of June 30, 1964

| Item | Acreage |
| :---: | :---: |
| Assignment to the Forest Service: | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { acres } \end{aligned}$ |
| Transferred to the Forest Service prior to 1/2/54................................. | 1,062 |
| Transferred to the Forest Service on $1 / 2 / 54$. | 6,958 |
| Placed under the Forest Service custody. | 827 |
| Total assigned to the Forest Service....................................... | 8,847 |
| Retained for permanent administration by the Forest Service: <br> National Forests. |  |
| National Grasslands | 3,804 |
|  | 5,264 |
| Balance (for disposal or permanent assignment)...................................... | 161 |
| Total under administration of the Forest Service. | 5,425 |
| Disposals to other agencies and parties: |  |
| Transferred to the Bureau of Land Management. | 2,187 |
| Transferred to other Federal agencies | 57 |
| Granted to State, county, and city agencies. | 806 |
| Sold to State, county, and city agencies:............................................ | 190 |
| Exchanged for lands within National Forests or research areas................... | 102 |
| Placed in trust for Pueblo Indians. | 78 |
| Reconveyances and sales to former owners and other private parties........... | 2 |
| Total disposals............................................................... | 3,422 |

Source: Forest Service.

## National Grassiands

Range management of project land has been improved by the establishment of National Grasslands, which are somewhat similar to National Forests (139). The National Grasslands consist of 24 former land utilization projects, where the Federal Government, the States, and the local people are cooperating to rebuild rangeland on the ruins of drought-stricken andmisused land. The 19 National Grasslands are situated in 11 western States--17 in the Great Plains, and one each in Idaho and Oregon.

The land utilization projects now in Na tional Grasslands began as part of the Department of Agriculture's emergency rehabilitation programs in the 1930's. Submarginal farms and depleted rangelands, resulting from homesteading and settlement of small farm units in serniarid
areas, were purchased and the occupants resettled, and slowly over the years the range was restored to better, more productive use. Lessons were being learned from the hard experience of attempting to farm unsuitable rangeland and then attempting to shift it back to grassland range.

The highest purpose of the National Grasslands is to serve as demonstration areas to show how lands classified as unsuitable for cultivation may be converted to grass for the benefit of both land and people in the areas. Under careful management, they are being developed for greater sustained yields of grass, water, wildife, and trees; they also offer opportunities for outdoor recreation. The National Grasslands are important units of a permanent system of the Forest Service dedicated to tested and approved principles of conservation and land use (5, 141).

TABLE 10.--Federal income from land utilization projects managed by the forest Service, fiscal years $1955-59$

| Year | Total acreage | Total income | Income by sources |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Grazing |  <br> forest products | Mineral leases | ```Haying, cropping, sale of seed``` | Recreation | Other |
|  | Acres | Dollars | Dollars | Dollars | Dollars | Dollars | Dollars | Dollars |
| 1955. | 7,048,111 | 1,618,410 | 806,967 | 309,295 | 374,261 | 65,713 | 33,237 | 28,937 |
| 1956. | 6,909,847 | 2,204,059 | 823,118 | 455,815 | 799,787 | 50,44 | 29,384 | 45,511 |
| $1957{ }^{1}$ | 6,945,157 | 1,734,666 | 684,102 | 215,120 | 737,461 | 38,063 | 30,084 | 29,836 |
| $1958{ }^{2}$. | 4,640,596 | 2,290,775 | 697,315 | 574,825 | 917,654 | 59,347 | 27,327 | 14,307 |
| $1959{ }^{3}$. | 4,638,540 | 1,919,236 | 734,640 | 346,955 | 747,579 | 25,379 | 38,095 | 26,588 |

[^18]Source: Reports of the Chief of the Forest Service for years speafied.

Use of the National Grasslands for grazing more than 165,000 cattle and 47,000 sheep annually must of necessity be integrated with the use of intermingled and nearby land (140). By agreement, the local people, who control the other lands and who, for the most part, are also users of the Government land, have accepted a large measure of responsibility in managing livestock on many of the areas. The local users frequentlyare organized into grazing associations to accomplish many of the conservation objectives in the National Grasslands and associated areas of private and public land.

Of the 3.8 million acres in the National Grasslands, grazing on 2.7 million acres is managed under cooperative agreements with grazing associations, and 1.1 million acres directly by the Forest Service. Permitsare issued by the Forest Service either tolocal grazing associations, which in turn distribute grazing privileges among members according to terms of the agreements, or directly to individual ranchers who meet simple criteria as to eligibility in areas not covered by grazing associations. Fees are paid on the basis of each animal-unit month of grazing permitted. ${ }^{8}$ This cooperative approach has resulted in good progress on both public and associated private lands in the revegetation of the land, installation

[^19]of water improvements, and fencing of units for management. This allows the harvesting of such forage for domestic livestock as is consistent with the long-term program of management.

Over 300,000 visits are made annually to the National Grasslands for hunting, fishing, camping, picnicking and other recreation. Visits to the areas are usually short, and facilities needed to accommodate the public are mostly confined to picnic areas and campsites near hunting and fishing. Outdoor recreation will increase as the public becomes aware that the grasslands are open to extensive public use.

Small areas of the National Grasslands support some tree growth of a woodland type and where these areas occur they generally have high esthetic recreational and wildife values. Consistent with these values, some wood products needed in the local communities are produced.

The National Grasslands furnish food, cover, and water for a wide variety of wildlife and fish. An estimated 27,000 antelope and 19,000 deer live all or a portion of the year on the areas. Bighorn sheep have been returned. Here also are found quail, prairie chickens, sharp-tail grouse, pheasants, wild turkey, and other game and song birds.

The proper management and use of the National Grasslands is a part of the big job of conserving and improving the Na tion's water resources and keeping soil in
place. Generally, grasslands are located in areas of unstable soil and deficient rainfall. A good vegetative cover must be retained to keep runoff at a minimum, reduce wind and water erosion, and enhance the water storage capacity of the land.

Grassland programs under cooperative grazing agreements with grazing associations have been strengthened since 1960. Most agreements with grazing associations have been continued, or renewed, with little change. It has been the policy not to change procedures for management that have been used successfully for many years. Local stockmen who are eligible can apply for permits to graze suitable areas on a longterm basis, provided they pay the customary grazing fees and assist in proper use and maintenance of the land.

In 1963, Secretary's (of Agriculture) Regulation of June 20, 1960, designating the land utilization grazing lands as $\mathrm{Na}-$ tional Grasslands, to be part of the National Forest System for administration under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, was amended, among other things: (1) To reaffirm the promotion of grassland agriculture and sustained-yield management of all land and water resources in the areas of which the Grasslands are a part; (2) to stress the demonstration of sound and practical principles of land use; and (3) to provide that management of the Federalland exerts a favorabie influenceover associated other public and private lands. ${ }^{9}$

## Management by the Bureau of Land Management

Some 18 land utilization projects, coniaining 2,464,000 acres, weretransferred to the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, and are managed and used primarily for grazing along with public domain land in Federal grazing districts. More than 1.9 million acres are in Montana. This acreage was acquired in 7 land utilization projects, of which the largest were Milk River, with 953,000 acres, the Lower Yellowstone, with 392,000 acres, and the Musselshell, with 268,000 acres. Most of this land was transferred from the Forest Service to the Bureau of Land Management by Executive Order Number 10787, November 6, 1958. Two Montana projects, Milk River and Buffalo Creek,

[^20]were analyzed in reports by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in 1937 and 1940, near the dates of acquisition. These reports snow the problems of intermingled private and public land holdings, and the hazards of farming scattered tracts in a dryland area (61, 93).

The land utilization land (or landacquired under Title LII of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act) is subject to the provisions for use and management which will best serve the conservation and land utilization program. The land is used under grazing permits by stockmen. The grazing regulations and fees conform to the general policies and procedures established for land utilization project land. Actual fees vary from area to area. As with all land acquired under Title III of the BankheadJones Farm Tenant Act, 25 percent of the revenue received from grazing and other uses is paid to the counties in which the land is located for road and school purposes.

Transfer of land utilization project land by lease, saie, or homestead is not authorized; however, exchanges of land and granting of easements and rights-of-way in the public interest are permissible. The authority for disposals of land utilization project land of any type is limited to application in the particular case (158).

At the time of acquisition of the land in the Milk River, Mont., land utilization project in 1937-38, it was within Federal grazing districts set up under the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934 (61, 93, 103). The project comprised 15 percent of the acreage in the Milk River District, compared with 27 percent in public domain land. In the Musselshell and Lower Yellowstone projects the percentage was even higher- 22 and 34 percent of the land area. A memorandum of understanding between the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior was made for administration of these lands, October 1 , 1936, including the provision that they be grazed in common with other public lands in the Federal grazing districts. ${ }^{10}$

## Management of Indian Projects

More than 1 million acres of range and other land which, were purchased for use of

[^21]Indian farmers and stockmen in increasing livestock production and incomes, were assigned to the custodianship of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. These projects were set up to aid 30 or moretribal groups, and were widely scattered. For instance, there were projects at Pine Ridge, S. Dal..; Fort Peck, Mont.; White Earth, Minn.; Seminole, Fla.; and Cherokee, Okla.

Since these projects were established for agricultural production, the land acquired was generally at least equal in quality to contiguous land. Most of the land was suitable for gainful use for grazing, hay and other feed crops, or forestry.

## Management by State and Local Agencies

Some 80 of the land utilization projects, totaling 1.3 million acres, weretransferred to State and local agencies. About 75 percent of this acreage was granted or sold to the agencies by the Forest Service during 1954-61 (table 11).

Nearly all the areas are managed for multiple uses, but the 4 most important uses are for parks, forests, and wildlife refuges, and for experiment stations to study and demonstrate ways and

TABLE 11.--Grants and sales of land utilization project land to State and local agencies, 1954-1961 ${ }^{1}$

| Region | Grants | Sales | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
|  | acres | acres | acres |
| Northeast. | 149 | 0 | 149 |
| Lake States | 79 | 14 | 93 |
| Corn Belt........... | 53 | 0 | 53 |
| Northern Plains | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Appalachian. | 192 | 14 | 205 |
| Southeast | 294 | 114 | 409 |
| Delta States | 10 | 46 | 56 |
| Southern Plains | 23 | 0 | 23 |
| Mountain. | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Pacific | -- | -- | -- |
| Total, 48 States | 806 | 188 | 994 |

${ }^{1}$ Record of disposition of land utilization project land to May 15, 1961, which was transferred to the Forest Service Jan. 2, 1954. Prior to Jan. 2, 1954, approximately 300,000 acres were transferred to State and local agencies, making a total of about 1,300,000 acres.
means of achieving better use of problem areas.

Management varies greatly depending upon the need, public interest, and avail. able funds for management and development. Many areas are used by large numbers of people for recreation, camping, hunting, fishing, and educational activities such as study of forestry, wildlife, and natural features by students and young people's groups. Other land is used for demonstration areas and experimental plots in connection with agricultural education and research. Some areas are nowreaching the point where, through management and development, they have sizable incomes, or are self-supporting from sale of forest and other products, and from users' fees and sale of licenses. Use of State parks and forests is especialiy heavy in the Eastern and Central Regions near centers of population where outdoor recreation areas generally are small and scarce.

Among the notable examples of Statemanaged projects in the East and Central Regions are Bladen Lakes State Forest, N.C.; Clemson School Forest, S.C.; Poinsett and Cheraw State Parks, S.C.; Rock Eagle State Park, Ga.; Hard Labor Creek State Park, Ga.; Warm Springs State Park, Ga.; Yellowwood State Forest, Ind.; Zaleski State Forest, Ohio; Tar Hollow State Forest, Ohio; French Creek State Park, Pa.; Catoctin State Park, Md.; and Lake of the Ozarks State Park, Mo.

## Plans for Long-Range Use and Management

In 1954-55, studies and hearings on proposals for use and management of land utilization project land revealed that there had been occasional public misunderstanding of the advantages and disadvantages that might be involved in disposing of the land already in use for special purposes. especially wherelargetracts wereinvolved. Study of the proposals indicated that disposition of this land should be the result of an objective evaluation of the individual projects and of how they could best serve the needs of the regions, communities, and people of the areas in which they were located (46).

Several public hearings were held and a number of congressional bills were considered. After study of the situation and the need for the land utilization project areas for forests, grassland, recreation, and wildife, and for conservation of land and
water, the general decision was that the land should continue to be held under Federal and State ownership, and to be
managed and used under authority of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of 1937 as amended. This policy has been followed.

## APPRAISAL OF THE LAND UTILIZATION PROGRAM

A notable accomplishment of the land utilization program was that for the first time it demonstrated to the public the potentialities of a definite agricultural land policy for poor farmland, whose use was uneconomic in the commontypes of field crops and with the usual forms of cultivation and management. Poor land and poor peopie dependent on farming were at a point where a program was needed to preserve land resources and to rehabilitate the people on that land. It was evident that submarginal land could not provide adequate family incomes. Some plan was needed for the future, and some action vital for the present.

As developed, the program helped many destitute families get off relief rolls; it provided much work for them on development and construction projects, or resettled them on more productive land. It helped some local governments to reduce their debt load by payment of delinquent taxes. Later, many farmers and ranchers were helped with grazing permits. Sawmill and pulpwood mill operators were able to buy and process timber from the projects. People were provided with opportunities for hunting, fishing, and other forms of recreation.

The land utilization program demonstrated that public purchase could be used to remove large areas of rural land of low productivity from submarginal uses; that such land could be converted to beneficial public uses; that residents could move from land of questionable productivity to land of better productivity; and that povertystricken people who moved could be successfully aided in gaining more adequate incomes and better homes.

It was also found that time must be allowed to work out needed adjustments, and that immediate results should not be expected from an adjustment program. The conclusion that time and effort must be allowed for adjustment is a point that must be emphasized. It could not be assumed that, merely because there were too many farmers with too manyacres incrops, these farmers could shift quickly to jobs or other locations with little effort or cost.

An additional accomplishment of the land utilization projects was to buid land re-
sources in the purchase areas and adjacent to them so people could have better opportunities for adequate incomes. As the surrounding farmers and ranchers observed the land use practices on the projects, improved practices and better management spread beyond the borders of the projects. The land utilization lands today serve their regions well in land use planning, adjustments to better land use, establishment of conservation practices, provision of permanent sources of income, and furnish. ing of recreational areas in regions formerly without them.

The land utilization program experience may be important in the future. Through trial and error, pitfalls to be avoided were discovered and procedures were worked out which should smooth the way for future programs, both through reduction in costs and avoidance of delays. That the program failed fully to accomplish all its objectives is also true, although failure was a matter of degree in many instances, and often had the positive effect of teaching lessons for the future.

The land retirement program was inaugurated during the greatest depression in the history of our country, a depression which had severely dis rupted our national economy. People were willing to graspat anything that gave them promise of getting the economy back to normal. In the 1930's, drought, dust storms, floods, and insects also struck at the hearts of agricultural regions. Under such circumstances, it was fortunate that a workable program could be put into operation on a national scale. Under intense pressures to expand operations to maximize the relief of distress, the land program quickly outgrew its original demonstrational character. As Howard Tolley, then Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, wrote on December 3. 1945, in a letter to L. C. Gray. "The sub. marginal land program marked a turning point in agricultural policy relative to needed adjustments in use of agricultural land and planning for the future. ${ }^{11}$

The land utilization program was administered by 5 different Federal agencies in the first 4 years of its existence, 193437. The frequent transfer of administration,
and the provisions for joint planning and recommendations by several agencies, contributed to delays and uncertainties in the essential plans and necessary actions to be taken (70). However, the transfer of many key personnel along with the program tended to minimize the problems caused by shifts of responsibility between agencies. The achievements of the program in these early years were significant despite the frequent changes in organization, shifts in plans, and ups and downs in budgets.

Previous experience in large-scale Federal acquisition of submarginal farms and resettlement of the occupants was limited. In their struggle to get started, the agencies at times made mistakes, and lost the confidence of the people concerned. Enough people with adequate training and experience in the work were not always available. On-the-job study and training were necessary. The work was not always well organized, and title clearance proved a stumbling block, as it took much time and specialized personnel. Although it improved with experience, procedure in many instances was slow and cumbersome (156). ${ }^{11}$

The chief handicaps in the efficient administration of the program were (1) the slow legal processes involved in title clearance, often to the frustration of the person or family ostensibly to be benefited; and (2) the transfer of the program from one administrative agency to another, with consequent confusion as to aims and methods. To these 2 handicaps, but mainly as a corollary of the second, should be added the diversion of funds available for the program and the use of program personnel for activities only remotely related to the program itself.

In some cases, allocated funds were withdrawn for relief needs, making it necessary to cancel options on land, to discontinue projects, and to discharge personnel. In several project areas this caused much disappointment and led to public criticism.

Because of stringent budget and legal restrictions on the purchase of submarginal farmland, questions sometimes arose as to whether the projects contributed to the public works and relief program from which they were financed and at the same time met the other land utilization program objectives. The problem of a workable definition of submarginal land applicable to all regions was never fully resolved.
${ }^{11}$ Title clearance was greatly facilitated as time went on and more experience was gained with the various procedures of land acquisition.

Some large holdings were bought on which occupants and agricultural operations were few, but which could be turned into recreation areas, public forests, etc., because of the availability of labor, although their full development for recreational use was premature in the 1930's. Also, the program was used to some extent as a means for other public agencies to acquire unfarmed land for their own special purposes.

As the program proceeded, attempts were made to answer the questions: What is submarginal land? How can submarginal land be identified? A thoughtful analysis by John D. Black (16) began by posing the question of whether there is such a thing as "unproductive land," or "submarginal land," since it is hard to find land which does not yield some kind of product. Dr. Black concluded that if net losses result from farming, the land is nearly always being misused. Much so-called submarginal land is land that is submarginally used; for example, by being planted to corn, cotton, or wheat, when it is not well suited to these crops but is better adapted to grass or trees.

Questions were asked about the effect of the land retirement program on farmland values and farm incomes in the areas where land purchases were made. Definite and final answers to these questions could not be made. The influences that agricultural programs exert on land values and incomes are very complex, and cannot be explained readily in simple terms, especially when making a long-term projection.

Since the 1930's, new crop varieties, different land preparation and cultivation practices, more timely operations with mechanization, and better control of plant diseases and insects have made it possible to farm some former marginal land with greater success than in earlier years.

Although the Federal Government shared the income from the land with counties, transfer of private land to the Government was looked on as a loss by local governments when they realized that they could not collect taxes or sell tax-reverted land in Government projects. Contradictions in local situations were often amazing, however. Local units earnestly sought land conservation and other Federal projects involving the purchase of real property, usually with full knowledge of their exempt status. Yet they protested the tax loss and often wanted reimbursement for both tax loss and any extra public service costs incurred.

Because of scattered holdings in some projects, the Government at times had titie to land that blocked areas served by local governments, but local governments could not discontinue services to areas under their jurisdictions. In some cases where local governments had little partin planning the projects, or were not fully informed, they questioned Government purchase and tax immunity even though their status may have been improved by removal of poor lands from their jurisdiction.

Purchase of land in local governmental units did not bring reduction in costs of government in all instances since the projects did not always follow boundaries of local units, some isolated settlers were allowed to remain, and few attempts were made to reorganize local government services to reflect the change in land use and population--a field in which the Federal Government has no authority. Thus, it is probable that the savings to local governments attributed to the land program have been overemphasized in some instances.

Federalacquisition programs always pose the question of payments in lieu of taxes. Experience with the land program from the l930's to the 1960's indicates that this question has not yet been fully settled to the satisfaction of State and local governments.

Experience with the land program indicated that simple procedures, readily understood and administered, and not changed irequently, contributed to the efficiency of work and on the whole brought the best response from the public and from the workers on the projects. In general, the greater the degree of uniformity and simplicity in administration of public purchase and control of public land use within a State, the greater the ease with which the necessary work can be carried out and the objectives of the program achieved.

A major question involving submarginal farm areas was the extent to which public purchase could be effectively used to bring about desirable large-scale adjustments. Students of this subject have pointed out that public acquisition must be supplemented by cooperative programs between Federal, State, and local agencies if good results are to be achieved. It has been questioned whether it is desirable for the Federal Government to undertake extensive purchase of submarginal farms in large blocks, unless establishment of a National Park, National Wildife Refuge, National Forest,
or National Grassland, or some other special purpose is involved.

Programs designed to acquire land occupied by low-income or isolated families for the purpose of helping the families improve their level of living, and of converting the land to a less-intensive type of agriculture or to nonagricultural uses, need to be accompanied by complementary activities. The success of the land atilization program depended largely upon the extent to which it was supplemented by other programs, including State and county zoning to reserve land for the usefor which it was best adapted and programs to assist in the relocation and employment of displaced families. Thus, a threefold cooperative program is necessary, embracing public purchase and conversion of strategic areas of submarginal farmlands to uses to which they are best adapted and needed, State and county zoning of lands against occupancy for uses for which they are physically and economically unsuited, and assistance to displaced families in relocating and obtaining employment.

Experience from 1934 to 1964 shows that generally the agricultural land utilization adjustment projects have served as good demonstrations of what can be done in shifting submarginal farm areas to more extensive agriculturaluses such as forestry, pasture, and range, and to needed public areas for wildife and recreation. During this 30 -year period much private farm reorganization has occurred, with purchase and lease of the land necessary for farm enlargement. Credit programs and programs for land and water development, improvement, and conservation have likewise assisted in bringing about desirable shifts in land use. In some Great Plains range areas of private land interspersed with public land, the entire areas have been brought under better use and management by means of long-term agreements or by allowing all land to be used by cooperative conservation and grazing associations. The use of both State and Federal land was made available to these associations under cooperative agreements providing for good practices of range management under a program supervised and controlled by Federal and State Governments.

A number of these agreements have expired, and have been renewed with similar policy arrangements. Grants and sales have been made to States for many of the smaller forest, recreation, and wildlife areas. The
bulk of the acreage in the larger projects has been added to nearby National Forests and Federal Grazing Districts, or has been used in establishment of new National Forests and National Grasslands. Practices, procedures, and land management organizations for the land utilization areas cited have been revised as new conditions and needs arose.

The purchase of so large an acreage-5.6 million acres--of submarginal farmland in the Great Plains was justified largely because of the widespread misuse of the land, resulting in rural poverty and inadequate farm units, and the urgent need for increasing opportunities for employment and income in such communities. Here especially, the demonstrational value of the land utilization projects was shown. By exhibiting proper land use to surrounding farmers and ranchers and to the public generally, the improved practices and better management spread beyond the borders of the projects. Although the success of the program as an educational process has never been fully measured, many people in the Great Plains and elsewhere have stated that they gained from observation of and experience with the results of the land utilization program.

The major group action alternatives to. public purchase of submarginal farm areas in the Great Plains in the 1930's were cooperative grazing associations to lease and manage large blocks of land as com-munity-type pastures, adoption of land use ordinances by soil conservation districts, rural zoning, block leasing of rangelands by individual ranchers, graduated taxation in accordance with use and capability of the land, and county control or management of land unsuitable for cultivation. It appears that no one of thesemeans alone would have been entirely satisfactory. They were most effective when used in combination.

As was observed in land utilization project areas in the 1930's by one writer, rural zoning followed by relocation will help make both more successful (117). Perhaps in time, Federal purchase as the most effective way of correcting abuses can be replaced to some extent by moderate public educational and administrative aids for guiding land use, land and water development, and private settlement, and for supervising credit and handling tax-delinquent lands (as for example, under the Fulmer Act). ${ }^{12}$

[^22]Clear distinction should be made between relief measures taken in a tempo. rary emergency, and measures taken as part of a permanent National program. If this distinction is made, land policy and programs from the outset can better serve a useful purpose.

John D. Black (16), in 1945, wrote "...the program that gets nearest to dealing with this problem is the land utilization program ... This is the program for buying rundown tracts of land, rehabilitating and reorganizing them into economic units, and then leasing them back into private ownership (or groups of operators). Apparently, this program is conceived at present (1945), like the Wisconsin and New York programs, mainly as a program for taking land out of regular farm use and getting it into special uses, such as timber, grazing or meadow. Where shift of land, largely from one major use class to another, is needed-and situations of this sort are not hard to find--such procedures are indicated.

A land retirement program should be paralleled by a program for finding farm jobs. A retirement program cannot solve the land problem when occupants lack better opportunities elsewhere. The largest areas of poor land are those in need of reforestation, regrassing, conservation practices, or drainage--all costly operations which require workers. It is not inconceivable that Federal programs could be developed to reclaim poor land areas and furnish employment should it be needed. But whatever means are taken to develop income opportunities for families in poor land areas, these people should have a part in the program, and should wholeheartedly accept the plan. The more responsibility local people assume from the beginning, the more likely are they to cooperatelater.

Another lesson learned at some cost is that with the exception of cases calling for immediate evacuation, families should be withdrawn from an area gradually and over an extended period. This procedure will result in less disruption to people, local governments, and social institutions. In the end, it may even prove that all the land in an area need not be purchased. By purchasing demonstration areas and using them for public purposes, the key to sound land use over a wide area may be provided (156). The successful cooperation of the Soil Conservation Service and the Farm Security Administration in carrying out such a program in some of the Georgia
projects has beendescribed on pages 22 and 23.

The land utilization program of the 1930 's was rural development in action. In numerous areas of the country it assisted in conservation and improvement of the land and water resources, and in protecting the health, safety, and welfare of the people. Its methods of achieving better land use and conservation were directed primarily at economic improvement, the physical development of land and water being a major means of bringing more jobs, larger incomes, and social advantages.

In almost every area where land utiliza. tion projects were located they led to an increase in work opportunities, to job
training, and to alleviation of poverty. In order to meet their living expenses, farmers on submarginal land in many areas had concentrated on cash crops of cotton, wheat, corn, and tobacco, had cut over their woodlands, or had overgrazed their range. Submarginal land prevented them on the one hand from practicing stable types of farming, while on the other hand it forced them to exploitative use of land, water, trees, and grass.

The results of experience with the land utilization program of the $1930^{\prime}$ s may provide useful guides for future policies and programs dealing with land useadjustment, conservation, rural development, and alleviation of rural poverty.

## II. EXAMPLES OF LAND UTILIZATION PROJECTS

The scope, objectives, and results of the land utilization program of the 1930's may be illustrated by 12 widely different types of projects. Each of the 12 projects served somewhat different purposes, according to the land use and related problems of the region where it was located.

Case studies of 3 of the agricultural demonstration projects are given in detail to illustrate the selection of purchase areas; their composition; how they were acquired, developed, and managed; and their disposition, use, and accomplishments. Nearly every project was a special
case by itself, because of the wide difference in land use problems in the various regions of the country. However, enough similarities existed to make studies of experiences of individual agricultural projects useful in understanding the program and its results.

Nine other projects are cited briefly to show the great variety of land use problems, the chief types of projects authorized, and some of the results of the program.

The original names of the 12 projects, and their present status, are given below:

Original land utilization projects,
$1934-39$$\quad \begin{gathered}\text { Federal and State projects formed from } \\ \text { land utilization projects }\end{gathered}$
Original land utilization projects,
$1934-39$$\quad \begin{gathered}\text { Federal and State projects formed from } \\ \text { land utilization projects }\end{gathered}$
Projects now assigned to Federal use:

Pledmont and North Central Georgia (Ga.-3 and 22)
Perkins-Corson (S. Dak.-21)
Badlands Fall River (S. Dak.-1)
Milk River (Mont.-2)
Morton County (Kans.-21)
Projects now assigned to State use: French Creek (Pa.-7)
Bean Blossom (Ind.-4)
Beltrami (Minn.-3)
Bladen Lakes (N.C.-4)
Clemson (S.C.-3)
Sandhills (N.C.-3)
New York Land (N.Y.-4)
${ }^{1}$ For detalls of 1960 use, see tabulation on p. 43.

# OCONEE NATIONAL FOREST AND ADJACENT WILDLIFE REFUGES, EXPERIMENT STATIONS, AND PARKS 

Examples of the agricultural land utilization projects in the Southeastern States are the 2 Piedmont projects, situated less than 75 miles southeast of Atlanta and just north of Macon. Figure 11 gives the location of the Plantation Piedmont Project (GA-3) and other Georgia projects established by 1935. The Plantation Piedmont Project was one of the first projects to be undertaken under the land utilization program. The other Piedmont project, North Central Georgia (GA-22), was started in adjacent Greene County in 1937-38. From these projects
later were formed the Oconee National Forest, Piedmont National Wildlife Refuge, National and State pasture and forest experiment stations, and State and local parks and recreational areas. Here the purchase and development of the land in hundreds of poor, eroded, partly idle cotton farms was carried out to show how such land could be restored and converted to more productive uses for benefit of the occupants and all people of the region.

The Old Cotton Belt in the 1930's, of which the Piedmont projects were a part,
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was and still is a region of shifting needs and uses for farmland. Changes in demand for agricultural products, together with competition from new lands of the Mississippi River Delta and the newly developed irrigated projects of the West, contributed to the shift of land from cotton, first to temporary idleness, then after a few years to forest as tree seeds scattered and had time to grow. Growth of population beyond the capacity of the land to support it from agriculture alone led to migration from the farm to jobs in nearby cities and to other States.

The Piedmont projects were in the Brier Patch Country, made famous by Joel Chandler Harris. When, 3 generations ago, Harris wrote the stories told him by Uncle Rernus about the adventures of Br'er Rabbit and Br'er Fox, and other fabled occupants of the fields and woodlands of the Brier Patch Country of the Lower Piedmont, it already was a fading example of the old cotton farm system. Farms were becoming smaller because of divisions among more people dependent upon the land, and less productive because of depletion of soil and
ravages of erosion caused by a century of continuous row-crop farming.

In 1934, when the projects were undertaken, an estimated 90 percent of the land in the project areas had been in cultivation at some time in the past 100 years. Thousands of acres were once cleared at great labor and put under cultivation for crops. Many thousands of acres were involved in the rotation from forest to fields, then back to woods, and perhaps on to a second or a third clearing.

Much of the land, while originally fertile, was not well adapted to continuous row-crop farming because of moderate to steep slopes and erosion. The land required either conservation practices in cultivation or long natural restoration periods in pasture and forest.

Acreages of cropland harvested in the counties where the purchase projects were located was at a peak from 1910 to 1920, but dropped more than 50 percent by 1930 , more than 80 percent by 1960. Much of the big decline from 1920 to 1930 was because of the severe losses in cotton production resulting from the heavy infestation of the cotton boll weevil. Erosion damage to the land also had taken a heavy toll in fertility and in suitability of land for cultivation. Insect and erosion damages in the 1920's combined with the economic losses because of the depression in the 1930's discouraged farmers from the continued outlays required for cotton farming. Failure to meet expenses for 2 to 3 years left many farmers, merchants, and bankers in the area broke or on the margin of bankruptcy.

Pasture acreages increased during these years, along with dairying and beef cattle production: Pasture acreages, however, were relatively small, and occupied only a minor part of the cropland left out of cultivation. By far the greater part of the uncultivated cropland acreage after a few years of weed, brier, and broomsedge growth returned rather quickly to volunteer forest. A similar pattern of change in use of cropland occurred in some 30 other Lower Piedmont Georgia counties.

## Land Use Plans in the 1930's

The Piedmont land utilization projects were initiated as the result of detailed surveys which were made from 1932 to 1934 by men from the Georgia Agricultural

Experiment Station, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the Bureau of Chemistry and Soils, and the Forest Service. The results of these surveys were published, in part, as research studies (67). Of particular interest was a land classification map of the 4 counties of the project area (fig. 12).

The original plans, made in cooperation with the people of the area, called for purchase and development of demonstration forests, pastures, wildife refuges, and recreational areas, totaling 150,000 acres of marginal to submarginal cotton farmland. The plans included provisions for resettlement and employment of families occupying the land purchased. Shortage of


Figure 12
funds and changes in the purchase program held the acreage actually acquired to 144,000 acres. This land was developed as planned. Several hundred workers, some of them former occupants of the land purchased, and some of them from nearby farms and small towns, were employed for 3 or more years in development work.

Natural restocking of forest areas in pine trees was aided by managed practices and fire protection measures, and supplemented by planting trees on open idle land. In this manner, many thousands of acres of badly eroded, rundown, hilly farmland were soon well stocked with rapidly growing trees. By World War II, 10 years later, the natural forests were beginning to supply much-needed lumber, poles, and pulpwood from sustained-yield cuttings.

Use of Project Resources in the 1960's
After 30 years, the public forests are successful commercial operations. Not only do they return a cash income to management agencies, timber operators, and workmen, but even more important, they serve as visible demonstrations of good forest management in a region where millions of acres of privately owned, unneeded, eroded former cotton farms have reverted to forest. These public forests are watched closely by farmers and owners and operators of forest land to learn the best ways of forest management.

Some of the most productive forest lands in the region are marked by old furrows, as abandoned fields usually have better soil, are easier to prepare and plant to trees, and are more accessible than wood. lands in general.

From the 2 Piedmont land utilization projects, 6 land use areas were formed. The demonstrational and recreational fea. tures of all 6 areas are well developed and widely used. While each unit has been set apart for a primary public purpose, all have varied multiple uses, including forest, wildife, pasture, recreation, watershed protection, conservationdemonstration, and education.

Listed below are the major use areas formed from the Piedmont and North

Central Georgia Land Utilization Projects (GA-3 and GA-22):

| Major Use Assignments, 1961 | Administering Agency | Acres ${ }^{\text {- }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Oconee National Forest | Forest Service |  |
| Uncle Remus Ranger District (GA-3) | " " | 67,933 |
| Redlands Ranger District (GA-22) | " ${ }^{\text {+ }}$ | 28,133 |
| Total Oconee Nadonal Forest | " " | 96,066 |
| Hitchid Experimental Forest (GA-3) | " " | 4,592 |
| Total, Forest Service |  | 100,658 |
| Pledmont National Wudlife Refuge (GA-3) | Fish \& Wildufe Serv. | 27,614 |
| Georgia State Experiment Station (Pasture \& Forest) (GA-3) | Ga. State Expt. Sta. | 14,315 |
| Rock Eagle State Park \& 4-H Club camp and center (GA-3) | Ga. State Park Serv. \& State University | 1,452 |
| Jones County Recreadonal Area (GA-3) | County Board of Commissioners | 199 |
| Total (GA-3) |  | 116,105 |
| Total (GA-22) |  | 28,133 |
| Grand total |  | 144,238 |

## Income and Expenditures

## Timber Sales

Timber sales from the Oconee National Forest for the 9 years $1955-63$ averaged 12,963 thousand feet board measure, and were valued at $\$ 354,064$. Timber sales include sales of pulpwood, fuel wood, and poles, as well as lumber. All timber sales have been converted to thousand feet board measure for the sake of summarizing total volume and value.

## The Uncle Remus Ranger District

As an illustration of the income from project lands, a summary of receipts and disbursements is presented here for the Uncle Remus Ranger District of the Oconee National Forest. The 1960 auditor's report showed receipts of $\$ 388,294$, of which $\$ 360,904$ was from the sale of forest prod. ucts. Total disbursements for 1960 were $\$ 322,910$. Most of the disbursements were
for personal and contract services, supplies, and materials used for maintenance, protection of the area, and improvements such as access roads and development of recreational areas.

The lease under which the project was operated by the soil conservation districts expired at the end of 1961 . Beginning with 1962, the land has been managed directly by the National Forest Supervisor for Georgia, according to regulations governing the administration of National Forests.

According to the auditor's report, $\$ 298,639.38$ was expended in 1961 from accumulated receipts from sale of project products from the land, for improvement of the land in the Uncle Remus Ranger District. The improvements included construction of 19.7 miles of road to serve the commercial forest areas at a cost of $\$ 172,261.07$, development of 2 new recreation areas, Hillsboro Lake and Sinclair Lake Recreation Areas, at a cost of $\$ 120,590.43$, and construction of a water system and well at project headquarters at a cost of $\$ 5,787.88$.

## Recreation

The recreation area improvements consisted of paved access roads; cleared and graded campsites, picnic grounds, parking lots, and trails; buildings such as bathhouses and rest and dressing rooms; water and sewer systems; and grills, picnic tables, boat docks, swimming facilities, garbage and trash cans, and other essential equipment. The roads in the forest were built chiefly to provide access to commercial forest areas for maintenance work, protection from fire, cutting and handling timber, and use by rangers, game wardens, and hunters.

Additional recreational facilities were being developed in the Oconee National Forest in 1963 and 1964. One roadside park has been completed and picnic areas developed at 2 lakes, plus 2 wayside parks in the western part of the area. Facilities are available for boating at 2 areas, and swimming at one. Two camping sites have been completed recently and several other camping sites are also planned indifferent areas.

The visitors to recreation areas in the Oconee National Forest averaged 45,700 per year from 1959 to 1963. The number increased to more than 75,000 annually in 1963 and 1964.

Recreation is one of the major uses of the Piedmont project areas. In addition to Hillsboro Lake and Sinclair Lake, new recreational areas in the Oconee National Forest, there are 2 older sites. One of these recreation sites, the Rock Eagle Park development, is centered around a famous Indian rock mound-a prehistoric effigy that has been restored, in Putnam County, near Eatonton. The 100-acre lake provides facilities for picnics, bathing, boating, and fishing. It first was leased, thentransferred by grant, to the $4-\mathrm{H}$ Club Group Camp and Center. The public has access to bathing, boating, and picnic facilities on one side of the lake. Other historical sites in the area are the ruins of one of the earliest cotton mills in Georgia, built about 1812 in the Scull's Shoal area, and two large prehistoric Indian mounds about one-half mile south of this site. Another recreational unit, which has been in use for several years at Miller Creek Lake in Jones County near Gray, consists of a 25 -acre lake that provides facilities for picnicking, bathing, boating, and fishing. It was transferred by grant to the Board of Commissioners for Jones County.

## Management

Since 1943, the administering agencies for areas now in the Oconee National Forest and the Piedmont National Wildlife Refuge projects have had a cooperative wildife program with the Georgia Game and Fish Commission. The wildlife management area contains about 43,000 acres of private and Government land, managed for deer, wild turkey, and other wildife. Three managed deer hunts have been held in recent years (1959-63) with some l,000 or more hunters participating.

The remainder of the project area is open seasonally for small-game hunting. As a result of the management area program, deer have increased and spread to adjoining areas to such an extent that a 15-day open season before the managed hunts is possible on both the project and county lands outside of the management area. There is close cooperation with the U.S. Fish and Wildife Service program on the adjoining Piedmont National Wildife Refuge, formerly a part of the land utilization project area.

The Piedmont land utilization projects have cooperated in and helped support a fire-control agreement with the Georgia Forestry Commission, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Hitchiti Experimental Forest, the Forest Service, and the Georgia Agricultural Experiment Station project. This cooperative program is closely related to the operations of a local pulp mill and lumber company holdings adjoining the area.

The area is particularly suited for continued multiple-use administration and management. It has a definite relationship to the watershed needs and benefits of the local community. It lies within the watershed of the large Georgia Power Company Sinclair Lake development, immediately south of the project, and is within the watershed of the proposed Green Brier Creek Flood Prevention Project.

Multiple-use management for forests, wildife, pastures, hunting, fishing, and recreation, and demonstrations of development, conservation, and use of land and water are practiced throughout the 144,238acre project area, thus insuring use of all resources to good advantage. The concept of multiple use is, of course, modified where needed for recognition of paramount rights and responsibilities.

After painstaking study from 1954 to 1960 by the Forest Service of the best use and management procedures for the land utilization projects in the Great Plains, several agricultural projects in South Dakota were established as National Grasslands. In 1960, the Perkins-Corson project was established as the Grand River National Grassland.

The Perkins-Corson Land Utilization Project represented a completely different situation from that in Piedmont Georgia. Here, land used for dryland farming with exceptionally low wheat yields was acquired and converted into a grazing area, and farmers and ranchers on land purchased were aided in relocating on better land. The project contains 155,428 acres, located along the Grand River in Perkins and Corson Counties. The project was the last of 5
land utilization projects organized in South Dakota, and one of the last projects initiated in the Nation. As a result, it profited from experience gained in other areas. Figure 13 shows the location of the Perkins-Corson and other projects in South Dakota.

One reason for management of grazing on National Grasslands by grazing associations is that it furnishes a ready means of extending uniform land use controls beyond the boundaries of purchased land, and thus assists in better use and maintenance of the entire area than if undertaken tract by tract. The land in the Grand River National Grassland is managed with associated private and public land by a Stateauthorized grazing association under a grazing agreement with the ForestService. Livestock are grazed on the land under a


Figure 13.--South Dakota land utilization projects.
${ }^{13}$ References used in preparing this section are blbliography references (5. 46, 47, and 133), and a paper presented at a ranger-manager meeting. Custer National Forest, March 1955, by D. A. Dyson, entitled "Philosophy and General Policles of Land Utilization--How It Was Accepted by the User."
common permit system by farmers and ranchers who have an adequate feed base to support their livestock during the time they are not on association controlled land.

## History of the South Dakota Land Utilization Projects

The land utilization project areas in western South Dakota consist of some of the poorest land in the State for cultivated crops. Before the homesteader reached these areas, ranchers were using this land without permit. Land near water was heavily grazed, while many areas without water nearby were not used at all. During that period, access to water was a key to control of surrounding land. Because the rancher was often without legal control of sufficient range for efficient ranch operations, he concentrated on control of access to water as a means of controlling land to which he had no valid claims to ownership. But the homestead acts upset this limited degree of control, as the potential farmer settler was allowed to homestead any unreserved portion of the public domain. Homestead laws required that a house be built on the land and that a certain acreage of land be cultivated. The first homesteads were 160 acres. Later, in 1909, 320 acres were allowed, and in 1916, it became possible to homestead 640 acres, but these changed rules came too late, for much of this area had already been settled in 160 acre farms.

In the 1920's, the combined effects of limited rainfall, drought, small farms, low prices, high taxes, and declining crop yields began to be felt. Property values declined, crops failed, tax delinquency became commonplace, and people began to move away. But the situation deteriorated so generally and so gradually that it attracted little public attention. However, in the following decade of the 1930 's, the prolonged drought, the depression, and the changes in systems of farming combined to aggravate the situation. As a result, the whole Nation became more aware of the need for some remedial public action.

Many crop farmers in western South Dakota found themselves stranded on uneconomic farms, heavily in debt, and with no reserve of capital or credit to continue or to expand their operations to efficient size. Many tracts of land were left idle, or abandoned entirely; some were foreclosed by loan companies and banks, which, in
turn, often became bankrupt. The counties took some land by tax deed, and the State foreclosed on some which had been financed under the South Dakota Rural Credit Program. County and State Governments and credit agencies tried to keep the land in operation, and to avoid taking title to large numbers of tracts where there appeared to be any hope of payment of taxes and mort. gage loans. They frequently refused to take a deed to land for debts unless they had a purchaser in sight. There was considerable public feeling against State, county, and credit agency foreclosures.

Suitability of the Land for

## Cultivated Crops

A hard fact of life about the Grand River area is the low and uncertain rainfall, averaging only 14 inches per year from 1907 to 1937, with many dry years and few wet years. In the areas with better soils and topography, successful production of wheat and roughage is possible if combined with stockraising. But most of the area, because of limited moisture and rugged terrain, is suitable only for grazing.

## Settlement Patterns and People

Because of the unsuitability for farming, the pattern of settlement on small to medium-sized farms, established as a result of the homestead laws, was bound in time to have some unfortunate consequences in crop failures, low incomes, farm foreclosures, and tax delinquency. The people who flocked to this area from 1907 to 1912 were, in great part, those who had little experience in the dryland farming that is required in the Western Great Plains Region. Those who had farmed were largely from the North Central States and other regions where moisture was more abundant and more certain. Moreover, they settled in numbers too great for the land. Perkins County in 1912 had more than 13,000 people. In 1960 it had fewer than 6,000 people.

In 1937, 506 farms, largely in Perkins County, were studied by land economists and farm management experts. More than 25 percent of the farms were unoccupied, and 35 percent of the cropland was idle or abandoned. Due to the drought of the $1930^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$, the average number of cattle had dropped from 18,000 to 4,000 and of sheep, from 44,000 to 25,000 . Nearly 25 percent of the farms had been taken over by mortgage foreclosures by creditors, and by counties for tax delinquencies. Some of this was
because of severe droughts and the great depression of the 1930's, but much was because of the normal uncertainty of crop farming on small to medium-sized dryland farms in an area unsuitable for farming.

## Purchase and Development of the Project

Some observers suggested that the way to solve the problem in the poor areas was to let the pattern of land use and ownership readjust itself. But experience in the Great Plains and other regions as well had shown that the problem of low income and crop failure is not subject to quick adjustment, with individuals, firms, and State and local agencies bearing the costs. As an alternative, a Federal land utilization purchase program was established, to acquire and improve for grazing 155,000 acres of farmland as an aid to livestock farmers and to the community as a whole.

The land acquired consisted of scattered tracts within a designated project area, usually in a pattern suited to grouping into community pastures. Tracts which appeared to be satisfactory ranch headquarters generally were not purchased. The small farms, rough lands, and dry tracts needed for control of access and water appear to have made up most of the purchases. In some cases of isolated tracts, adjacent county and State land was purchased or public domain. land was transferred to the project to block in an area. Of the approximately 500,000 acres, 30 percent was purchased-a smaller proportion than in some other South Dakota projects. Most of the land purchased from private owners had improvements, and a part had been plowed for crops.

By August 1943, 19,000 acres had been seeded, 33 dams and dugouts for holding water constructed, and 210 miles of new fences built around community pastures. Further work has been done since that time. From 1943 to 1959 , much was done by the grazing association in improvement and maintenance of land and water resources through use of a portion of the fees charged for grazing permits, as direct Federal payments for these purposes decreased.

The removal of 162 farm operating units in the project area affected several schools, and some were closed or consolidated with others in the counties. The grouping of tracts into community-type pastures and the removal of other land from farming made it possible to close roads or to reduce road maintenance. The closing of schools
and roads and the building of firebreaks by the grazing association resulted in some savings to local governments.

## Resettlement of Families

After acquisition of the land, one of the first problems was relocation of families whose homes were purchased. This problem was largely confined to those who had insufficient means to rent or buy land, or who lacked skills for other jobs. Resettlement aid was given to those most in need of help in finding homes and jobs. Many others were given employment on the project removing unneeded buildings and fences; building dams and recreation areas; and making land improvements, including reseeding cropland areas to grass, erosion control, and water conservation measures.

## Later Administration and Use

## Grazing

The project was administered by the Soil Conservation Service or held under its custodianship during the period of acquisition and the stages of development from 1938 to 1954. Administration was transferred from the Soil Conservation Service to the Forest Service in 1954. At present, it is administered under a 10 -year agreement with the Grand River Cooperative Grazing Association, signed in 1961.

The agreement between the Forest Service and the grazing association contains specifications for use and maintenance of the land and improvements. The primary restriction is that the land be used only for grazing and that grazing be limited to the number of animal units it is determined the range can carry for a certain number of summer and fall months. A Forest Service ranger supervises overall administration of the ranger district and assists in development and recommendations for use. A total of 182,129 acres are managed by the association, including 155,428 acres of land utilization project land and 26,701 acres of privately owned and State and county owned land.

The grazing association's maintenance supervisor and his assistants distribute salt, maintain the stock oilers, repair the approximately 385 miles of boundary fence, and do the required maintenance on springs, wells, dugouts, and reservoirs. Most of the developments for watering the stock have
been financed by the grazing association. Maintenance of the 231 miles of fireguards is by the grazing association.

The grazing association owns and maintains a rural firetruck that is stationed in Lemmon and is operated by the city fire department. Fire detection has not been too great a problem, because most ranches and farms have telephones. Fire suppression in practically all cases has been by the local fire departments from Lemmon, Bison, Hettinger, Glad Valley, or Lodgepole, with assistance from ranchers and farmers. The local fire departments have radio contact with the State Highway Department; the Game, Fish, and Parks Department; the Highway Patrol; the game warden; and the local police.

There are 21 community pastures in the Grand River Grassland, ranging from 1,280 acres up to more than 18,000 acres, and 48 private allotments. Range condition mapping has been completed. Allotment plans are completed for only a few of the allotments.

## Recreation

Deer and antelope are plentiful and use the entire area. There are some areas where deer are somewhat concentrated, but it is not uncommon to find mule deer anywhere in the area. White-tailed deer are found along the Grand River and its brush-lined tributaries.

Sharptail grouse are fairly numerous but their habitats are becoming sparse.Several
projects ha:e been completed to protect existing habitats for this species and develop new ones. Hungarian partridge occur throughout the area, but the populationis not great. Chinese pheasant are found along the river and on cropland near the brushy draws.

There are approximately 4 miles of shoreline under Forest Service jurisdiction along Shadehill Reservoir. There are plans for a boat ramp and sanitary facilities on one of the points, if demand warrants it. The Grizzly Campground, completed in 1962, is appreciated and used by many people. About three-fourths mile of access road was constructed in 1963 from the campground to a State Game, Fish, and Park road.

## Income and Expenditures

The average Federal income received per year, 1954 to 1962, for the use of the 155,000 acres of Federal land in the Grand River National Grassland was $\$ 43,106$.

Grazing permits issued to an average of 138 ranchers during the 6 years 1959 to 1964 ranged from 58,240 animal-unit months of grazing in 1959 to 50,700 in 1964. This represented 6 months' grazing for 7,526 head of cattle and 4,620 sheep in 1964. Because of drought, the stocking rates have varied from year to year.

Average annual receipts, expenses for local management and maintenance, and capital expenditures for development 195962, are listed below:

| Item | Average number | Average annual income or expenditures |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Income from-- |  |  |
| Grazing, 1954-62........... | 58,244 andmal-unt months ${ }^{1}$ | \$24,735 |
| Mineral leases, 1954-62. | 109 mineral leases | 13,571 |
| Land use, 1954-62 ......... | 706 acres in hay and other crops $^{2}$ | 4,800 |
| Recrearion, $1962 . . . . . . . .$. | 50,800 visits | -- |
| Wildufe, 1962 inventory.. | 3,400 antelope <br> 900 white-tailed deer <br> 2,000 mule deer | - |
|  |  |  |
| Total.................... |  | 43,106 |
| Expenditures for-- |  |  |
| Local management, operation and maintenance, 1959-62 |  | 31,456 |
| Development and capital improvements, 1960-62. |  | 3,178 |

${ }^{1} 1$ month's grazing tenure by 1 mature cow or steer, or 5 sheep.
${ }^{2}$ Inciudes sale of crested wheat grass seed when there was a good seed crop.
Source: Summarized from tabies prepared by the project management field office of the Forest Service, January 1964.

Changes, 1955-64
There were several significant changes in the character of the project from 1955 to 1964. The first and most important has to do with the size of each ranch unit. In 1955, the private ranch units associated with the project appeared to besmaller than average for the community, with many units relying entirely on project lands for summer pasture. Now almost all operators have additional private pasture, and the averagesize of their permits is no indication of the scale of their operations.

The grazing fees are based on a Government charge, and also include costs of grazing association operations, and some additional charge for development and maintenance. The Grand RiverGrazing Association, incorporated in 1940, has strengthened and improved its leadership in development and maintenance of public and private land.

## Achievements of the Project

Public objectives, as described in part I, p. 12, for the land use program in the Great Plains, were more completely achieved in the Perkins-Corson project than in some other projects. There are a number of reasons for this. First, the land was purchased in fairly solid blocks. Second, the grazing association itself purchased many of the isolated tracts that remained in the project area. Third, the grazing association was able to provide leadership in the development and administration of the project area. For these reasons, community pastures in the project have been relatively successful and the relationship of the grazing association and Federal administrators $h$ :.s been generally harmonious.

## Comparison of the Georgia Piedmont and the Perkins-Corson Land Utilization Projects

While the same general program objectives were pursued in both the Georgia and South Dakota land utilization projects, the origin of the problem in each case was different. The Homestead Act, leading to 160-acre farms in a poor dryland area, was a factor in South Dakota, but not in Georgia. A century of intensive row-crop cultivation of erodible, sloping land under a share tenancy system was a chief factor in Georgia. In fact, nearly all the institu-
tional and physical land problems whichled to abusive use of cropland were different in the 2 cases. The contrasts are interesting and significant. Possibly even the criteria for evaluating the success of the program in each case need to be different.

In studying the projects, attempts were made to getanswers to 2 questions: (1) What was the economic effect of the purchase programs on the agriculture of the communities? (2) How has the development and adjustment of agriculture differed within and outside of the project areas? These 2 questions are of course closely related, and very difficult to answer, unless the effects of the program happen to be very great. In these cases, no positive answers were available, since agriculture has changed greatly in the 30 -year period since initiation of the projects because of improved practices, mechanization, and shifts in type of farming and land use. However, there were some judgments by individuals that the projects were beneficial and by others that they were not of great effect in changing the type of agriculture.

In the Georgia Piedmont project area, the number of farms and amount of land in row crops has declined to less than 25 percent of the peak production period. The change was large prior to the $1930^{\prime} s, b e-$ cause of boll weevil infestation, erosion, low productivity, and declining cotton yields. Shifts to generalized livestock farming, dairying, and forestry already had started in the 1920's, together with heavy outmigration of farm people. The Georgia Piedmont projects were a demonstration of what could be done to stabilize conditions and to change and improve land use and development.

In the Grand River National Grassland area, formerly the Perkins-Corson Land Utilization Project, there likewise are speculations by observers as to-effects and changes. It is difficult to separate the effects of the project from the effects of many other factors that promoted changebetween the 1930's and the 1960's. The general opinions expressed are that the project has been useful to the area. In making comparisons between land utilization projects, it is well to remember that significant contrasts exist between projects in the Great Plains as well as between those projects and projects in other regions.

In summary, no meaningful comparisons can be made among land utilization projects without balancing many factors. The success of a project should be measured in
terms of the location and condition of the land when purchased; the amount of land purchased; the time and money needed for
development, improvement, and maintenance; the effect of transfers of adminis. trative responsibility; and so on.

## BUFFALO GAP NATIONAL GRASSLAND ${ }^{14}$

The Buffalo Gap National Grassland, organized from the Badlands-Fall River Land Utilization Project (SDl-South Dakota), is located in Custer, Jackson, and Pennington Counties in southwestern South Dakota. Work here was initiated in 1934, with project headquarters at Hot Springs and Wall, S. Dak. Following acquisition and development, the project was administered by the Department of Agriculture in cooperation with local grazing associations.

## Description and Justification

The 550,000 acres in the project are characterized by wide expanses of gently rolling prairie grassland with rougher terrain and badiand formations along the White and Cheyenne Rivers. At the time of purchase, 86 percent of the land was in pasture, 13 percent in cropland, and 1 percent in wasteland. Cropland was of reasonably good-quality clay soils, but because of the lack of rainfall, grain yields were 2 to 4 bushels an acre. Farms averaged 245 acres in size, too small for economic crop production under the semiarid conditions and types of farming pursued. Rangeland was badly overgrazed, leaving little vegetation to retard the flow of spring rains and afford protection from driving winds. Consequently, wind and water erosion caused great damage. Living conditions here in the 1930's varied from fairly good to extremely poor. Of 706 families studied, 412 were dependent on relief. Inadequate housing, lack of medical care, and scarcity of drinking water and food were prevalent. Many children suffered from undernourishment and ill health.

There were no organized recreational facilities. Seventy-six small country schools with an average of less than 7 pupils per school were scattered throughout the area. There was a high rate of tax delinquency.

## Early Development

This land, where well managed, produced fair native pasture. Restoration of the grass cover was accomplished between 1935 and 1941 and the area was devoted to grazing under controlled conditions. Erosion control measures were installed and pasture was improved by planting grass, constructing dams to conserve water and create watering places for stock, building check dams, developing springs, and eradicating harmful rodents. Fences and auto passes (cattle guards, or special entrances for vehicles only) were built. Two game sanctuaries were established to protect wildife. Completion of the project placedthe grazing industry of the area on a more stable basis and provided a demonstration of reclamation and better land use methods applicable to millions of acres of similar land in the northern Great Plains.

During the 54 weeks of operation prior to January 1, 1937, an average of 269 men were employed on this project weekly.

## Families Residing on Land

Three-hundred and thirty-seven families lived in the project area in 1934-35. Nearly all these families moved from the project area; 120 required assistance in relocating.

## Use of the Project Land, 1959-63

The half-million acres of range furnished forage for an annual average of 202,318 animal-unit months of grazing in the 5 years 1959-63. Average Federal income and expenditures during these years are listed on the following page.

[^23]| Item | Average number | Average annual income or expenditures |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1959-63 income from-- |  |  |
| Grazing .......................................... | 202,318 animal-unit months ${ }^{1}$ | \$92,410 |
| Mineral leases. | 151 leases | 21,912 |
| Hay and other crops.......................... | 177 acres | 255 |
| Total....................................... |  | \$114,577 |
| Recreation Wildufe inventory | 44,490 visits | --- |
|  | 1,600 antelope 83 white-talled deer 720 mule deer | - |
|  |  | --- |
|  |  | --- |
| Watershed........................................ | All areas are useful for watershed purposes |  |
| Expenditures for local management, operation, and development, 1962-64. |  | \$69,397 |

[^24]There are 4 improved recreational areas for camping and picnicking. Hunting, fishing, hiking, riding, sightseeing, and nature study are important activities of the visitors. Plans have been made for additional recreational facilities.

In addition to the deer and antelope listed in the wildlife inventory, there are numerous small game animals and game birds, including wild turkeys.

## Fall River Ranger District

The Fall River Ranger District, the largest of the 2 districts in the grassland, contains 310,000 acres of usable range from the land utilization project area. The number of cattle permitted was 12,283, and the number of sheep 5,634 , for an average grazing season of slightly over 6 months. The number of livestock was just about equal to the appraised carrying capacity. Nearly two-thirds of the animal-unit months of grazing permitted were on National Grassland and one-third on private land fenced and used with the Grassland. The average permit on the Grassland was for 67 animal units, and on the Grassland and the enclosed private land combined was for 105 animal units. Direct permittees numbered 110 and grazing district permittees 90. Nearly all operators had additional summer pasture.

## Range Improvernents Inventory

Including those made prior to 1954, range improvements in the Fall River Ranger District consist of 446 stockwater dams and dugout water holes or ponds, 18 wells, 1 spring, 382 miles of fence, 21 cattle guards, and $l$ barn, at a total cost of \$685,390. Improvements arefinancedin part by Federal agencies and in part by permittees, with permittees doing some of the work according to agreement. Plans for development and maintenance originate principally with the Forest Service.

## Special-Use Permits

The most numerous special-use permits to authorize access are found in connection with uranium mining claims, oil and gas leases, and rights-of-way for power, pipelines, ditches, and fences. These access permits are, of course, distinct from those legal instruments which grant access rights to minerals. Mining in rangeland areas often increases damage, by dumping waste and by creating erosion as earth is dug and moved.

## Range Management

The National Grasslands are allotted to ranchers as individuals or groups for grazing specified numbers of livestock. Size of
allotment is based on amount of former use as well as on weather and range conditions.

Range analysis field work has been completed on the 162 National Grassland grazing allotments to ranchers. Maps are finished for 117 allotments. Management plans have been or are being written on 29 allotments. It will be necessary to review the range analysis on about 10 percent of the allotments to make corrections and improve the data. Management plans need to be written for 133 allotments.

Six individual allotments to ranchers, including a total of 34,407 acres, are under intensive management. Two allotments have established systems of rest rotation, and 4 allotments are under deferred rotation. The Shirttail allotment is managed under a system of deferred rotation, which is a part of the revegetation program.

Grazing agreements were in effect in 1964 with 2 cooperative grazing districts, the Pioneer and Indian Districts. The Pioneer District includes 101,935 acres and has 67 members. The Indian District includes 49,050 acres, with 23 rancher members. The Cottonwood District, for which a cooperative agreement was being developed in 1964, contains 53,355 acres of project land.

Wildlife developments consist of 2 watering places for wild turkey and 6 fenced habitat areas which have been developed over a period of years. Trees and shrubs have been planted in the habitat areas. Browse and berry-producing shrubs have been planted within fenced areas surrounding 4 developed springs. Three big-game and browse production and utilizationareas are being maintained.

In 1964, 8 stockwater dams and dugout ponds or water holes were constructed on National Grassland allotments by permittees. The Forest Service shared one-half the cost by allowing grazing fee credits. Surveys and plans were made by the Forest Service range technician. In addition, the range technician surveyed and prepared cooperative agreements for 4 dams and a spring that were constructed by permittees at no cost to the Forest Service.

## Use of Project in 1964

One of the aims of the land use purchase program was to extend good land use beyond the boundaries of the land purchased. In the Great Plains this was accomplished by forming grazing associations and putting all the land these associations controlled under a Federal grazing association partnership type of management. In the Buffalo Gap Grassland, 64 percent of the permitted grazing is on the Federal land and 36. percent is on private fenced land withinor near the grassland. It was originally assumed that the grazing associations would add to their grazing land by leasing the county tax deed land, but the counties chose to sell this land and thus put it back on the tax roll.

Management problems have been critical at times in recent years, because of drought and consequent variations in carrying capacity of range from year to year. Recurring periods of low and high rainfall and accompanying changes in forage production necessitate yearly consideration of adjust. ments in stocking rates. It is not a routine matter or a simple operation to issuegrazing permits or to adjust them to changes in carrying capacity. Ranchers, grazingassociation representatives, and rangers must work cooperatively to maintain a beneficial working relationship. The needed contacts to obtain this relationship require time and numerous ranch and field visits and much office work by rangers. Rangers are said to need more time than they now have for grazing association and permittee contacts on the ground to work out grazing use arrangements and problems satisfactorily from both the private and public standpoint.

In the Buffalo Gap National Grassland more land is grazed under individual allotments than in the Grand River National Grassland. Only a limited number of community pastures are possible because of the widely scattered acreage interspersed with other public and private holdings. The Federal agency administering the land has had to provide the leadership for development of the land. In a few cases there have been differences over policy which required time to adjust satisfactorily. As a result, development of this land has not been as fully achieved as in some other areas.

Characteristic of the land development work in the Great Plains is that of the 953.000-acre Milk River Project (LU-MT-2) in Phillips. Valley, and Blaine Counties in Montana (fig. 14). The objective of the development was to convert overgrazed pasture and abandoned farmiands into productive, permanent, and stabilized range. Grass was restored on the land both by giving it a period of rest in which to naturally reseed, and by artificially reseeding where destruction of grass was most serious. Improvement of water facilities also played an important part. A large number of check dams and stock ponds were built to conserve small amounts of rainfall and snowfall and to distribute water for cattle. Fences were changed to conform to new patterns of use, and buildings no longer needed were removed. Some recreational areas also were developed, including picnic and campsites.

This project was the second largest in the Nation. It consisted of land acquired from private owners. intermingled with public dornain land. Private dryfarming land was acquired and converted into a grazing area, while the impoverished dryland wheat farmers were aided in moving onto better tracts. The area was organized into State grazing association districts and used under suitable conservational regulations.

In northern Montana, the reasons for land purchase were similar to those in the Dakotas and Wyoming. First, hundreds of families had become dependent upon public relief, seed loans, or other subsidies, because of the inability of their land to produce grain crops except in wet years. Second, thousands of acres of rangeland were seriously depleted by wind erosion and overgrazing. Thousands of acres of rangeland had been homesteaded in public


Figure 14.--Montana land utilization projects.
25 Bibliography references used in preparing this section were (26. 77. 111, and 126).
domain areas and plowed up for grain cultivation, destroying the natural grass cover. Perhaps 10 or 20 years would have to elapse before natural reseeding replaced the grass cover.

The Milk River Grazing Project would never have been undertaken if the problem had been approached from the viewpoint of how to acquire the best available grazing land. It was undertaken to help resident families obtain more adequate incomes by relocating on better farmiand, and to restore to range land which was poorly adapted to cultivation.

The Milk River project was an effort to reorganize the use of land and water resources on an area basis. It not only restored nearly a million acres of land poorly adapted for farming to grazing, but encouraged relocation of people in the irrigated areas to develop irrigated land for intensified production of feed crops. The Milk River is a source of water for a rather narrow strip of irrigated land. Extending back on either side are many miles of grassland interspersed with benches of dryfarming. As the project progressed, many families in the dryfarm areas gradually congregated in the irrigated areas, where homes, roads, schools, and other facilities could be more efficiently maintained. The rangelands to either side were available for grazing.

The land utilization project lands were leased and operated from about 1940 to 1958 under the management of local grazing associations. The livestock was pastured under plans and rules set up cooperatively by the grazing association and the Federal custodial agency. Some operators had wheatland which they dryfarmed from their homes in the irrigated areas. Diversification of enterprises among livestock,
feed crops, and wheat brought greater security by lessening the dependence on income from a single crop or enterprise.

The grazing association paid fees to the Government according to the carrying capacity of the land. The association provided range riders and managed the operation, including numbers of livestock permitted. distribution of water, and grazing relations and maintenance. Each member was allotted the number of livestock that could begrazed in accordance with the amount of feed which he could produce on his farmandinaccordance with the carrying capacity of the rangeland in his area. The grazing fee per head per month varied with the prices of beef and mutton. The fees were used to manage the land, maintain and improve it, and pay the rental under the agreement with the Federal custodial agency. Twenty-five percent of the Federal income was paid to the counties where the land was located. Area management in the form of grazing associations and soil conservation district plans and programs modified the management and use of many farms and ranches in the region and aided in maintenance of the land in a manner that gave a more reliable income.

The Milk River land utilization project was administered by the Soil Conservation Service from 1940 to 1953, and by the Forest Service from 1954 to 1958. In 1958, the project land was transferred to the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior for management in Federal grazing districts along with adjacent and intermingled public domain land. Ranchers and farmers use the grazing land by payment of fees for their livestock under the animalunit permit system for land utilization project land in the Federal grazing districts.

## CIMARRON NATIONAL GRASSLAND

The Cimarron National Grassland of Morton County, Kans., was started in 1936 on land purchased with land utilization funds (fig. 15). Over a 3-year period, about 107,000 acres along the Cimarron River were acquired. In November 1938, the area was placed under the administrative control of the Soil Conservation Service, and an active program of reseeding grasses was started and has continued to the present. ${ }^{16}$

[^25]In 1954, the project was transferred to the Forest Service for administration, and in 1960 was established as a National Grassland for grazing, recreation, and wildlife.

Forage is the principal use, but a secondary objective is soil stabilization and the prevention of erosion. This is being accomplished by reseeding, balancing the number of livestock with the available forage, and other range-improving practices.

The Cimarron National Grassland organization is cooperating with wildife


Figure 15.-- Kansas land utilization project, October 1938.
management agencies by providing the best possible habitat for game birds and animals, and by controlling rodents and predators. There are limited resources for fishing and
big-game hunting; game birds are plentiful. Several series of waterfowl and fishing ponds were constructed along the Cimarron River by the State Fish and Game Department. The use of the area by sportsmen is increasing. It is planned to increase the amount of game by improving quality and quantity of food and cover. A tabulation follows, showing average use and income during 1953-62:

| Item | Average number | Average Federal Income |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Animal-unit months of grazing ${ }^{2}$ $\qquad$ | 16,025 | \$15,365 |
| Mineral leases......... | 11 | 53,674 |
| Recreation visits....... | 3,465 | --- |
| Other ${ }^{2}$................... | 101 | 14,648 |
| Total................... | -- | 83,687 |

${ }^{1} 1$ month's grazing tenure by 1 mature cow or steer, or 5 sheep.
${ }^{2}$ Includes cropping, haying, and miscellaneous other land uses, such as transmission and pipeline easements.

Source: National Grassland records, Forest Service.

## FRENCH CREEK STATE PARK

Fifty miles west of downtown Philadelphia lies what was first named French Creek Recreational Area, and later, FrenchCreek State Park. It is admirably adapted to recreational use, having interesting scenery and beautiful streams and lakes. Roads and railroads bring it within easy reach of several million people who live within a 50 -mile radius. Many people had long wished to acquire this tract for recreational purposes, as the area did not have adequate recreational facilities.

It was not entirely justifiable to purchase this land as part of the land utilization program, for not only was its price relatively high at the time, but the amount of cropland it contained was not large, and the farmland was not fully submarginal when moderately well managed. Yet commonsense indicated the urgent need of reserving this area for public use before private development forced people in the region, especially those with low incomes,
to travel even further out into the country for scenic outdoor recreational facilities. On these grounds, the project was approved as an exceptional case, and work was started in 1934-35 to develop the 6,000 acres of woodland, fields, and pastures into an attractive outdoor playground. The French Creek project was an example of the problems encountered in justifying purchase and retirement of farmland suitable for conversion to recreational and other special purpose uses.

The area wastransferred to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in 1947 for use as a State Park. Three lakes are within the park; the largest, Hopewell Lake, covers 68 acres. Facilities include picnic areas, campsites, bathing beaches, hiking and bridle trails, places for fishing and boating, and food and refreshment concessions. Horseshoe Trail, a historic trail extending from Valley Forge to Battling Run Gap near Hershey, passes through the Park.

## NEW YORK LAND UTILIZATION PROJECT ${ }^{17}$

The 15,000 acres purchased in the New York Land Utilization Project (NY-LU 4) in the south-central region of the State near Ithaca weregradually being abandoned in the middle $1930^{\prime} s$. Five of the land purchase areas were in Tompltins County. One, the Hector Unit, was in Schuyler County. Of the 293 tracts purchased in 1935-37 only 133, or less than half, were occupied. Unfavorable soil and topography were generally accepted causes for the abandonment of farming.

According to the records, 118 families moved as a direct result of the purchase program, and 5 were given life leases on their homes and permitted to live in the purchase area. Of the families who moved, 90 percent were farmers. Many families were able to find new homes without assistance. Some purchased other farms. Others went to live in nearby villages and towns, frequently near or with relatives. Some families needed help in relocation.

A list of 200 farms for sale was prepared, and farmers whose land was purchased were told of these opportunities, and in some cases were shown a number of farms. At the time the project land was purchased, a survey was made of the families who applied for assistance, with the intention of helping them obtain work and places to live on resettlement projects. ${ }^{18}$ Although a few families were accepted for resettlement projects in the first 3 years after the project land was purchased, the majority were found ineligible, or withdrew their applications as they found places
themselves during the long period of waiting for action on their applications.

Seventy-two of the displaced families had some equity in their farms and so were usually able to find places and relocate without assistance. Fifty purchased other farms; 22 did not continue farming, but became day workers or retired because of age.

Later, 10 families were assisted by the Farm Security Administration in obtaining permanent farm locations. Forty percent of the families found new places and moved to them without Government assistance. Some families received small loans to aid with relocation and operation of farms in new locations.

In the 1940's, a survey was made by Cornell University and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics to find how families from the purchase area succeeded in adjusting to relocation (42). Of 92 families interviewed, 69 ( 75 percent) said they were better off as a result of selling their land and resettling in a new location. The other 29 families said their situation had not improved.

It seems reasonable to conclude from these answers that the relocation program was about 75 percent successful. The families who were most successful in relocation and readjustment were the young families where husband and wife were between 21 and 40 years of age, had completed 8 grades of school or more, were in good health, and continued as farm owners and operators.

## BELTRAMI WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT AREA ${ }^{19}$

A different approach to the problem of acquisition of land for land utilization projects is illustrated by the Beltrami Island project in northern Minnesota (fig. 16). Here the purchase of about 80,000 acres in poor, scattered farms in large forest areas was carried out chiefly to relieve individual distress, and to relieve the counties of the heavy expenditures in-

[^26]volved in maintaining schools for children living on isolated farms and in keeping roads open to the scattered homes. The purchased farms were at first included in a public forest, but this land was less valuable than other land that might have been selected if commercial forests had been the single objective. The project contained considerable areas of burned-over land, on which restocking of timber trees was a serious problem. But there was little question from the viewpoint of social and economic welfare that the lands should be put in public ownership. Many of the counties in the region bordering the western Great Lakes were on the brink of financial difficulty unless changes were made in the scattered type of settlement, which required


Figure 16.--Minnesota land utilization projects, October 1938.
heavy costs for public services. The Beltrami Island project did much to demonstrate in practical terms the ways and means of carrying out this all-important process. The aid which the project provided to the settlers themselves was of great social significance, for they were helped to move from isolated unproductive farms inside immense woodland areas to betterfarms closer to markets, schools, roads, and rural communities in which their interests centered.

Under a long-term agreement made in 1940, the Minnesota Department of Conservation managed the land as a part of the Beltrami State Forest. Later, because of the suitability of the land for big game animals, wild birds, and fur-bearing animals, major emphasis was placed on wildlife management and the project was renamed the Beltrami Wildlife Management Area. Recreation and forestry are important secondary uses of the land.

## YELLOWWOOD STATE FOREST ${ }^{20}$

The 21,500-acre Bean Blossom Land Utilization Project, now the Yellowwood State Forest, was initiated in 1935 in the scenic hills of Brown County, Ind., 8 miles west of Nashville, Ind. (fig. 17).

Farming in the area was mostly limited to small, hilly patches of land not suited to cultivation. Timber had been overcut, reducing this source of income. Wildlife was rapidly diminishing. Relief costs were high, and many families were in need. Support of schools and roads was a heavy burden. There was widespread tax delinquency. Return of families to the land during depression years and absence of outside employment had added to the problem. Some 180 families were struggling vainly to earn


Figure 17.--Indiana land udilization projects, October 1938.
a living under these conditions in the Bean Blossom project area alone. Yet the value of the land in the area as a playground and recreational site, as a scenic attraction, and for forests had already been proven by the 16,000-acre Brown County State Park and Game Preserve near Nashville.

The immediate objective of the project was to take the land out of unprofitable use and to show how it could be used economically for more desirable purposes. By 1938, development of the Bean Blossom Project had laid the foundation for a better rural economy based on sound use of natural resources. An extensive forest had been improved and enlarged. A 147-acre lake and 2 lakes of 20 acres each hadbeen made, and roads, trails, campsites, and picnic areas improved and developed.

The Bean Blossom Project was managed by the Indiana Conservation Department under a long-term agreement as a State Forest from 1938 to 1956, when it was granted to the State and became Yellowwood State Forest.

The forest may be reached by Indiana State Roads 45 and 46, near Belmont. The three lakes--Ault Lake, Bear Lake, and Yellowwood Lake--all are well stocked for excellent fishing. Hunting is permitted during the open season for several game species.

Visitors to Yellowwood State Forest will find pleasure in a number of things: The abundance of wildflowers and wildlife, the magnificent trees, the beautiful lakes, the inspirational scenery. But the hiking trails have become the feature attraction. The popularity of those at Yellowwood is attributable to their length, to their ruggedness, to the challenges they present, and to their unspoiled natural beauty.

Two trails have been marked through the forest. The $22-m i l e$ Tulip Tree Trace, opened in 1958, commences at the south end of the picnic area at Yellowwood Lake and terminates in Morgan-Monroe State Forest which lies north and west of Yellowwood. Eighteen miles of the Trace are through dense forest, following old Indian, pioneer, and stagecoach trails.

The second trail, Ten $O^{\prime}$ Clock Line, opened in February 1959, extends from a point across from the south camping ground at Yellowwood Lake to the firetower on Weed Patch Hill in Brown County State

[^27]Park which lies to the southeast. This 16 mile hike is a rough one across a series of ridges and valleys.

These trails have become so popular that thousands of hikers from Indiana and other parts of the country traverse their routes. Boy Scouts use the trails for nature study and other outdoor Scouting activities.

To meet the increasing public use of this forest for outdoor recreation, many improvements have been made. Two new campgrounds have been cleared, one primarily for Boy Scouts and one for the public. doubling the general camping area. Camping is permitted only where designated.

Other improvements include a water system and sanitary facilities. Many visi-
tors, other than rugged hiking enthusiasts, just come for a day or weekend of leisurely loafing and picnicking. To insure their enjoyment of the forest, picnic areas have been enlarged and playground equipment erected for children. Many people come just to drive the miles of scenic forest roads.

Yellowwood Forest is perhaps the best example in the State for study in action of correct forest management. Study plotsare to be found throughout and the results of forest management are clearly evidenced by several thousand acres of reclaimed fields which were planted to fast-growing pine; some of the trees, now 24 years old, are several inches in diameter and 40 feet tall.

## BLADEN LAKES STATE FOREST ${ }^{21}$

The Bladen Lakes State Forest of North Carolina was formed from the Jones and Salter Lakes Land Utilization Project (fig. 18). The land in this project was purchased during the period 1936-42 under the authority of Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and antecedent emergency acts. The 35,875 acres cost an average of $\$ 4.51$ per acre.

In 1936, the area was occupied by a stranded population. First settled during the late colonial period, it had a history of poverty. For a hundred years after the arrival of the first settlers, farmers practiced subsistence farming along the river lowlands and creek bottoms, and sold naval
stores from the large stands of longleaf pine then in the area. Later, production of cotton became important. An increase in the population beyond the capacity of the land to support it came from 2 chief sources: Those who moved into the area as laborers in the turpentine and lumbering industries, and those who were influenced by the unwise promotion of cotton production.

By 1935 low price, poor soil, and the boll weevil had made production of cotton as a cash crop unprofitable. The naval stores and timber which had provided a large part of the population with a source of livelihood for many years was practically


Figure 18.--North Carolina land utilzation projects, April 1939.

[^28]exhausted. Without the means of moving to an area of greater productivity, and with no way of supporting themselves on their submarginal lands, the people had, by 1935, become truly stranded in the economic sense.

The delinquent tax problem was of grave importance. The majority of farms which had not passed from the hands of the original owners to corporations, commercial banks, land banks, etc., had a number of years of back taxes owing.

Such was the general situation facing the initial planners for the land utilization program in this area.

Several months werespent in determining economic conditions, attitudes of local residents and county officials, land values, and land boundaries, and in securing options to purchase the land. Agricultural land was also purchased for the resettlement of farm families desiring such resettlement.

During the period 1936-1939, through use of Civilian Conservation Corps labor and local residents, many miles of truck trails were constructed, game refuges were established, and the Jones Lake and Singletary Lake recreational centers were developed. Hundreds of acres of pine plantations were established on all available open fields. Many other projects basic to the development and management of this area were begun or completed during these years.

By 1938 the majority of the area which forms the present Bladen Lakes State Forest was optioned or purchased. Under a cooperative agreement, the property was turned over to the Forestry Division of the North Carolina Department of Conservation and Development on July 1, 1939, for administration and operation. Since that time, with the exception of the first 2 critical years, Bladen Lakes State Forest has been operated and developed on a completely selfsustaining basis. On October 19, 1954, the entire area was transferred to the State of North Carolina by the Federal Government in fee simple.

## Objectives

The primary objectives in the management of the forest area are to build up the growing stock of timber on the overcut and badly burned areas; to utilize all resources, including game; and to demonstrate that such an area can more than payits own way under sound forestry operations.

As a secondary objective, the full expansion of the recreational use of natural lakes and surrounding areas has been of high priority. In 1947, the continued development of these recreational facilities was turned over to the Division of State Parks.

In recent years, the use of the State Forest as a demonstrational area in all phases of forest management and operational techniques has been emphasized. Several hundred persons visit the forest each year toobserve plarting, control-burning, road construction, logging, sawmill operation, grafting and other silvicultural techniques, charcoal manufacturing, fencepost treatment, and other general forest management practices. Teachers, private landowners, businessmen, county agents, farm boys, college students, foreign foresters, and Federal and State Forest Service personnel are represented among the visitors. Cost analyses are prepared and published for all the operations, and are helpful aids when lectures are presented to visitors. Many interested persons avail themselves of these analyses.

## Financial Development

A very trying time was experienced in attempting to start operations on the State Forest. On occasion, difficulty was encountered in securing sufficient funds to pay for labor. The purchase of adequate equipment was a process requiring many years. During the early days of development, employment was vital to the progress and welfare of local residents. As the forest progressed and as labor costs increased, it became necessary to mechanize operations as much as possible. At present, a much greater volume of work is done with a small number of men using modern machine ry than was done by larger crews in earlier days.

Receipts for 25 years, July 1939 to June 1964, are summarized in the following tabulation:

Sawed lumber Loge
Pulpwood
Treated posts
Other

| $25,558,885$ board feet | $\$ 1,227,339$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| $12,803,452$ board feet | 300,190 |
| 56,969 cords | 391,017 |
| 346,947 posts | 169,341 |
|  | 152,913 |
|  | $2,240,800$ |

While the State Forest has been selfsupporting almost since its inception, large sums of money and a great amount of effort have gone into the project. The 35,875 acres
of land cost the Federal Government a total of $\$ 165,466.90$ in 1939. Since this initial purchase of property, the capitalized value of the State Forest has tremendously increased. Below is a summary of the valuation of the State Forest from a Bladen County report prepared for tax purposes in October 1957:

Total value of forested lands $\qquad$ $\$ 1,301,570.00$
Taxable valuation (35 percent of above) .........................................
(Tax rate @ $\$ 1.35$ per $\$ 100$ )
Tax pald to Bladen County on State Forest $\qquad$

This valuation does not include buildings, houses, sawmill, and equipment. It represents an estimate of the valuation of the Forest as compared to other forested lands in the county.

## Personnel and Organization

The State Forest directly employs 30 persons listed as foresters, rangers, foremen, equipment operators, post plant operators, forestry workers, etc. In addition to these persons directly employed, 12 to 16 are engaged in contractual work, such as preparing fenceposts and cutting pulpwood. There are approximately 150 persons dependent upon wage earners working on the Forest.

## Experimental Projects in Progress

As stated before, a principal objective of the administration of the State Forest is its continued development as a demonstrational area for all interested persons. In furtherance of this objective, joint studies are undertaken with cooperating State and Federal agencies.

Each year, an extensive fire prevention campaign is waged in the general area of the State Forest. Fire prevention exhibits are mounted in local store windows and such exhibits attract a considerable amount of favorable attention. During periods of extreme danger, heavy motor patrols are started and personal contact work with all persons living around the Forest is intensified. A year-round duty roster of all persons employed by the forest is maintained, and during critical periods all persons are subject to standby duty.

For the past 8 to 10 years, large-scale control burning operations have been con-
ducted on the State Forest. Nearly all longleaf ridges are now on a 2 - to 3 -year burning rotation. These controlled burns have greatly reduced the general threat of forest fires on the State Forest, and have aided in the suppression of several potentially disastrous fires. The controlled burns have also served to release longleaf pine seedlings from the grass stage in heavy wiregrass cover, to eliminate brown spot from innumerable areas of severe infestation, and to prepare seedbeds receptive to to the regeneration of many acres of longleaf pine in openings throughout the forest area.

No uncontrolled forest fire of any consequence has burned on Bladen Lakes State Forest since April 1955.

## Construction and Maintenance

Initially, only such headquarters buildings were constructed as were necessary-office, garage, and supervisor's residence. Several of the better homes of local residents were salvaged for use by State Forest employees. Since the early years, many improvements and additions have beenmade on all of the original buildings and several structures have been added.

## Truck Trails

During the first years of its operations, the State constructed 44.6 miles of forest roads. Heavy emphasis has been placed on new road and trail construction work during the past few years, and approximately 45 miles of new roads have been added to the State Forest network, making a total of 89.6 miles. These represent only roads maintained by State Forest personnel. They do not include the 40 or 50 miles of the State highway system of graded and paved roads passing through the Forest or the innumerable miles of access trails constructed and maintained.

## Game Management

No hunting is permitted on Bladen Lakes State Forest. It is a game preserve, and game wardens employed by the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission heavily patrol the area to insure that all wildife is protected.

Of course, innumerable private parties of deer hunters regularly hunt on private lands around the State Forest and harvest the excess 'crop' of deer raised on its protected areas.

## SANDHILLS WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT AREA ${ }^{22}$

The Sandhills Project (LU-NC-3) in North Carolina illustrates developments undertaken in the naturally forested eastern part of the United States.

For the most part, the 113,000 acres purchased in the Sandhills area was unsuited to successful cultivated crop productionand more adapted to upland game on the hills and fish in the streams, ponds, and lakes.

Forest stand improvement at first was a leading job. Because of the need for foresttree stock to restore this sandy area to forest cover, a forest-tree nursery was one of the first things to be developed on the Sandhills project. During the year 1937, 13 million forest-tree seedlings were produced and used on the project and other nearby projects where similar conditions prevailed.

Wildife development also received high priority on the Sandhills project. A fish hatchery was established to provide fish for restocking streams, lakes, and ponds in the project area and in other projects in the Southeast. Protective cover for upland game and food crops for game birds were planted. Recreational facilities on this project included development of an artificial lake, and the building of cabins, trails, camping areas, and picnic grounds for the use of the large number of visitors.

Game farms were developed for produc. tion of quail, turkey, and small game animals. Construction of impounding dams as
sources of water for many fish breeding pools, fishing sites, and other water needs in the area was completed at an early stage of project development. Lakes on the project are now available for public fishing.

Game raised on the game farms was released on the designated game refuges, and surplus game distributed to other public projects, including forest, recreational, and wildife areas. Public hunting is allowed under supervision and control. The overflow of deer from nearby public forests and private areas in uplands and swamps served to establish an increase in the supply of deer on the project. Hunting and fishing privileges are in demand, since the Sandhills Region is an attractive fall and winter resort area near centers of considerable population.

The purchase and development of land unsuited to farming gave the owners and operators an opportunity to dispose of sub. marginal farms and to move to better land, and has kept the submarginal land from being used for farming. The practical forestry development by fire protection, tree planting, and management; wildife produc. tion and conservation; and development of fishing, hunting, and recreational facilities has served to demonstrate ways to use poor farm lands in the Sandhills Region for wild game and recreation, to the greater benefit of the people of nearby States and of the public generally.

## CLEMSON FOREST ${ }^{23}$

## Historical Background

The land in Clemson Forest (Clemson University Land Utilization Project, South Carolina (SC-3)) was acquired during the period 1934-39. The purchase included 206 separate tracts varying in size from 9.8 to 1,054 acres. During the preceding 175 years or 30 , the land was in private ownership and used in varying degrees of intensity by 1,000 or more farm families that occupied the land in regular and irregular succession.

Clemson University begansupervising the land in December 1939, under a cooperative agreement with the Federal Government. Administration of the land was set up under
the direction of President Robert F. Poole, and in 1946 and 1947 two foresters, N. B. Goebel and Dr. K. Lehotsky, were employed to manage the forest and to establish a basic curriculum in forestry.

Two notable events have occurred since then: (1) The land use area, comprising 27,469 acres, was deeded to the university in 1954 and (2) the Hartwell Dam, that would take 7,667 acres of college land for its reservoir, including 5,626 acres in forest, was begun in 1956. University timber salvage operations began in the basin in May 1956.

Records on the timber harvest from the forest show that 33.3 million board feet of timber were harvested and sold in the 15

[^29]years 1944-59. Included in this harvestwere 16.1 million board feet cut from the 5,626 acres absorbed by the Hartwell Reservoir. Timber sales 1959-62 averaged $\$ 50,000$ annually. Approximately 1 million board feet of sawtimber and 5,000 cords of pulpwood were cut each year.

Timber Inventories, 1936-58
In 1936 the U.S. Government made a cruise of the timber in the land utilization project area. The area claseed as forestland in this cruise totalled 17,644 acres. The cruise gave a total of $37,368,000$ board feet, or an average of 2,118 board feet per acre.

To obtain more recent data regarding the condition of the Clemson Forest as a guide to management, a systematic reconnaissance inventory was made during the summer of 1958 , in which 232 point samples were taken. The following tabulation compares the inventories:

| Date of <br> Inventory | Total forest <br> acreage | Total volume | Av. volume <br> per acre |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Board ft | Board ft. |
| $1936 . . . . .$. | 17,644 | $37,368,000$ | 2,115 |
| $1958 \ldots . .$. | 16,000 | $72,000,000$ | 4,500 |

In round figures, the inventory showed 127,000 cords of pine pulpwood, 77,000 cords of hardwoods, 30 million board feet of pine sawtimber, and 42 million board feet of hardwood sawtimber. This gives a total growing stock of 204,000 cords of wood plus 72 million board feet of sawtimber.

## Coordination of Forest Management with Research, Teaching, and Demonstration

It is the objective of the forest management staff to so coordinate the management activities that they will serve the needs of teaching, research, and demonstration. Accordingly, the following suggestions were offered by the forester in a report in 1959:

1. Proceed with the program of stand delineation, and prepareprescriptions for the trouble spots, i.e., salvage and sanitation areas, etc.
2. Review the plan of operations for the forest with a committee of five representing teaching, research, and demonstration.
3. Operate the forest as recommended by the committee and approved by the Head, Department of Forestry.
4. Budget the timber sale receipts to carry on the development of the forest.
It is estimated that through salvage and sanitation cuttings there can be an annual cutting budget of around $1,500,000$ board feet during the first cutting cycle. This would result in an annual income of $\$ 30,000$. The pine and hardwood pulpwood market would take 5,000 cords, 50 percent of which would be pine. This would a mount to $\$ 15,000$. On the basis of these estimates, an annual income of around $\$ 45,000$ would be realized from timber sales.

Through the coordinated efforts of the committee, as proposed in items 2 and 3 above, a forest can be developed that will meet the needs of research, teaching, and demonstration, and incidentally provide the income to finance the major operations.
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## APPENDIX A. --EXPLANATION OF DIFFERENCES IN REPORTS OF ACREAGES ACQUIRED IN THE LAND UTILIZATION PROGRAM ${ }^{26}$

Annual and other reports and records of acquisition, title clearance, payment, and transfer of land by the agencies administering the land utilization program show that $11,299,000$ acres of land were acquired in the program (table 12). If to this is added the 353,525 acres for which titles had not been cleared prior to transfer to other agencies, the total amount of land acquired under the program totals $11,652,062$ acres.

There were several instances of transfers of land and responsibility for title clearance subsequent to acceptance of options and the commitment of funds, but prior to title transfers. For example, the recreational land use projects were consigned by Executive Order to the National Park Service and other agencies on November 14, 1936, before completion of titles.

The total acreages for land acquired under the land utilization program include the land for which titles had been obtained in recreational projects prior to the transfer of these projects to other agencies by the Executive Order. Titles had been obtained for 127,697 acres for recreational projects on this date, out of the total recreational areas of 394,968 acres, for which approvals and commitments to purchase had been made. Thus, the difference--267,271 acres--optioned and approved for purchase, but for which titles had not been obtained are not included in the total land utilization acreage reported acquired.

Payment had been made and titles cleared for 713,319 acres of the total of 734,999 acres of wildlife lands for which commitments had been made, leaving 21,680 acres not included in the total acquired under the land utilization program. Of the total Indian lands of 971,879 acres for which commitments had been made at time of transfer, payment had ? en made and titles cleared for 907,325 acres, making a difference of 64,574 acres not included in the acreage acquired under the land utilization program.

Various landholding and administering agencies of the land utilization program in the 1930's and early 1940's did not keep records of real estate on a uniform basis. Various sets of figures, ostensibly pertaining to the same acquisition, transfer, assignment, grant, or exchange, reported by different agencies in the 1930's frequently are not in complete agreement, nor are they subject to verification. The writers of various reports have endeavored to select the most reasonable presentation of data. Nevertheless, overall totals given in the tables may be approximations subject to variation depending on dates and sources.

Total acreage acquisitions reported by years generally represent land for which titles had been cleared and for which the sellers had been paid. For some years, especially for 1935 and 1936, data ondelivery of checks were not always readily available, anc the acreage under legally accepted options and approvals for purchase were used as th: acquired acreage. However, data for other years shows there was not a large difference in the total acreage for which options hadbeen accepted and approvals given for purchase during the year, and the final acreage for which titles were cleared and checks were delivered. The land uses as of June 30, 1964, are shown in tables 13 and 14.

Another source of difference in land utilization acreage reported acquired was exchanges, grants, and sales of larger or smaller acreages of private and other public land of land acquired in the land utilization program. Table 15 shows grants and sales to States and local agencies. Frequently, exchanges resulted in increases in acreage of certain projects. The differences sometimes are explained in footnotes or in detailed records of annual operations, but are not always carried in final or summary reports.

Transfers of about 500,000 acres in scatteredtracts of public domain land to the land utilization program also affected total acreage and average costs per acre of land acquired. Records of transfers of tracts of public domain land within or adjacent to land utilization projects are not always clear as to whether the acreage was included in the totals acquired. Total acreage acquired as calculated from reports and records may be low because of exclusion of some public-domain land.
${ }^{24}$ Data and calculations are based on annual reports and memoranda of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the Soil Conservation Service, and the Resettlement Administration, and on Agricultural Statistics, 1936-53. U.S. Dept. Agr.

TABLE 12.--Submarginal land acquired by U.S. Department of Agriculture, by States,1935-46

| State and region | Original or emergency programs, 1935-37 ${ }^{1}$ | New or Title III program 1938-46 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tota1 } \\ & \text { 1935-46 } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1,000 acres | 1,000 acres | 1,000 acres |
| Maine. | 7 | 9 | 26 |
| New Hampshire | 0 | 0 | (4) |
| Vermont... | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Massachusetts | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rhode Island | 13 | (4) | 13 |
| Connecticut. | 10 | 2 | 12 |
| New York. | 74 | 20 | 94 |
| New Jersey. | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pennsylvania. | 33 | 16 | 49 |
| Delaware. | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| Maryland. | 41 | 4 | 45 |
| Dist. of Columbia. | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Northeast. | 192 | 52 | 244 |
| Michigan. | 92 | 15 | 107 |
| Wisconsin. | 225 | 19 | 244 |
| Minnesota | 189 | 15 | 204 |
| Lake States. | 506 | 49 | 555 |
| Ohio. | 36 | 2 | 38 |
| Indiana. | 49 | 16 | 65 |
| Illinois. | 28 | 15 | 43 |
| Iowa. | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Missouri | 13 | 27 | 40 |
| Corn Belt. | 128 | 60 | 188 |
| North Dakota. | 882 | 263 | 1,145 |
| South Dakota. | 742 | 230 | 972 |
| Nebraska. | 176 | 25 | 201 |
| Kansas. | 54 | 48 | 102 |
| Northern Plains. | 1,854 | 566 | 2,420 |
| Virginia... | 42 | 15 | 57 |
| West Virginia. | 6 | 10 | 16 |
| North Carolina. | 141 | 21 | 162 |
| Kentucky. | 70 | 2 | 72 |
| Tennessee. | 69 | 16 | 85 |
| Appalachian. | 328 | 64 | 392 |

TABLE 12.--Submarginal land acquired by U.S. Department of Agriculture, by States, 1935-46--Continued

| State and region | Original or emergency programs, 1935-37 ${ }^{1}$ | New or Title III program $1938-46^{2}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total } \\ & 1935-46^{3} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1,000 acres | 1,000 acres | 1,000 Acres |
| South Carolina. | 148 | 7 | 155 |
| Georgia. | 181 | 78 | 259 |
| Florida. | 609 | -6 | 625 |
| Alabama. | 127 | 5 | 132 |
| Southeast. | 1,065 | 106 | 1,171 |
| Mississippi. | 110 | 26 | 136 |
| Arkansas. | 254 | 33 | 287 |
| Louisiana. | 200 | 2 | 202 |
| Delta States. | 564 | 61 | 625 |
| Oklahoma. | 60 | 93 | 153 |
| Texas. | 18 | 114 | 132 |
| Southern Plains. | 78 | 207 | 285 |
| Montana. | 1,709 | 402 | 2,111 |
| Idaho. | $\cdot 138$ | 1 | 139 |
| Hyoming. | 273 | 151 | 424 |
| Colorado. | 254 | 410 | 664 |
| New Mexico. | 1,042 | 308 | 1,350 |
| Arizona | 0 | 46 | 46 |
| Utah. | 65 | 4 | 69 |
| Nevada. | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Mountain. | 3,481 | 1,325 | 4,806 |
| Washington. | 241 | 9 | 250 |
| Oregon.... | 239 | 102 | 341 |
| California. | 0 | 22 | 22 |
| Pacific. | 480 | 133 | 613 |
| United States. | 8,676 | 2,623 | 11,299 |

[^30]TABLE 13.--Land utilization land in National Forests, National Grasslands, and other areas administered by the Forest Service as of june 30, $1964^{1}$

| State and region | National Forests | National Grasslands | Other areas | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1,000 acres | 1,000 acres | 1,000 acres | 1,000 acres |
| Maine. | 0 | 0 | $\left({ }^{2}\right)$ | ${ }^{2}$ ) |
| New Hampshire. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Vermont. ..... | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| - Massachusetts. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rhode Island. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Connecticut.. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| New York. | 0 | 0 | 14 | 14 |
| New Jersey. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pennsylvania. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Delaware..... | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Maryland. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dist. Of Columbia. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Northeast. | 0 | 0 | 14 | 14 |
| Michigan. | 1 | 0 | 7 | 8 |
| Wisconsin. | 15 | 0 | 1 | 16 |
| Minnesota.. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lake States.. | 16 | 0 | 8 | 24 |
| Ohio. . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Indiana. | (2) | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Illinois. | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Iowa. | 0 | 0 | $\left({ }^{2}\right)$ | ${ }^{2}$ ) |
| Missouri. | 3 | 0 | 13 | 16 |
| Corn Belt.... | 13 | 0 | 16 | 29 |
| North Dakota. | 0 | 1,105 | 0 | 1,105 |
| South Dakota. | 0 | 864 | 3 | 867 |
| Nebraska. . | 40 | 94 | 0 | 134 |
| Kansas. | 0 | 107 | 0 | 107 |
| Northern Plains.. | 40 | 2,170 | 3 | 2,213 |
| Virginia........... | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| West Virginia. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| North Carolina. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kentucky. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tennessee. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Appalachian.. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| South Carolina. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Georgia.... | 153 | 0 | 9 | 162 |
| Florida.. | 262 | 0 | 0 | 262 |
| Alabama. | 97 | 0 | 0 | 97 |
| Southeast........... | 512 | 0 | 9 | 521 |

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 13.--Land utilization land in National Forests, National Grasslands, and cther areas administered by the Forest Service as of June 30 , $1964^{1}$--iontinued

| State and region | National Forests | National Grasslands | Other areas | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1,000 acres | 1,000 acres | 1,000 acres | 1,000 acres |
| Mississippi.. | 85 | 0 | 0 | 85 |
| Arkansas. | 161 | 0 | 0 | 161 |
| Louisiana. | 31 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| Delta States | 277 | 0 | 0 | 277 |
| Oklahoma. | 35 | 47 | 0 | 82 |
| Texas. | 0 | 117 | 0 | 117 |
| Southern Plains.. | 35 | 164 | 0 | 199 |
| Montana. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Idaho.. | 4 | 48 | 0 | 52 |
| Wyoming. | 0 | 573 | 0 | 573 |
| Colorado. | 11 | 612 | 1 | 624 |
| New Mexico. | 215 | 134 | 89 | 438 |
| Arizona. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Utah. | 43 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| Nevada. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mountain. . | 273 | 1,367 | 90 | 1,730 |
| Washington. . | 220 | 0 | 1 | 221 |
| Oregon. . | 74 | 103 | 0 | 177 |
| California. | 0 | 0 | 19 | 19 |
| Pacific. | 294 | 103 | 20 | 417 |
| United States. | 1,460 | 3,804 | 161 | 5,425 |

[^31]TABLE 14.--Federal Grazing District areas, National Parks, National Wildlife Refuges, and Indian Land units formed from land utilization projects under administration of agencies of the U.S. Department of the Interior

| State and region | Federal grazing district areas ${ }^{1}$ | National wildife refuges ${ }^{2}$ | National Parks ${ }^{2}$ | Indian lands ${ }^{2}$ | Total acreage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1,000 acres | 1,000 acres | 1,000 acres | 1,000 acres | 1,000 acres |
| Maine............. | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| New Hampshire..... | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Vermont. . . . . . . . . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Massachusetts. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rhode Island...... | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Connecticut. . . . . . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| New York.......... | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| New Jersey........ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pennsylvania...... | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Delaware.......... | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Maryland. . . . . . . . | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| Dist. of Columbia. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Northeast. . . . . . | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 |
| -Michigan. . . . . . . . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Wisconsin. | 0 | 97 | 0 | 39 | 137 |
| Minnesota......... | 0 | 82 | 0 | 29 | 110 |
| Lake States..... | 0 | 179 | 0 | 72 | 251 |
| Ohio.............. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Indiana. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Illinois. | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Iowa. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Missouri. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Corn Belt....... | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| North Dakota. . . . . | 0 | 4 | 45 | 12 | 61 |
| South Dakota...... | 0 | 0 | 45 | 114 | 159 |
| Nebraska. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kansas. | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | (3) |
| Northern Plains. | (3) | 4 | 90 | 126 | 220 |
| Virginia.......... | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 21 |
| West Virginia..... | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| North Carolina.... | 0 | 6 | 10 | 0 | 16 |
| Kentucky. . . . . . . . . | 0 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 47 |
| Tennessee......... | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Appalachian..... | 0 | 53 | 31 | 0 | 84 |
| South Carolina.... | 0 | 89 | 4 | 0 | 93 |
| Georgia........... | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| Florida........... | 0 | 23 | 0 | 27 | 50 |
| Alabama. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Southeast. . . . . . | 0 | 140 | 4 | 27 | 171 |

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 14.--Federal Grazing District areas, National Parks, National Wildife Refuges, and Indian Land units formed from land utilization projects under administration of agencies of the U.S. Department of the Interior--Continued

| State and region | Federal grazing district areas ${ }^{1}$ | National wildife refuges ${ }^{2}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { National } \\ & \text { Parks }^{2} \end{aligned}$ | Indian 1ands ${ }^{2}$ | Total <br> acreage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1,000 acres | 1,000 acres | 1,000 acres | 1,000 acres | 1,000 acres |
| Mississippi. | 0 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| Arkansas... | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Louisiana. | 0 | 162 | 0 | 0 | 162 |
| Delta States. | 0 | 200 | 0 | 0 | 200 |
| Oklahoma. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 19 |
| Texas. | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Southern Plains. | 0 | 8 | 0 | 19 | 27 |
| Montana. | 1,925 | 19 | 0 | 120 | 2,064 |
| Idaho. | 73 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 81 |
| Wyoming. | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Colorado. | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| New Mexico. | 233 | 0 | 2 | 637 | 872 |
| Arizona. | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| Utah. | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Nevada. | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Mountain. . . . . . . . | 2,354 | 19 | 2 | 765 | 3,140 |
| Washington.......... | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| Oregon.. | 95 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 96 |
| California.......... | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Pacific........... | 95 | 32 | 0 | 1 | 128 |
| United States... | 2,449 | 667 | 139 | 1,010 | 4,265 |

${ }^{2}$ Land utilization project acreage reported in 1964 by the Bureau of Land Management as administered in Federal Grazing District Areas.
${ }^{2}$ From reports and tables, Fish and Wildife Service, National Park Service, and Indian Service, 1961.
${ }^{3}$ Kansas, 80 acres.

TABLE 15. - Grants and sales of land utilization project lands to State and local agencies, 1954-1961

| State and region | Grants | Sales | Total acreage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| . | 1,000 acres | 1,000 acres | 1,000 acres |
| Maine. | 17 | 0 | 17 |
| New Hampshire. | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Vermont....... | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Massachusetts | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rhode Island. | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| Connecticut. | 12 | 0 | 12 |
| New York.... | 19 | 0 | 19 |
| New Jersey. | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pennsylvania. | 41 | 0 | 41 |
| Delaware. | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| Maryland. | 45 | 0 | 45 |
| Dist. of Columbia. | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Northeast.. | 149 | 0 | 149 |
| Michigan. | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Wisconsin. | 57 | 14 | 71 |
| Minnesota. | 21 | 0 | 21 |
| Lake States....... | 79 | 14 | 93 |
| Ohio... | 38 | 0 | 38 |
| Indiana. | 14 | 0 | 14 |
| Illinois. | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Iowa.. | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Missouri. | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Corn Belt.. | 53 | 0 | 53 |
| North Dakota. . | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| South Dakota. | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Nebraska. | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kansas... | ( ${ }^{2}$ ) | 0 | ( ${ }^{2}$ ) |
| Northern Plains. | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Virginia..... | 40 | 0 | 40 |
| West Virginia. | 15 | 0 | 15 |
| North Carolina. | 35 | 14 | 49 |
| Kentucky. | 27 | 0 | 27 |
| Tennessee. | 75 | 0 | 75 |
| Appalachian. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 192 | 14 | 206 |
| South Carolina.. | 56 | 0 | 56 |
| Georgia.. | 53 | 0 | 53 |
| Florida. | 185 | 114 | 299 |
| Alabama. | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Southeast..... | 294 | 114 | 408 |

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 15.--Grants and sales of land utilization project lands to State and local agencies, 1954-1961--Continued

| State and region | Grants | Sales | Total acreage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1,000 acres | 1,000 acres | 1,000 acres |
| Mississippi. | 8 | 0 | 8 |
| Arikansas.. | 2 | 46 | 48 |
| Louisiana. | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Delta States. | 10 | 46 | 56 |
| Oklahoma. | 19 | 0 | 19 |
| Texas.. | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| Southern Plains........ | 23 | 0 | 23 |
| Montana. | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Idaho. . | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wyoning. | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Colorado. | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| New Mexico. | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Arizona. | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Utah. . | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nevada. | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mountain. | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Washington. | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Oregon..... | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| California. | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pacific. | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| United States.......... | 806 | 188 | 994 |

${ }^{1}$ Record of grants and sales from Jan. 2, 1954, to May 15, 1961, to State and local agencies from acreages transferred to the Forest Service. Prior to Jan. 2, 1954, approximately 300,000 acres were transferred to State and local agencies, making a total of almost $1,300,000$ acres in 80 some projects.
${ }^{2}$ Kansas; 152 acres.

## APPENDIX B. --CHRONOLOGY OF THE LAND UTILIZATION PROGRAM ${ }^{25}$

## A. FACTORS LFADING UP TO ESTABLISHMENT OF THE PROGRAM

1. Research and reports on land utilization, 1919-1934.
2. Recognition by Congress of the problem of submarginal land by special authorization in the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1929 for the Federal Farm Board ito make investigations and reports,... including ... land utilization for agricultural purposes; reduction in acreages of unprofitable marginal lands in cultivation." 26
3. Recommendation of a program of land utilization by the National Conference of Land Utilization held in Chicago, November $1931 .{ }^{27}$
4. Recommendation for retirement of farmland unsuitable for agricultural use, by the Land Planning Committee of the National Resources Boardin its report, December 1934. ${ }^{28}$
5. Action by the Special Board of Public Works to starta Federal Land Program including proposal to offset increased production from new reclamation projects by purchase and retirement of submarginal farmlands, August 1933.
B. FIRST FUNDS FOR SUBMARGINAL LAND PURCHASE OF $\$ 25,000,000$ ALLOTTED BY THE PRESIDENT TO FEDERAL SURPLUS RELIEF CORPORATION, DECEMBER 1933.
C. PROGFAM UNDER FEDERAL EMERGENCY RELIEF ANDAGRICULTURALADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATIONS, 1934-35.
6. Funds transferred February 1934 by Special Board of Public Works from Federal Surplus Relief Corporation to Federal Emergency Relief Administration.
7. Policies and procedures outlined in Federal Surplus Relief Corporation Resolution of January 1934.
8. Submarginal Land Committee representing the Federal Emergency Relief Administration and the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture, including the Land Policy Section of Agricultural Adjustment Administration, assigned overall direction of the program from February to July 1934.
9. State Rural Rehabilitation Corporations given responsibility for resettlement of families, May 1934.
10. Procedure and policies realigned under Director of the Land Program, appointed by Federal Emergency Relief Administration, July 1934.
11. Special board for public works accepted program of projects outlined by the Director of the Land Program, July 1934.
12. Drought relief funds totaling $\$ 53,390,000$ made available to The Land Program, August 1934.
13. Major part of drought relief funds allotted for land purchase and development withdrawn for relief purposes, March 1935.
14. In certain States, withdrawal from homesteading or disposal of all public domain lands for classification, February 1935.
15. Federal Emergency Relief Administration Administrator given authority by President to purchase and administer certain property, March 1935.
16. Emergency Relief Appropriation Act authorized President to acquire real property approved April 1935.

[^32]12. Authority given the President to allot funds from emergency relief appropriations to purchase and develop submarginal lands for public purposes, August 1935. (Sec. 55, PL 320, 74th Congress.)
D. PṘOGRAM UNDER RESETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION ${ }^{29}$

1. Resettlement Administration established, by Executive Order, April 1935.
2. The land utilization program transferred to the Resettlement Administration, with an initial allotment of $\$ 48$ million dollars for land purchase and $\$ 18$ million dollars to employ labor for development, April 1935.
3. Land Utilization Division of Resettlement Administrationgivenimmediatedirection of program, April 1935.
4. Reassignment of planning and acquisition of land for resettlement of families on submarginal lands from Land Utilization Division to Resettlement Division, November 1935.
5. Withdrawal, March 1935, of $\$ 50,000,000$ of drought-relief-allotted funds delayed land acquisition--and opened door to early criticism of program. Development of projects restärted later by allotment of $\$ 40,391,676$ for employment of relief labor.
6. Memorandum of Understanding with the Department of the Interior: Public Domain Lands in LU Projects, October 1935.
7. Memorandum of Understanding with Office of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior: Administration of Indian Projects (including final disposition made of such projects), October 1936 to September 1939.
8. Recreational demonstration projects transferred to National ParkService, November 1936.
9. Wildlife projects transferred to the Fish and Wildife Service (formerly the Biological Survey) prior to and after November 1936.
10. Logjam in payment of vendors finally broken, April to November 1936.
11. Resettlement Administration transferred to Department of Agriculture, December 1936.
12. Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act enacted by Congress, July 1937.
13. Appropriation of $\$ 10$ million for fiscal year ending June 1938 , and not to exceed $\$ 20$ million for each of 2 fiscal years thereafter, was authorized by the BankheadJones Farm Tenant Act, to effectuate the land utilization program, as redirected by the Act.
14. Name of Resettlement Administration changed to Farm Security Administration, September 1937, with assignment of responsibility for resettlement and tenant purchase programs under Titles I, II, and IV of Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.
E. LAND UTILIZATION PROGRAM UNDER BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS, September 1937.
15. Transfer of land utilization program to Bureau of Agricultural Economics, authorized by Secretary of Agriculture, September 1937.
16. Departmental policies for land utilization program under Title III of the BankheadJones Farm Tenant Act outlined by Secretary, September 1937
17. Organization under Bureau of Agricultural Economics, September 1937.
18. Lands acquired under emergency program transferred to Title LI Prograrn, June 1938.
19. The Farm Security Administration's part in program from September 1937 to July 1938.
(a) Memorandum of Understanding between Farm Security Administration and Bureau of Agricultural Economics as to responsibilities for land utilization, September 1937.

[^33](b) Memorandum of Agreement between Bureau of Agricultural Economics and Farm Security Administration for relocation of families on land utilization projects, February 1938.
(c) Transfer of program to Bureau of Agricultural Economics completed, July 1938.
(d) Memorandum of Agreement between Bureau of Agricultural Economics and Farm Security Administration for assistance to families on projects established under Title III, July 1938.
F. PROGRAM UNDER SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE, October 1938 to December 1953.

1. Secretary of Agriculture authorizes transfer of program to Soil Conservation Service, October 1938.
2. Organization under Soil Conservation Service from November 1938 to May 1942.
3. Statement of objectives, policies and management of the Soil Conservation Service.
G. PROGRAM UNDER FOREST SERVICE, January 1954 to December 1964.
4. Transfer of program to Forest Service authorized by Secretary of Agriculture, effective January 1954.
5. Disposal of lands acquired under Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act: (a) Assignments, sales, and transfers prior to January 2, 1954.
(b) Assignments, sales, and transfers on and after January 2, 1954.
6. Management and use of land utilization program lands.

## APPENDIX C. --LAND UTILIZATION PROJECT WORK UNITS COMPLETED AND IN PROGRESS FOR SELECTED JOBS OF LAND IM PROVEMENTS, JUNE 30, 1938

| I tem | Unit | iobs |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Completed | In progress | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Administration buildings... | Number | 80 | 25 | 105 |
| Sarns....................... | do. | 46 | 15 | 61 |
| Bathhouses. | do. | 25 | 9 | 34 |
| Bridges. | do. | 902 | 728 | 1,630 |
| Cabins.. | do. | 170 | 88 | 258 |
| Corrals. | do. | 212 | 42 | 253 |
| Dipping vats. | do. | 17 | 14 | 31 |
| Dwellings... | do. | 78 | 24 | 102 |
| Fences... | Miles | 9,343 | 1,115 | 10,458 |
| Carages... | Number | 68 | 27 | 95 |
| Impounding dams. | do. | 1,575 | 331 | 1,906 |
| Latrines....... | do. | 254 | 220 | 474 |
| Lodges... | do. | 6 | 7 | 13 |
| Miscellaneous buildings. | do. | 358 | 209 | 567 |
| Power lines............. | Miles | 515 | 49 | 564 |
| Sewerage systems | Number | 117 | 74 | 191 |
| Shel ters........ | do. | 285 | 91 | 376 |
| Water systems. | do. | 431 | 504 | 935 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Road construction | do. | 1,657 | 1,608 | 3,265 |
| Telephone lines.. | do. | 1,193 | 1,777 | 2,970 |
| Truck trails... | do. | 1,371 | 2,551 | 3,922 |
| Other trails. | do. | 577 | 219 | 796 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Clearing land........ | Acres | 76,661 | 25,027 2,720 | 101,688 3,653 |
| Removal of farmsteads | Number | 933 | 2,720 51,136 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,653 \\ 104,405 \end{array}$ |
| Seeding..... | Acres | 53,269 | 51,136 | 104,405 |
| Erosion control: |  |  |  |  |
| Dikes and levees. | Cubic yd. | 117,451 | 94,918 | 212,369 |
| Najor check dams.......... | Number | 234,219 | 16,113 | 250,332 |
| Terracing................. | Miles | 1,050 | 1,665 | 2,715 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Firebreaks....... | Miles | 3,498 | 3,285 | 6,783 |
| Fire hazard reduction..... | Acres | 176,194 | 93,000 | 269,194 |
| Forest stand improvement. . . | do. | 229,414 | 134,185 | 363, 599 |
| Lookout towers.............. | Number | 108 | 19 22 |  |
| Nurseries.... | do. | 33 33,872 | 84,772 | 118,644 |
| Wildife: |  |  |  |  |
| Biological conditioning. | Acres | 213,609 | 9,583 | 223,192 |
| Fish-rearing ponds...... | Number | 113 | 83 | 40, 196 |
| Food and cover planting. | Acres | 18,433 | 22,428 | 40,861 |
| Game farms.................. | Number | 40 | 17 | 57 |

[^34]
## APPENDIX D
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THE NATIONAL GRASSLANDS:
ORIGIN ANI) DEVELOPMENT

## IN TIIE DUST BOWL

On 20 June 1960, the U.S. Department of Agriculture created nineteen National Grasslands from twenty-two land utilization projects in eleven western states. Those National Grasslands included four which were located in the most severely wind-eroded area of the Great Plains known as the Dust Bowl (see lig. 1). At that time the Mills project in New Mexico, the Morton County project in Kansas, the Cimarron project in Oklahoma, the Dallam County project in Texas, and the Southeastern and Southern Otero projects in Colorado became respectively the Kiowa, Cimarron, Rita Blanca, and Comanche National Grasslands. Each land utilization project had been part of the Roosevelt Administration's national soil conservation program during the 1930s - a program that was specifically designed to restore severely eroded lands such as those found in the Dust Bowl. There, drought, crop fallure, overgrazing, soil structure, and the prevailing winds had contributcd to the most serious wind erosion problem in the nation by 1932.'

As wind erosion incteased on the Great Plains during the early 1930s, the interests of the social scientists who championed the need to remove submarginal lands from cultivation, also intensified. If the most severely eroded lands could be removed from cultivation and restored to grass and the blowing rangeland reseeded, New Dealers argued, the soil could be stabilized, the dust storms ended, and the land returned to a grazing economy with the federal government dictating the best conservation practices. The development of the land utilization projects in the Dust Bowl would be the supreme test of the tederal government to
$K$ Dene, as liokt is Associate Edior of Timeline. Ohio Historical Suciety. Columbus, Ohie)

Priderul Regaver. 24 Juac 1960; R. Douglas Hist, The Duv Bowd An Atriculturud and Bum ial thetary (Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1981), 33; "National (;rasslands Established." fournal "/ Firrestry 58 (Augusi 1960): 679: Kcith A. Argow, "Our National Criasslands: Dusiland to


: hiceve those groals in the Great Plans where soil erosion had becone a major economic and social problem.

Pans to remove submanginal farmlands from cultivation. however, did uot begin with the dust stoms. Since the early 1920s, social scienrists liad been stulying land utilization in relation to productivity and soil conservation. In 1929 the Agriculcural Marketing Act enabled the federal farm Board to analyze the suitability of removing marginal linds from cultivation. Two years later, delegates from land-grant colleges. ferleral agencies, and farm organizations met at the National Conference on l.and Uilization in Chicago where they wiged the fedcral purchase of submarginal lands. That conference led to the organisatton of the National Land Use Planning Commaitlee in 1932. This (ombittee studied tand-use problems and also recommended the fedctat acquisition of submanginal famland to renove it from cultivation. F.aly in 1933, Pasident Ileabert Hoover, in support of the committees toommendations. songht Congressionalapproval for aplan that wonld anable the lederal govermment to lease submanginal tamb themey removing in from productivity. Tlee work of the National land Use Planming (ommintee contimued with the creation of the National Resources Boad on I Jume 1934. Soon thereafter, the I:and Planning Committee of the National Resources Board completed a sturly of the nation's land and water resources and issued a report outlining land-use policies that would be in the best interests of the general public. Specifically. that report called for the lederal government of formulate a long-term landnse policy that would provicle for the acquisition and removal of as mut It as $75,000.000$ acres fromentavation nationwide. ${ }^{2}$

Thus, by the time the dust beg:n to blow severely. agricultural experts. social sciemtists, and government officials had developed a "Land Progran" which sought to achieve economic adjustments through public ownership todeal with the "agricultural naladjustments" of severely croded lands. This land utilization policy would provide an "agricultural plase" (os supplement the "engincering phase" of the federal land realamation program. Pogedrer witl New Deal zeal, it also wonld provide the basis for a grand soil conservation experiment in the Dust Bowl Indeed, New Dealers believed the time was right for the federal govermment to use public finnds to purchase subinarginal lands. Most import:mely, however: New Deal social scientists based the development

 Departurant ol Agriculture, Economic Research Service, no. 85. vi.d.. 1-5: Richard S
 woul Pico. I 966 ), 39: 1 . (: Gray. "The Soctal and E.conomic laplications of the N
al I and Piogram.: fuarnal of Farm E:conomics is (May 19:36): 260 Marion Cisua (0.al'lunnong (Bathomere: The lohms Hopkins Unversity Press, 1981), 108.
and imp. mentation of land-use policy on the Inediel daat the necelven
 resented by the federal govemoment, Itad an obligation wasmat tame to use their lands wisely for the benefit of all. The famed then, did un
 ety that was obligated to oversec itsuse to guamatec future gencoatons. the inheritance of fertile fiedds rather thin croded hillsides and dust laden air. To exercise that responsibility. however, the goven moment had the obligation of providing guidelines for the proper use of the soll, and if need be, it could use its coercive power to insure that those regula tions woull be observel.'

Mose tangible mather dan theoretial development of the taml-ane programbeganon 28 December 1933, whenthe Dublic Works Admins tration (IWA) aramsterred twenty-five million dollas to the federal
 ginal lands. Afier lebraay 1934. however. pramay womibila, for the plaming and acpuisition of submarginal lands revided with the Land Policy Section of the Agricultural Adjustment Adminisn.mion (AAA) aldongh the fERA administered limancial and legal matory and hamelled resctulement under its Division of Rumal Rchatmlitaion. On 1 May 1935. President Roosevelt transterad responsibihy for lhe land utilization program to the Resettement Administation moste.mline administrative responsibility. Under the Resetlement Admimsantion, the Division of I.and Uilization assumed responsibility tor administering the work which the AAA hat begum fimisdiction. howoret. again changed on I September 1937. when the mewly acatedl:um. a. curity Administration assumed comtrol of the lamd milization projern. That authority lasted until 16 October 1938. when the Soil Comson. tion Service ( SCS ) became responsible tor alministering the laml pur chase program under Title III of the Bankhead- Jones liam Telame Io of 1937. The Soil Conservation Service continued to putichase latuds in
 gram ended except for finalacquisitions to block in amara.*




 1937): 9-10.



 chases nationwide, andonly $\$ 9.000 .000$ ivere used lor actuisimon im ine (: "'‥"

The land purchase program in the Dust Bowl had many objectives. First, the federal government planned to purchase the most severely wind eroded or "muisance lands" known as "blow hazards." Then. fedeal officials planned to halt wind erosion. (urn the land-use projects into demonstration areas where farmers could observe the best soil consorvation techniques, and eventually return the land to grazing under government management. At the same time the land purchase program would enable the federal government to consolidate the farms which worial scientists considered too small to provide an "adequate level of living." Submarginal lands. the social scientist argued. prevented tarmers from alfording the best soil conservation procedures. such as listing. terracing. and strip cropping. The farmers, whose continued occupancy was not "socially desirable." particularly those on easily blown soils in the Dust Bowl. were to be resettled on better lands elsewhere. Those who remained would be able to expand their operations by leasing the restored grasslands from the government. ${ }^{\text {s }}$

- With a land-ase policy formulated the next step wasto begin acquisiton of submarginal lands. In order to do so. government officials first identified "problem" areas in the Dust Bowl where wind erosion was severe. Next. they completed a preliminary study of the area which detailed the economic and social characteristics of the residents. identified soil types. determined the area's best agricultural use noted local opinion about the project and estimated restoration costs. The preliminary plans also designated project boundaries. When the Secretary of Agriculture a pproved the preliminary plans, agency funds became available for land purchase. Officials then compiled records such as the landowner's mame. legal description of the tract, and mongage, tax. and lien informanion. Employees at the regional oflices recommended specilic wacts for purchase which they then mapped and appraised. Negotiations for purchase begain. and the government took options for the land. Upon federal acceptance, the option becanc a land purchase contrat. When the Atorney Gencrat's office approved the tansation. it sent a voucher to the Freasury Department which issued a check. Fi-
 awrence to W.M. Kussell. 29 December 1936. I.U-CO-4. National Archives, Record Cioup IIt (hercafier all inanuscript citations are froin Soil Conservation service. Land Acpuistion fïles. National Archives. Record Group 114): Gr:y. "Social and Economic Im plications," 267-69: Ralph F. Wilcox to James M. Ciay. 12 A ugust 1938, I.U-OK-21: Derelopment Plan for Southern Otero County I.and Readjustment Project. n.d.. I.U.CO-4 Wooten. The l.and Utilization Program. 6: Mills Land Use Adjustment Project. New Mexico Proposil A-4. Final Plan 15 May 1935. I.L-NM-5: I.. C. Gray to Hon. B. W. Gerhart. 20 June 1935. I.U-NM-5: C. F. Clayton. "Prograin of the Federal Government for the Purchase and Use of Subnarginal Land " Joumalof Farm Economicr 17 (A ugust 1935): 58.
nally, check and deed were exchanged. or if necossary, fund were dis bursed to satisfy outstanding debts or liens.

Although the government was prepared to use the power ol cminent domain to actuire needed lands. it was not willing to exercise that anthority in the Dust Bowl. Court ordered sales, officials realized, would have caused adverse publicity and alienated residents. Instead, an ap praiser inspected the lands, consulted with cattemen, fanmers and , ,th ers. and based his valuation on the land's productivity as gramel land. desirability. and comparable sales. The appraised value of impone ments depended upon their condition and meplacement ossts. Where mortgages exceeded appraised land values. the AAA asked the liederal Land Bank and other lending agencies to renegotiate mortgages so that the owners would receive at least some equity. Upon iuthorization, the appraiser negotiated a selling price with the owner. (tivics, newothe less. charged that the federal govermment was attempting to conto famers into leaving the region and that appraiscos were incomperont Federal oflicials argned in turn that all sates were vohmany and that the appraisers were knowledgeable and capable of handling the tash at hand. Moreover, if appraisers determined that certain lands willin a purchase area were worth inore in crops than ing grass, the ledetal pow ermment was not interested in acquining those lands. Hestcat, agenc) officials preferred for the farmers to remain on the land. Pan of the problem was, of course that Dust Bowl lands were worth far less dua ing times of drought and severe wind erosion than in theses of nomal on above normal precipitation. Invariably. landowners hoped tor hafis 1920s prices rather than depressed Dust Bowl valataioms.'

If a considerable umber of tracts were not optioucd, as wistie a are
 higher prices or where school tands were havaly mongaged. pelm makers instructed project managers wo submit plams for supple meon.al land purchases. By expanding the project area offictah hoped that os toration could proceed withont delay as well as parven the profed hom

 tion 26. (August 1942). 5-7, 0-12
 sis of the I.and Acquistion Program." 7-8: A. G. Black. Memorandum for the Seratily of Agriculure. 7 April 19:38. IU-OK-21: A. G. Black. Meınorandum for the Secretury of Agriculture. \$1 Angust 1938. I.U-CO-4: Wooten. The I.and thatuation Programe, 7. Nomm.an G. Fuiler to I..C. Gray. I8 October 1937. LU-CO-4: Sonthern Oucro Commy 1 and Us Adjustment Project, 20 February 1935. I.U.CO-4: New Mexicu Sulanarginal Laud P'u chase Project Proposal A-4. 10 June 1935. L.U-NM-5: Petition from Otero (iounty w die Agricultural Adjustment Administration. 23 April 1935 : 1.U.C.O. 4
being placed in jeopardy. The private lands interspersed in the purdiase area could be purchased later if owners changed their minds and if funds were available. In the meantime, privately held lands were to be organized into soil conservation districts. so the appropriate conservation procedures conld be applied to both public and private lands within the are:a of the land utilization project."
local merchants also criticized the land utilization projects. They feared that any loss of residents would irreparably damage their businesses. Still others objected to the federal land purchase program because it would ruin the tax base. In Morton County, Kansas. for example, the ne:lrly 107.000 acres purchased represented 20 percent of the tixable land in the county and 9 percent of the tax:able valtation. In lour of the live townships involved in the land-use area, the tax bases weve reduced from 2 to 14 percent. One township lose 65 percent of its tixable acreage and 50 percent of its tax base. In 1936 revenue losses were approximately $\$ 7.000$. Two years later, federal purchases on the Mills project in New Mexico reduced the tax base for the school district by 17 percent. Federal economists expected future grazing revenues to cover only 50 percent of the lost taxes. The land-use projects. however. reduced the need for public services and helped consolidate schools and close roads, thereby offsetting some of the tax losses incurred by the local governments. Moreover. tax delinquencies were so high in the purchase areas that the immediate tax loss was not great. Eventually, policymakers hoped. income from the reestablished grazing areas woukd bring the connties more revente than had been collected when taxes were paid. In 1937 the problem of tax losses was lessened when Title III of the B:akhead-jones Farm Tenant Act required the federal government to teturn 25 percent of the revenucs earned on project lands to the counties for the maintenance of schools and roads. This provision lessened opposition to the land purchase program from local government. ${ }^{9}$

Some Dust Bowl landowners objected to the land-use program, because land sale payments that they had been promised were slow in arriving. Invariably, those who optioned lands wanted payment imme-

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { A 6. Black, Memorandum tor the Sectelary of Agricutare, } 7 \text { April 1938. 1.U.(OK-21 }
\end{aligned}
$$

Siray. 12 August 1938, I.U-OK-21: A.W.K. w L.C. Gray, n.d., I.U.CO-4: A.G. Black
Memorandum for the Secretary of Agriculture, 31 Augusi 1938. I.U-CO-4.
"(iray. "Soctial and Economic Implications," 266, 272: Wooten. The Land Utilization Pro
6'un. 23-25. Contidential Reportio M. M. Kelso on Effects of Mills Project I.U-NM-5, on
i.ocal Public Finance. Together with Analysis of Local Sentiment Periaining Thereto. 8
Apil 1938. 1.U.NM-5: Clayton. "Program of the Federal Ciovermment lor the Purchase hare Proged Propenal A-4, 10 bambary 1935, 1. 1 . NM -5
diately to lielp meet financiad obligations during those dust haden, in pression years. Bure:ncratic procednres, however, wathly pmentred payment for more than a year. This lag naturally foscewd dismont.d tion with the program. After 1938 with the return of meatronmal pue cipitation. more famers and ranchers began opposmg dre land pur chase program. The return of adequate lamitall cansed die grass atid the crops to grow and portended profitable returns once again foom their lands. With new vegetation holding the sombluring the cimly sping "blow months." the land purchase program became less antractive than when the "black blizzards" had swept across the land only a few ve:an earlier: Nevertheless. as long as the dust blew, moss residenes in the "blow hazavd" area of the sonthern Gecal Plans suppotled the federat government's land-use program. ${ }^{10}$

In spite of these problems and objections, the lamd-use progran in the Dust Bowl became a grand experiment for the federal gowetmant and particularly for the Soil Conservation Service. A soil conservation project on such a large scale was unprecedented. At firss, lew people were certain about how best to restore the wind-croded lands wigtas Both corrective and preventive soil erosion procedures deaty wors needed, but no one was certain which techniques would work beat While some soil conservationists believed the lands shombd be allowed or reseed naturally, no one knew how long the process would tioke. Eisn mates ranged from twenty-five to forty years depending on die length wh time the land hat been cultivated or grazed, ammal precipitaton, and the proximity of seed grasslands and blowing fielils. More specd. how ever: was necded. and the Soil Conservation Senvice soon insuthed . technical program to stabilize blowing lands."

At first. the SCS listed the blow lands" so that decp tumows womld catch as much soiland hold as much moisture as possible. The Se S. atoo planted drought resistant cover crops. such as black amber ance and sudan grass, to reduce wind velocity at gromend level and theroby lald moving soil. Ustally, the SCS fonthed that it needed or list atid plame winderoded croplands two or three tines before the soil stopped nowing with the wind. During this time. the SCS hoped that ivecds would quickly cover the land. Indeed, the key to stabilizing the soil was for coves it with vegetation of some sott. In the absence of the best granses, the SCS utilized weeds, such as the Russian thistle, to loold the soil rather
${ }^{10}$ Gray. "Social and F.conomic hoplications." 264-65: D. R. W. Wugner-Smith In I It Hauter. 5 Octoler 1935. I.U-NM-5: Albuquerque journal. \& Octoler 1935: Kiv R.c.u.d (Kus




than to let it main barren and exposed to the wind. Still. even tempoary stabilization took time. The SCS did not give major attention to permanemt stabilization by planting native grasses on project lands unments such as fences and buildings from the acquired lands and erected new fences, laid cattle guards, and built farm ponds. During the course of project development. owners and relief workers were hired with Works Progress Administration, Public Works Administration, and Ti the Ilt funds."

While the $S(S$ worked to stabilize the soil. it also began experiments to determine the best grass varieties for reseeding the land purchase areas. It the beginning. the agency did not know whicli sceds or seed hed preparation methods were most sutable for the Just Bowl. Consequenty, with the aid of state experiment stations the SCS cominenced trial plantings at selected sites to determine the best techniques. Soil cientists experimented with seeding both sandy and hard lands. From those experinents, they learned that sorghums. mowed at a height of twelve inches with the clippings left on the ground. provided the best over crops for newly seeded grasses. The amount of seed needed de pended upon germination, natural reseeding, planting methods, and seed varieties. Test plots on the Morton County project indicated that blue grama. sand love grass, side-oats grama. little bluestem. and sand bluestem were the most suitable varieties for sandy areas. Blue grama, side-oats grama. and buffalo grass were best for hard lands. Serious shortages of litte bluestem. sand bluestion, and side-oats grama dictated, however, that more than 75 percent of the seeding mixtures for both sandy and hard soils be composed of blie grama, buflalo, and sand love grasses. Cirass varieties. however, differed even within the Bust Bowl. Blue granna. crested wheat grass, western wheat grass, and (;alleta, for example, were the best varieties for eastern New Mexico. (;rain drills with double disk furrow openers planted the seeds about one inch deep. Some grass seeds were broadcast: that is. dropped at
"Geonge $S$ Alwood, "Holory ol the Cumarton National (inasstand" (Unpubtishat man-

 Range Management 6 (February 1953): 45; D. A. Savage. "Grass Culture and Range Improvement in the Ceniral and Soulhern Greal Plains." U.S. Depariment of Agriculture, Cirrular $19!$ (February 1939). 4-5; I. H. Hauler 1o W. W. Alexander, 30 June 1937. LU-
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ercet permanent corrals or limit the gr:zing areas by placing salt acar water holes. Individual livestockmen or grazing associations also were responsible for the maintenance of fences and ponds. By 1943 the Morton (onmy project, for example. had sufficient precipitation and new grass to enable the SC.S to grant local cattemen permits. The following Year: the Morton Comity Grazing Association was organized to rent the grassiands for a portion of the year. Some federal officials hoped that in tine these leases would pay for the projects. They estintited that the Mills project would be self-liquidating in fonteen years, while lands in B:a: Combly on the Southeastern Colorado project would seturn a prolit intentofitteen years.s
In retrospect, the federal tand-use adjustment projects in the Dust Bowl did not involve the permanent removal of land from agriculture. Rather: the projects fostered a change or readjustment in agriculture on those lands froin crop production and exploitative grazing to controlled livestock-raising and sound range management practices. Certainly, the federal government never intended to remove all Dust Bowl land from cultivation. That task would have been impractical given the tegionis settement patterins and climatic and soil characteristics. and because the removal of larger land blocks would have been a financial impossibility. Finding was always less than had been requested or needed, and projects usually were ieduced in seope due to monetary shortages. Reseeding sometimes stopped altogether as fiunds were exhausted. In addition. development work continually lagged becamse payments for optioned lands took time to process. Frequently options expired and authorties did not have the power to renew thein. Moreover, the emergency relief legistation. which financed the projects prior to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. mandated hiring the unemployed. The SCS. however. intended to employ resident operators both to speed the work and also to streamline the burenucracy involved. I.andowners h:d their own teans. Itactors, and grain drills: relief workers did not. This necessitated the acquisition of expensive equipment from other sources. PWA funds. however. could be spent only for heavy equipment or for the construction of dimns. In addition, the administrative tansfer of responsibility anong five agencies hindered project development. At best, the federal govermment hoped the land-use projects would show farmers and cattlementhe best soilcon-
"Range management Plan. Southern Otero Project, 12 Angust 1937. I.U- CO.4: Proposed Regulations for the Administration of the Grazing Lands Under Control of the Mills 1 and Project, sa, April, 1937, 1.U-NM-5: Arwood. "History of the Cimarron Nationtal (Crassland." ${ }^{4} 4-35$. Mills, Land Use Adjustment Project Conditions Justifying the Acpuisition of the Land and tle Execulion of the Developtnem Proposal. I5 Seprember Acpusition of the Land and the Execution of the Deveropmend proposial. I5 sepuember 1pplement Southeastern (.olorado Land (.itzation
servition practices possible and bedp discomage "speatalue misuse" of the land by nonresidents. ${ }^{16}$

The greatest problem. however: of the land-use adjustment phoject,m the Dust Bowl involved the resettement program. Otiginally, polic, makers had intended to relocate families elsewhere in "subsisternce homestead communities." I andowners on the Morton (ionnty propat. for example, were to be resedted on the Mississippidelta. Mills poojor farmers were to be relocaned on the Storrie project near I as Víg.s. New Mexico. or on the Midalle Rio Gande Comseriany y boject m the Kio Grande Valley. Later plams called for their resellement on state lamh near L.os I.unas of in the Fort Sumer hrigation Distrit in New Mexion. Frequent changes in procedure. lack of ckearly defined objectives. del.as in optioning and paying for land. and bandequate funds and ate.s) lon resetulement plagued the resetulement progrann. Adelitionally. lew people were willing to sell their bands and to resette when they did not knem where they would be sent or how their relocation would be lintancel. As at result. lew Dust Bowl fimmers chose to resente on oiler fedenal tands and instead used their moncy either to move to neanhy towns or wiccotablah themselves on lams of the ir own choosing. As a hamamitatian pogram designed to inprove the standird of living anong those who sold then lands by relocating them on better fanms. the resettranemportionol the land utilization program wats a linilue."

 not residem farmers struggling to grow crops on too few actes in a drought-stricken land Indeed. from Jamany 1938 though fane 19.41 the ferleral governmem purchased only 1.827 tracts totaling $5 x 1.696$ acres in the southern Great Plains. most of which were in the Dust Bowl Those lands included 249,268 acres in cropland :mad 3:3.4.428 acce in rangetand for 42.9 and 57.1 percent of the total are: respectively. Ond

 25 May 1939. Amarillo Kegionall Reconds of the Projet Plans Dumom. I936-1941.




"Wooten. The Laved C'alization Pragram. 22: New Mexico Submarginal I.and Fiuc lione Projeci Proposal A-4. 10 Jancuary 1935. IU-NM-5: Thomas K. Borlind io C. F. Chatom, It May 1936. L.U-NM-5: Norinan G. Fuller to P. V. Cardon. 23 April 1935. I.U.(: ( $)-\mathrm{A}: \mathrm{L}$.andi, The Probable Social Effects of Parchasing Submarginal 1 and ${ }^{*} 516$. Only I sia 24.148 families who sold their lands nationwide were reseuled on federaituadsoluand

 (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Pless, 1979). I50-51
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 tember 1983. the acreages for the Dusi Bowl National Girassifids were: coinanchi
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29.3 percent of those lands were in use at the time of purchase, while 49 percent were abandoned and 21.7 percent elassified as "partially idle or abandoned." Resident owners occupied only 6.7 pereent of the purchased acreage, while tenants occupied 10 percent of the tracts leaving 83. I percent unoccupied. Clearly, the SCS did not force a host of landowners off their farms. Moreover, the 581,696 acres which the SCS had purchased by mid-194l had been appraised at $\$ 1,892,251$. Of that
 $\$ 3.12$ per acre. With subsurface rights included, the appraised value averaged $\$ 3.72$ per acre. Although the price per acre was low when compared to valaations based on use daring times of normal precipitation, Dist bowd landowners were the only ones to receive more than the average assessed value per acre. On the other land milization projects, prices averaged \$.13 per acre below the appraised value. ${ }^{\text {ts }}$

Ulimatcly, the Soil Conservation Service achicved success with the remm of near normal precipitation during the late 1930s and early 1940s. Even so, the work of the SCS was important. The listing, terracing, furrowing, strip cropping, and artificial reseeding activities of the agency were instrumental in helping to stabilize the most severely wind-
 tentially hazandous lands offered soil conservationists the opportumity to condact experiments free from the host of agreements, regulations, and paperwork associated with private landownership. ${ }^{19}$

The land-use projects were not the panacea capable of solving all of the regional, economic, social, and erosion problems that many New Deal social scientists had hoped. As part of a broad soil conservation program in the Dust Bowl, however, the land-use projects contributed
 wind crosion and restoring a sound agricultural base in the sonthern Gicat Plains. In addition, the land-use projects, together with the creation of soil conservation districts, helped to enstre the best conservation and land-use on both lederal and private lands following the return of normal precipitation to the Dust Bowl.
 conservation work on the Dust Bowl land utilization projects until the catly 1950s, when jurisdiction lor the projects once again changed. On 2 November 1953. Eza Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculure, transferred the land utilization projects from the Soil Conservation Service
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## APPENDIX E


（e）Action on：－Unjess the Commistor acts upon the application for retearase Withun enirty days alter it is Bled．such polkcation shall be deemed to have been denled．
2．In 84.50 change＂quadrupieste＂in the first paragraph to read＂sextuple＂ Also delete the sentence reading－Ex－ mbits shall be certioled in sceordance with $\{131$
3．In 4.60 change＂three copies＂to resd＂five copies＂．
4．In $\$ 4.70$ change＂quadruplicate＂in the first parasraph to read＂sextuple
5．In $\$ 5.1$ change＂Quadruplicate＂to read＂sextuple＂．And change＂the Com－ raistion＇s rules＇ 20 read＂this chapter＂
6．In 131.2 delete the parenthetical instruction indicatine the number of coples to be fied．Chanfe them 9 in the form set out in the scction to read as follows：
－The proposed Initlal and ultumate senerse of development tor the project is as followe：（See \｛4．N（ h ））

7．In $: 1313$ delete the percrithetical finstruction indicating the cumber of coples to be tiod
8．In $\$ 1315$ delete the ps：enthet：cal instruction indscateng tre number of conies to be filed Chicnat ikm 3 in the form set out in the section to read：
8．The transmisetion bat wait e．sery phout ．．．．．．kwh of byarwelearsit taesgy in at source of supply to ．．．．．．．．．．．．．the poart of delivery：ant ．．．．．．．．．knh of ：nco－piu！ect energy th the same the oppoijet difec． tion．The project energy wita be ureu 105 the followtat purposes．

9．In \＄ 131.6 delete the thard sentence beginnung vith the word＂Uniess＂in the partathetical instruction paragraph in Item（2）．In item \＆（c）of the form delete the word＂other＂

10．Delete the Note．referrine to Order No．106，appended to $\$ 1316$ and lasert in lieu thereof the fodlowing：

Norz：Tap following requireraenta for the project map to be five as Exhbite $K$ are project ma
There stall bo submutted pursuapt to 154.00 and 121.8 vien reeb applucation for

Ifcrave for m minor project－harine tomialled water－Whet capucty of 100 borecpower or water－Thet capmetry of 100 boreepomer or
 10g the portion of the surams terolopea．and locethon of all esmential projeet wor he fdame． reseivolro．cobdures．powerboraer，raliraces accesy rowds．and trammianon unes）．and the arrs ocrupied by all projeot worts en ldmited by a project bouncary，ase indient－ tap State．county．metiolen．Compritip． runge．section and the smadest legal sub－ divition or numbered lot or tract．The mand shall shov the ownerthip．whether Guv－ ernomeat or privale．（or each parcel of innd ernactet or patan． andicate thether or ar the apertes 30 incicave varther of not the any reservation such es a dathonal rorert．Ladian reservielon te．
Exhibit if thall conform is the sollowiar specifications and arall show the followiag idsormation
（1）The exhiblt shall be an late dra tracing unen，not spatler traje 8 tarbes oy 10＇s ineter．accompanied by four mints thereof drawn to an approprtate ecaic of one losis cquats not mure inan 1.000 seet．
（ 2 ）The projece boundary shath be stated separatc！y for tach caciuty agd showin on the tinip The ：iumber of feet on each itue of
 ruads．Foivernouse unde．tasirace and trans mi：sson ltwes stall be at lea：t 10 feet The dislatices of the project boindaly froin bie turvey center lanee nera not be tatrisical on both sides 0 ：the center lines of the alfuc－ ti－te arer ：or at la pais ol the projeet and．in the viensist of las powernouze they that be 1．tege crongh to anow at least do teet on cach ace ui car puwercouse anc to inctiar all jap ut car purercouse ane to inctuar aid ofset：or chantes in officte with poines of change should ba defnitety decerited on tre chang：yhould be defnitety deterited on trit widp The groject woundiry inc：oniañ he With ：lated courses hisd austancer，weich line shall be not less thaj 30 iect horkiuntal mensuremeat from the ence snd frotn the inta on the domistrean she at the asm ang hot lexa than to seet outuce of a contour around the remervols estmblianed by the bieh． ese point on the asm and abuement．Th eat point on the asm and abutmene．TBe given．The project area and boundury at the given．The project area and boundmis；at the
powernouse．dame，apd reser vols enould．is necessary for clarity．be shown in an lasert sketch to a darger scale than that ueed for the rest or she profect woris．
（2）If piscucable．there shall be shown oue of pure elfe by austance acd beeting

## NOTICES

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
Bureay of Customs
［5．D． 834001
Fergergote reom Cridnd Victondh， Taiknolipas．Mexaco convict lanion goces
Opon evidence presented to me．I fund． pursuant to the provistons of 512.42 of the Customs Resulations（ 19 CF＇R 12．42）， promulgated in accordance with the au－ thonty contanad in aection 307．Tarif Act of 1930 （I9 0．8．C．1307）．that con－ het labor is used wholly or in part in the manufacture of furniture wholly or in caler value of wood in the gtate peni－ tenliary at Cludad Victoria．Iamault－ bas．Merico．
accortbagly，on and after the date of publicatson of this Anding in the weekiy

Treasury decisions．eollectors of customs shall prohibit．under the provicions of section 307．Tarif Act of 1930．the for－ portation of furniture wholly or an chire value of wood manufactured in the State penitentiary at Cudad Vicioria．Tamau－ lipas．Mexico．uniess the importer estabishes by setusiactory evidence．Is provided for in $\$ \$ 12.42$ to 12.46 ，inclusive． of the Customs Regulations．that the merchandise was not manulactured wholly or in part by convict labor．

## 〔semb C．A．Burrica．

Acting Commiseloner of Customs．
Approved：December 28． 1053.
H．CEnNEAN ROEE．
Acting Secretary of the Treasury．
\｛P．R．Doc．64－49：Miea．Jan 8．1054：
from a deflite porint or points on the peopect boxisedary whith polat or polotes cese be tiden unce on be grounc．to estaplinhed cornere of tho pubile had aures or to a mineray monumeal or other axed recogralanole objec If the hand is vosurneyea．
（4）It the project afreers uarurveyod Goo． ernmene tacda．the protractiva of rownibip and section tunt shall be shown：sueh pro－ tractions．wbatrever avallable．to be cboce recogrtised by ehe agsacy of eme Unilud seates： heving jurthatiction over ibe lande．
（5）The map sbat bent the follonatag caro ufficte disted and angned by the applleant： This map is a part or che application ser a lleenie made of the underresped ehis ．．．．．．－asy of ．．．．．．．．．．19．．．
（Neme of applicant）
11．In $\$ 131.10$ deleto the pareathet－ Ical unsuruction undicatias the aumber of con：es to be filed．Change the paren． thetical instruetion sncluded in item 8 of the foim set out in the scetion to read：
（Rere give a concise general avaripti－ of the project and the propoces ectecme dovelupment minuang an eatimate or inseailed eipacily ibld the averuge ant： wueput）
12 2 In $\$ 13120$ change the wo ＂authoimed the giving of＂in items and（7）of tre form to read＂give Change the worcis＂approval of＂In item （7）of the form to read＂approvel to＂． In fcotnote 5 w this section chanse the second senteace to reas：

1：ehe commateston acts fevorably upon the appilicator．te wal lave to the sppll－ cante an uracr approving the transfes of the mesrace．
b．In the same footnoce $S$ delete from the fifth seateace．
（e g．sequastion of wuber sights ung stake dans from the transforor．
c．Also in the same footnote 5 deleu． the last seatence．
13．In $\$ 131.30$ delete the parpathetical instruction indicating the number of copies to be filed．
［P．R．Doc．54－69：Filed．Jan．5．1954： 3：54 $=\mathrm{m} .1$

## DEPARTMENT OF ACRICULTURE

## Onice of the Secrenary

## Alamama

DESASTER ASSETANCE：DEXENEATIOE ANE centintcation of coundes contatirep ar brotant hra
Pursuant to the authority delegated to met by the Adminustrator of the Fed． eral Civil Deferne Adrminietration（18 F．R．4809）and for the purposes of sec－ tion 2 （d）of Public Lat 38．sust Con－ cress．as ameaded by Public Lat 115， 884 Congrews．the followting additional counties are determined os of Decem－ ber 18．1953，to be in the erem afrected by the major disascer occasioned by drought determined by the Pretident on November 36，1953．pursuant to Publio Lat 875．81st Congrens：
:: ed:esday, January 6, 1954
b. The following research programs: Production and utillzation (except forestry) research. Including research under Title I of the Rescarch and Mar) keting Act of 1946 (7 U.S. C. 42 land ecofarm management and costs, land pronomics, and asricularm labor. ordinarily ductioclated with farm management probassoclated conservation. except the natlonal soll survey: grass. and control of undesirable plants: range management (except as otherwise assigned in this document) : cotton ginning and processing: under section $T$ (b) of the Strategic and Critical Materiais Stock Pling Act (50 U. S. C. 98f) : under the seq.).
of 1949 ( 42 U. S. C. Investigations. Inspec-
c. The reseamentations, demonstrations. development work. service and regulatory work. and control and eradication of insects, plant and animal pests and diseases provided for under the heading "Agricultural Research Administration" in the Department 019 (except forest propriation Act of 1954 rexcept on offpests and diseases and restation and storfarm handing. trans products. including investigations of insect infestations of fif-farm stored products). and inspection and certification service, and standardization incidental thereto. for foods for dogs, cats, and other carnivors. d. Admintstration of the Federal Insecticide. Fungicide an
(7 U. S. C. 135-135k).
(7 U. S. C. ${ }^{135-135 k}$ ). e. The prosram and Puerto Rico under the Teritorles, and Puerto Rico und suppleHatch Act of March acts. and payments mental and related Experiment Stations under section 204 (b) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U. S. C. 1623 (b) ).
f. Eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contaglous diseases of animals and poultry.
g. Hog Cholera Serum and Virus Marketing Agreement Act (7 U. S. C. 851855).
. Administration of Title III of the h. Ach and Marketing Act (7 U. S. C. 1628-1629).

1. All administrative functions on behall of the Secretary relating to the acquisition and adminlstration of patent rishts.

Scc. 201. Reservations-a. ReservaHons to the Secretary. (1) Final action on regulations under the Hog Cholera Serum and Virus Marketing Agreement Act. previously requiring approval of the President.
(2) The issuance. amendment. termination or suspension of any marketing agreement or order or any provision thereof.
(3) Designation of members of adivis(3) Desittees under Title III of the ory committee Marketing Act (7 U. S. C. 1628-1629).
(4) Determination as to the measure and character of. cooperation with Mexico in the Foot and Mouth Disease Mesico in the purament to section 1 of the act

## FEDERAL REGISTER

Commissioners on any jolnt commission with the Government of Mexico set up under such Program (5) Approval of reserves for emergency outbreaks of Insect pests and plant diseases. (6) Determination of emersencies in connection with the eradication of 1006 and mouth disease and other co
diseases of animals and policial Oflcer.
b. Reservations to cedings pursuant to Final action in proce the Administrative sections 7 and 8 ox Procedure Act, excep under the Hog making procem and Virus Marketing Agreement Act.

## Fordest Service

ASSIGNMENT OF FURCTIONS
SEC. 300. Assignment of functions. The following assignment of functions Is hereby made to the Forest Service:
a. Over-all leadershlp in forest and forest range conservation. development, and utilization. (As used here and elsewhere in this Document the term "forest" includes wroodlands, and brush covered wild lands in mountalnous areas.) b. The protection. management and administration of the national forests and lands acquired for or being administered in connection with national forest purposes.
c. The following research programs: forest management: range management on forest ranges and adjacent. integrated on fonforest lands: forest fire control: fornonorest lands. est production and uer forest and forest protection and other forest resources and economics.
d. The programs of cooperation in the protection. development. conservation. management and utilization of forest resources, except as otherwise assigned in thls document.
e. Forest disease and pest research. control. and eradication. 23 of the

1. Programs under section 23 (23. 238). Federal Highway Act (23 U.S. C. 23. 23a).
g. Naval stores conservation program authorized by sections 7-17 of Allotment Conservation and 50 -590q).
Act ( $16 \mathrm{U} . \mathrm{S} . \mathrm{C} .590 \mathrm{~g}$ management and
h. The protection, Title III of the administration under Tenant Act (7 Bankhead-Jones Farm lands under the U. B. C. 1010-1012). of Department inadministration of this cluding the custodianship agencles.
loan to States and lility under such poll-
2. The responsibility under sures as may cies. principles. and procedures with the be established in Gervice for the making of preliminary examinations and surveys. the installation of works of improvement under the Flood Control Act provement ander the and supplemented. and the collection of data, necessary to the preparation of comprehensive river. basin reports. on all national forests and other lands in the watershed or basin. administered by the Forest Berice. range areas adjacent to the national forests in the waterahed or basin and urent conjunction. With such forvare
J. The responsibillty under such polle cles. princlples. and procedures. as mas be established in cooperation with the Soll Conservation Service for conducte Ing surveys and investigations and for carrying out preventive measures under the small watershed demonstration proo gram (item or Wat Agriculture Appos priation Act. 1954) on all netional forests and other lands in the deatse nated watersheds administered by the Forest Service. range areas adjacent to the national forests in such watersbed and used in conjunction with such forests, and other forest lands withth such watersheds.

SEC. 301. Reservations-a. Reservar. tions to the Secretary. (1) The authore ity to issue rules and regulations relate Ing to the national forests and other lands administered for national corcat purposes. to lands administered under Title III of the Bankhead-Jones under renant Act, and Federal Kighway Act. ection 23 of the Federal member of the
(2) The authority as a membermion National Forest
(16 U. S. C. 513).
(3) The making of recommendstions to the President with respect to the transfer of lands pursuant to the provtslons of subsection (c) of section 83 of Title III of the Bankhead1 (8)),
Tenant Act (7 U. S.
(4) The making of the establishing of to the President or parts thereof under the provisions of section 9 of the Aet of June 7. 1924 ( 43 Stat. 655).
(5) Final approvel of regulations under section 4 of the soll Conservition and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U. B. C. 590d) relating to naval stores.
(6) Final approval and submission to ${ }^{\circ}$ the Congress of the results of preliminary examinations and survey reports under the Flood Control Act of 193, 3 amended and supplemented.
(7) Approval of requests for appere tionment of reserves under the reapt

## Pest Control Act.

## SOIL CONEERYATIOM SEIVICE

## Assiginceit or fuxctions

SEc. 400. Assignment of functions.
The following assignment of fumetions is hereby made to the BOll Conservation service:
a. The responsibllity of acting as the technical service agency in the nild of soll and water conservation and sood prevention.
b. Adminustration of the programs for soll and water conservation. Includins the Act of Apri 27. 1935 (16 U. 8. C the act except as otherwise assigued 5908-1. extional soll surver.
c. General responsiblitit for ad.efien
c. as amended and supplemented. an administration of sctivities in eepros tion with river basin investagatice of preparation of reports thereon, whin recosmition of the reaponaibilities th whe assigned.
d. Administration of the ats Inixi
$t$
in activijin: exall such implated. niects or

ALABAMA

Faycte.
Iamar.

> Marion.
> Winston.

Done this 31st day of December 1953. (SEAL)
true D. Morse.
Acting Secretary of Agriculture.
1F. R. Doc. B4-07: Flled. Jan B. 1984: 8:51 a. m. 1

## Agency Heads et al.

delegations of authority and ASSIGNMENT OF FUNCTIONS
Sectron 100. Authority. The delegatlons in this document are made pursuant to authority vested in the Secretary of Asriculture by section 161. Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 22) and Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, as well as all other statutes and prior Reorganization Plans vesting authority in the Secretary of Agriculture with regard to the functions of the Department of Agriculture.

Sec. 101. General purpose. The purpose of this documeat is to provide as nearly as may be a general and concise authority under which the agencies of this Department are vested with authorities adequate to the discharge of their responsibilities. As a result of the terms of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1053. the Secretary of Agriculture is enabled to provide the subordinate officers and units of the Department with Such delegations and assignments as he finds are necessary or desirable in relation to the functions periormed.
Sec. 102. Relation to Office of the Secretary. No delegation or authorization prescribed in this document shall preclude the Secretary from exercising any of the powers or functions or from performing any of the duties conferred herein and any such delegations or authorization is subject at all times to withdrawal or amendment by the Secretary. No delegation or authorization prescribed in this document shall preclude the exercise of any delegation or Euthorization otherwise provided to the Under Secretary. Assistant Secretaries. Administrative Assistant Secretary. or Assistant to the Secretary for Agricultural Credit, or to the Staff agencies as provided in section 112 hereof.
SEc. 103. Responsibilities of Agency licads-a. Responsibility to the Secretary. The delegations contained in this cocument are made subject to the gencral responsibility of the Secretary to the President and to the Consress for the administration of the Department. The head of each agency (1) will maintain close working relationships with the ollicer to whom he reports. (2) will keep him advised with respect to major problcms and developments. and (3) will discuss with him proposed actions involving major policy questions or other important considerations or questions, including matters involving relationships with other asencies of this Department. other Fcucral agencles, or other governmental or private organizations or groups.
b. Reponsibility for coordination of policies and operations. It is the re-
sponsibility of each agency to consult and cooperate with other Department agencies when its activities relate to, affect. or are affected by the work of these agencies and to see that its policies, programs. and operations are coordinated with theirs. to the end that the Department oparatce with maximum unity and effectiveness.
c. Responsibility for elfcient operation. Agency heads, having broad authority to carry on the functions of their agencies, are responsible for seeing that the work of their agencies is efficiently administered and that the public obtains the fullest possible beneft for the funds expended. To accomplish these objectives and to insure that the maximum possible improvements in programs and operations are achieved. agency heads should see that periodic reviews are conducted as required by Executive Order 10072 and 5 U. S. C. 1151.

## organization of the departmant

Sec. 100. Service agencics. The Serv-, ice agencies of the Department of Agriculture are grouped as follows:
a. Federal-States relations:

Agricultural Research Service.
Forest Service.
Soll Conservation Service.

## Federal Extension Service.

Agricultural Conservation Program Service.
Farmer Cooperative Bervice.
b. Marketing and Foreign Agriculture:

Agricultural Marketing Service.
Foreign Agricultural Service.
Commodity Exchange Authority.
c. Agricultural Stabilization:

Commodity Stabilization Service (including Commodity Credit Corporation Punctions asslgned in accordance with Commodity Credit Corporation by-laws).

Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committees.

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.
d. Agricultural Credit:

Farmers Home Administration.

- Rural ElectriAcation Administration.

Sec. 110. Staf Agencies. The Stafi agencies of the Department of Agriculture are as follows:
a. Office of the Solicitor.
b. Administrative Agencies:

Offce of Budget and Finsice.
Office of Hearing Examiners.
Office of Information.
Library.
Omce of Personnel.
Offce of Plant and Operations.
Sec. 111. The functions of the Staff agencies are prescribed particularly in the Department's Administrative Regulations and otherwise.

Sec. 112. Delegations and authorizations to Service agencies shall be subject to such delegations and authorizations as are granted to Staff agencies by the Administrative Regulations or otherwise.

## GENERAL DELEGAIION OF AUTHORITY

Sec. 116. Delegations of authority to agency heads. The head of each agency shall. under the general direction and supervision of the secretary of Agriculture and the Under Secretary. and the Assistant Secretary, the Administrative Assistant Secretary, or the Assistant
to the Eccretary in charfe o tural Credit to whom is assigne elal direction and supervision onagency. direct and supervise the activi. ties of the employees of this argency. Subject to any reservation of sauthority contained in the assignment of functions to the individual agency, or othorwina reserved in the Administrative Regulations. the head of any agency is hercby delegated authority to take any action. including the authority to execute any document, authorize any expenditurc. and promulgate any rule, regulntion. order or instruction, required by law is, deemed by him to be necessary and proper to the discharge of the functions assigned to his agency. The head of anv such agency may. ennsistent ritii and with due resard to his personal responsi. bility for the proper discharge of the functions assigned to his agency. delc. gate and provide for the redclegation of his authority to appropriate officers and employees. Reservations of authority to the Sccretary are subject to the provisions otherwise made for the authority of the Under Secretary and Assistant secretaries.

## PRIOR AUTEORİ̇ATIONS

SEc. 120. Status of prior atathorizations and delegations. All delegation: and authorizations of the secretary af. fecting the subject matter of this docu. ment or in conflict with the provisions of section 116 are hereby rescin cept where reserved or other pressly recognized by referenc document. However any reg.man. order. authorization. or similar innuru: ment. heretofore issued by the Secreta:ry. shall remain in full force and effect. cix. cepting that any delegations or autho: 1 zations contained therein shall be coil. strued to conform to the assimment; made in this document. Also, any rer. ujation, order, autleprization, or simili:instrument including delegations of aii. thority heretofore issued pursuant to an; sccretarial delegation or autherization by any other oficer of the Departmarat shall continue in full force and effect unless and until withdrawn or superseded pursuant to authority granted in this document. Nothing in tinls document shall be construed to disturb other regulations or instructions governing the general conduct of officers and :-mlovees of the Department or providing ior the orderls handling of correspondence and communications.

Fedebal-States Relations; Aghicuttural Reszarci Service ASSIGNMENT OF FUNCITONS
Sec. 200. Assignment of functions. The following assignment of functions is hereby made. to the Agricultural Rcsearch Service:
a. Coordination of all resenrch activities of the Department, Including examination and analysis of all such activities current and contem review and approval of all pró proposals prior to Indtiation, ady consultation on planning with heaus of agencies, and reports and recommende tions to the Secretary.

## APPENDIX F

FEDERAL REGISTER

Friday, June 24, 1960
§213.2 Auhturily for Gilicf, Forest Serv.
§213.2 Auliturity for Chicf, Forest Serv-
ice, to group and name National
Grassilinds.
The Chief. Forest Service, is author-
ized to group the national grasslands into administrative units and to provide such administrative units and to provide such specific designations therefor as he inds
necessary and desirable for effective and
 8213.3 Protection, occupancy, use and 821 administration.
(a) The rules and regulations ap-















 the purposes of sald Tytle III.




 with the terms thereof.

The rules and regulations heretofore

 ice, but not as to such project lands administered by other agencies.

Done at Washington, D.C., this 20th day of June 1960.

曷
 narily be payable upon a sale of similar
paperty by en vendor other than the property by a vendor other than the
Covernment.


## PART 213 -ADMINISTRATION OF INVNEI WZVA SJNOT-OVBHYNVZ

 National Grasslands.
 § 213.1 Designation, administration, and (a) The land utllization projects adture designated in paragraph (e) of this





 revolvers, see $811.102-11$ of this title) revolvers,
or retalies or manufacturers' excise
taxes (see s8 11.101 and 11.102 of this title and the following sections) pur-
chased free of tax, are sold to individuals chased free of tax, are sold to no ndividuals
co
posit funds collected pursuant to ? finance ofacer and furnish the name of宛 ment. If the contractor's name and he known, the sales officer will ascertain whether the information is avallable
\$1011.2102 Transfers of Governmientowned property.

Sections 1011.2100 and 1011.2101 are -dosd paumo-itururuasiod 10 siajscreat erty purchased by the Government free
(a) All sales of surplus property and Government-owned contractor inventory
(except gasoline), as defined in the Federal Property and Administrative Serv(b) All sales of scrap or of used (c) Transfers to a contractor under a cost type contract of Covernment-owned
property for use in connection wlth the performance of the contract. (d) Sales to contractor under a fixed
 performiance
$\$ 1011.2103$. )
(e) Transfers to other agencles of the position to the Federal Supply Service. of the $\mathbf{U}$ ilted States, or political subdivislon thereof, or the District of Colum-
bla, when original sales to such agencles bia, when original sales to such agencies
or instrumentalities are tax exempt.
81011.2103 Sale of propery to a conAs indicated in 81011.2102 (d). Is propprice contract, the amount of the Federal



## APPENDIX G

[1'ublic-No. 210-75th Conoures]
R 517 -IST Sesaion]
[H. R. 7502]
AN ACT


TITLEI-R:ARM TENANG IROVISIONS




9
 politicul subdivision, sulumarginal land and land not primarily suitable for cultivation, and intercust in and options on sucl land. Succh
property may be acquired subject to any reservatious, ountstanding eestates, interests, ecusenentits, or other encunbrances which the Secre-
tary deteruines' will not interfere with the utilization of such tary detarimes win wim not interfere
pruperty for the (b) Ro protect, inprove, develop, and administer any propery so to adapt it to ite nost brneticial use. out a consideration any property to accquired, under tuclt ternis and

 is used for public purposes. The Secretary may recomnnend to the
President other Federal, State, or Territorial agencies to administer such property, together witl 1 lle e conditious of use and administration which will best serve the plirposes of a land-conser ration and land.
proverty to sitch agcelicies. , With res pect (d) With respect to any land, or any interest thercin, ecquiren



 mation concernulng tlesese ust tivities.
 proverty acquirsed by, or transterred to, the secretary for the pur-
 Statute, pun pmended (U. S. C., 1934 ed, titlo 18, ste. 101). marmpore ro gouxites $-8$






anderad int thunsuant to, thin Ahet nes cirecumetances may require unler nuy mortyage, lease, coill ract, or ar aree ment entered , into
 Provided, That th prosecution and defenge of all litigation under
this Act shall be cunducted under the eupervision of tue Attorney General, had the legal representation dhall be by the United Sutes nay arise, or by such other nutiorney or atturneys as muy, uider the
(i) Muke sucth rultss and regulationg as he deems necessury to curry out this Act.
 Sec, 42. (a) The Secretary ys suthorized and directed Wunty connmittee coumposed of turee farners residing in the cosulition



 These Scretury shall preserile rulee governing the prwechlure of thio
 of such clerical assistants as he deems muy be required by any









may where suitable be utilized for the purposes of title I of this Act, and the Secretary nay sell said land and make loans for the necessary improvement thereof to such individuals and upon
shall be in accordance with the provisions of said title.
oenhial provisions applicable to gale

Sec. 44. The sale or other disposition of any real property acquired by the Secretary pursuant to the provisions of this Act, or any interest threin, shall be subject to the reservation by the Secretary on behalf of the United States of not less than an undivided three-finithis of
inc interest of the Gnited States in all coul, oil, gas, and other mincrals in or under such property.

## Thansfer of a mailable lands

Sec. 45. The President may at any time in his discretion transfer o the Secretary or the Corporation any right, interest, or title held by the United States. and mider the supervision of the Secretary, in
any land which the D'rosidc-nt shall find suitable for the purposes of this Act, wind the secretary or the Corporation, as the cuse may be, ming Act, unia the and ispose of such land in such inanner, and subject to such terms and conditions, as the I'resident determines will best carry out the objectives of this Act.
trangactions witit corpmationg
Spe. 46. Nothing in this Act shall be constrned to authorize the muking of any loan, or the sale or other disposition of real property or any interest therein, to any private corporation, for farming purposen.
surveys and mesearcil
Sec: 47. The Secretary is authorized to conduct surveys, investigahons, and research reliting to the conditions and factors nffecting. and the metlools of accomplishing noost effectively, the purposes of this Act, and may publish and disscminute information pertinent to the various asperits of his activities.

Sec. 48. The Secretary may procide for the paymant of any obligaion or indebtedncss to hin under this Act undry a siten of retiable bayments under which a surplus above the peqnitw employed to reduce payments below the required pifment in periods of subnormal production or prices.
aet-ofy
Sec. 49. No set-ofi shall be made against any payment to be made y the Sccretury to any person under the provisions of this Act, by eason of any indebtellness of such person to the United States, and 10 delt due to the Scretary under the provisions of this Act shall be ct off against any paynents owing by the United States, unless the ohjectives of this Act.

Sxc. 50. (a) All property which is being utilized to carry out the purposes of title I or titie II of this Act (other than property used solely for administrative purposes) shall, not withstanding that legal
title to such property remains in the Siecretary or the Corporation, be subject to taxation by the State, Territory, District, dependency, and political subdivision concerned, in the same manner and to the same etent as other similar property is taxed.
(b) All property to which subsection (a) of this section is inappli cable which act shall be exempt from all taxation Corporation pursuant to by the United States or any State, Territory, District, politicul subilivision, but nothing in this subsection shall be construed ms affecting the authority or duty of the Secretary under any other law to iuake payments in respect of any such property in lieu of tares.

## bid at forecloserie

Sisc. 51. The Secretary is authorized and empowered to bid for and purchase at any foreclosure or other sule, or otherwise to acquire property pledged or mortgaged to secure any loan or other indebted ness owing under this Act; to accept title to any property 80 pur-
clased ir aciluired ; to operate or leuse such property for such period us may be deenied uccessury or advisable to protect the investunent therein; and to sell or otherwise dispose of such property so purchased or acyuired upon such terins and for such considerations as the Secretary shall determine to be reasonable, but subject to the reservation of the rights provided for in section 44.

## penalties

Sec. 52. (a) Whouver makes uny material representation, knowing it to le false, for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Corporatiou upon any application, advance, discount, purchase, or repurchuse agreement, contract of sale, lease, or loan, or any change
or extension of any of the same by renewal, deferment of action or or extension of any of the same by renewal, deferment of action or for, whall be punished by a fine of not more than $\$ 5,000$ or bw imprinonment for not more than two years, or both.
(b) Whoover, being connectad in any capacity with the Corporation, (i) oupbarelong, dontrectp, purloing, or willfully misapplies any
 to tho berporatimes mide ahervimentrudted to it; or (2) with intent to dotrind (Oargeration, or any ethar budy politic
 examiner of the Corporation, mimes any mitry in any book, report, or stutement of, or to, the Corporatica of dmaws any oruer,
or issues, puts forth, or assigns any note or other oblimation or draft mortgage, judgment, or decree thercof; or (3) with intent to defraud the Corporation, participates or shares in or receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefits througli any traisaction, loan, commission contract, or any other act of the Corporation, shall be punithed by a fine of not nore than $\$ 10,000$ or by imprison.
ment for not nore than five years, or both.

APPENDIX H

BANKIIFAD-IONHASARM TIHNAN'T ACT'
Mr. Jonks, from the commither of confercoice, sulminted the
 MTLI: F F.IR, TMN.MN"IROMMIONS











## 7



(t) Shall lare sucression in its corporate namei,
(y) A A Aly, /rovit, cller, and use a corruvate seal, whichs stall be















边 the Ciripurrutium.







 Art, wud, id in his jultument neeressary and advisable, to pursue the wet ine proveculian mud diffeuse of all lilisigation under this Ift shall be condut tril
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II



 Stules or any Shate, Territory, District, lependency, or politicul subdini-
siun, but nothing tu this subsection shall be construed as afferting the "uthurity or'duty of the Sicretary whiler ung other law to muke payments bid at mokeclosure
bid at mokeclosure




 devalties
 or ceparchase ayreempm, comtract of sole, lease, or loan, or any change
then "r esteusion of auly of the same by reneuxal, deferment of action or otherbe puniahal by a fine of wot mare than $\$ 5,000$ or by imprisonmeut for
nom nure thun turi gears, wr both.
(1) (1) Wheszleser, abstracts, comected in any cupurity with the Corporution, fumds, securities, or other things of avilue, whether belonging to the Cor-





 by imprisonment for not wore than five years, or both.


(d) The promivions of sections 112, 115, 114, 115, 116, and 117 of

GENEKAL PRDTASTONA


 thansfer of avallamer lands
 Cuitrit Stules, num wuder the superiviou of the Secretury, in an!" land

 ssmavnormon, ma, scoblarsavel


SURTETS AND RESEARCH

 YAkAMIE PAMENTS
 sET-otre
 taxation




[^35]
##  

 Mr. CANNON of Missourl. Mr. Speaker. I move thHouse recede and concur in the Senate amendment. The molion mis agreed to. The SPEAKERR. Whithout objection, a motion to recon rider each of the molions,
There was no objection,
zakection. temancy an





 Estend therr own remarka on the bll. The BPEAEKR. ts there objection to requeat of the The BPEAKERR LE hrere objectlon
There wien no objectlon.
Accordingls the House resoived issell into the commultiee of the Whole House on the olate of be Didon tar the can
siderallon of the bul $\mathbf{H}$ R. 7582 . with Mr. Divka to the chatr,




 me unau the meerere is tateen up under whe ominute ruve In fact it has been my proviere to tor bande edministration.
 no problem
farn tenancy.

 nolished, no two members of the commitit.
plete accord on all phases or the subject.
Tiue problem of the hand is as old es blstory, Contact whit the well is ee esseniav as sunlight and airy Thero can wrom the soll.
His in not urpritine then. that diumertements and disputes

 ratlon. Throushoul ald

 lavion of hand in the hands of a tew is a problem that
practicully at countries have been compelled to met tace proctlea.
Faty years ago less than one tarmer in four was a tenant
 tenamis
 more end more.

Tre erumanaor



Several tepe are necessary in order to make tarm ornaer-
 angle element in whe whole question
we mave unroush the operallon of the Pumm Act and the inmecrealt







 tutuon may set the wo phases mixed ned tu may burt tho

 to the coochusion witer study that this wos the better method In really tenance ts not the problem.
 of the natuanal income. Be
problem of price and income.
At $n$ mather af tact. the percentage of tenancty for the
Nation ouly been chected and hat not been decreased. and it there-
 Inanaing the purchase of famulr-bized farmas it the problem
Then too, the question on

 man tract of land. boot in the town and fin the country.

 $\xrightarrow[\substack{\text { trecta } \\ \text { taxee. }}]{\text { a }}$
mara corantion
Much assltance canart beormantion in states and aubalyt-


anall tracts. Some of the states have already taken sleps Hion, sleps should be taten to secure state and locea coopera Lin all along the have. Under the Eysem now prevalung In meny of the states 2 tuif properiy leery is made by both
 trom the land The proar ami will be breally handicapped in
nny secloon where thit condtuan prevala any seclon where thit condilitan prevaliz
 by the Pederas oovernment in tion to make any steps calken
 Che Government could well aford to nancee hito purchate for
 or mherest. These parments could thuse be made on whase that would not calse an undue burden on the purchaser.
In practicelly every community in America there are worthy tenants who would live Lo vurn home and who would wort hard to pay out a hame it it could be purchased under such
condillons as to alve them an opportunity to see daylight
The problem is tremendous and far reachins, 11 cannot bo it is necessary to stari rraduully and endeavor to deliars,
 discourating at timea, bed this mates it ailt he more um-
 cooperateon by the siates. as wel as by indimduais, may be

hree-wing approuch to he coummilue has recommendcd a tenants in the purchase ot Becond, rehabilltutlon loans for temporary ald to tenante
 primarily sulted to cultivation, and the utilizing of such land or varisuu pubbic purposea
Purchase of mall tamm homes-me tor the financing of the
 Million the third yeer to be peportioned emong ue verious
States on the basts of tarm pooulation and prevalence of enancr.
The measure provides that loans may be made not in ex cess of the apprased value of single unit tarme to wornh price over a 30 -year perfod. with interest at the rate of 3 The Commintuen
 mitee of three resident tamerse who ore fammiar with iocal It is turther provided that
Hroush such locul committee and that no thail be made selected and no tenant anmil be ananced excepl with the
approval of the local commitee. In tint way the tenant

 this select method on the pert of the iocal commilite. the

In orter to avolu specculation it is provided that no purCcescen thil be permitted to tell the iand thot oher then a

 Lomakt an unauthorized sale of bis property until he bis met
order to prevent speculation in land, which has Irceucnils Tue man
 Tiplues and fnancing
The Reaseltement
June 30, 1937. The Beeretary of Asricult ure is eutiorized io
 The Reselliement Administration not oniv inherited th:

 Receetuement Adminstration tor pumminisering this prok 1 mm
 Lstration made both loons and sranis to pocople in tie countity. We authorize the Adminstralion to yilize any sunds that

 recomniended the broadening is the base of these
order $i o$ make aut

 private sources.

 primorily sultable for tulase. These lands may be used for any public purposes. such as parks. game preserves. recreaThe needid for such a propram are manites and are weil

_ on oos evation

The tenant problem la age old Far beik in of our rece, in times tess complex thar our own, we nind the Tarmer tulung land that didd not belong to him. Bc did part of what was produced such relationshipa bectere. Lenant and landowner are lound in various ages and various Lspes ar soivernmenk
it an onily naturat
our shorea earis in our ow the dera of tenancy should reach
 There were many harye ianded estatee end sentiemen farm
ers.
Our tona period of westward expansle


 ${ }^{2}$ nation.
The development of the tenancy problen has taken pluco
targely tn the lasi so years. alyd today we fod tenancy




 velopment was the one-crop systern of coltun, because it Wa the single one that would produce the recturis necessary interest rates. wot cumitro ro une urctum
The rapid increase in tenoincy, how swer, huss divedeleped
 Into a problem in many other sections of outir coultry. buis
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cultural problems, aside from their grave economic mant-

 true I I Link thau we men who represch hergely asmcul
解





 Am- wenant chese of our populialion.






 But mant bouit Lhy men I am whand ebout-his tenant























 nom
 cks that would munte those nomees secure. In that tender



 Mr. Clamman, I yicid 20 minutean to the spenter of the


 for you a brod plecture of this wo-called tenant-sarminas






Mr. BANKIIEAD. 1 append hereto two tablea of rethat
whe. The frsi thows the total of whte and colored finm wopulition and lotal tenants by rexional croup, es follows:

| Drabha eal yito |  |  | ${ }^{\text {A }}$ | Toun |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 11. 20.1007 | 1930, 011 | 2 max | U.20.94 |
| Frigitami (Mvioa No- |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 19. |  |
| - |  | 20, 128 | 1.wn |  |
| Nat viluoit Mitui | $\checkmark 180$ |  |  |  |
| Nortichorit |  |  | ame | 1.47 |
| and |  |  |  |  |
|  | , | 21sa |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| mix. D4, 1 |  |  |  |  |
|  | axal | 1.:̇ıu* |  |  |
|  | 4, 51. .81 | 1.672, 216 | 1.08424 | 2, ¢m, |
| Levemeo | 4.20 | 2 zw sis | 76.80 | 2, 6,31 |
| 发mond |  |  |  |  |
| ,1er, Au | 1.1880,19 | 110.603 | a, 0.2 | 11400 |
| dill | 1.16.6es | 2mat |  | m |
| The second table shows by group total number of farmers. total white and colored tenants. and the total of all teagnte. |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Alsamat |  |  |
|  |  |  | -129 ${ }^{\text {ant }}$ |  |
| Uniteatione |  | 2 man , |  | $-2 \mathrm{molis}$ |
| Nesarnes |  |  |  |  |
| \&fill |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Mr. HOPE Mr. Chairman. I yield 15 mid
Hemal from New York Mar. WroswonThl.
Mr. WAOSWORTH. Ma. Chalrman. I know I apeak the durnis the last 20 minulear when I mey the eddrens junt deilvered by the Speaker of the House ban been an inspiration (o us all. (Applause.) He and the chalrman of the comind thls bill. have lent a ditgity to this debate and a tone My excure for tificting mysets upan you for is minutes
 dition verr much like the tradition described by the eppeater
a few moments ago. No member oo my family durthe the a few moments ago. No member of my famly during the
List 150 years has been engaged in any burness but $f$ trin ing. I refer to that group of the fanilly that livea in a certaln area in western New York. It has always peen a
faccinatug yroblemt in me. I have never been able to vear lascinating yroblem to me. I Mave never been able to kar
myseld away from it. Indeed. I have not tried. I Ion mith the prayer of certain meenbers that the Congress madjourn
quickly. that I may go home. quickly. that I may go home.
 clustion that we should start on suen brought to the con-
luclitan lons haveriment. My
 nimanish what mikht be termed private cornamercial urder-

But this question of farm tenancy and ita underiyine itre of the Nation too such tmmense importance in the

 shove cane whe the conturian that the Federal Government
i and not unmindf cure. Applause. At the meme Ume
 Ladividuak. may maike feartul mistates in the managenent
or rinancing of buannesa while 1 am willing to see Indeed whul I am more than willing to aee this experimen
atart. and I relolice that it in in aman way. neverthelesa atart. and 1 re loice that it in in a sman way. nevertheless i
can visuire come misastes which may be made which may


 there is to trow about farming. But there are certatin
flundmental thingi which ever. good farmer, at reast.
know: certain fundamental principles the vilation of which over any connalderable period of ture will bring an country it is undertaken.
Farm troubles in inis couniry whatch. of course. have been
made much more acute $a$ the result of droughi, have been growing upon us for 20 years or more. Some of them have an economic origitn. the loas. for example. of our foreten markets. in which we were accustomed to rid ourselves o
surpluses of certain crops: aceldents. acts of cood as the
 years. very, very extersive droughts; and then. is you will
not regard it as impertunent. bad farming. We might just not regard it as impertunent. bad farming. We might Jus
as well admit that in certain directions and In certain im
portant areas one of the montrit. portant aseas one of the contributing elements to farm dis
tress has been unsound faming. Iress has been unsound farmings. I do not mean to seen to
acold. but I cannot biling myself to facta. My concern with respect to this bill is that the coovernment. If tit to to nnannec the purchase of farms and lend 100 percent of the value of
the farms to the purchasers. ahall mee to it. If posibibe. with

 will so to maste. Bear in mind that tradition of which I
apoke and of which the speaker apoke-in fact. I got it
apor
 the best thing for the land in the fool of the owner. an old-
fachioned farming adaze. It implies that the owner is exer-
 acreas. that he loves those acres. and is intent 50 to manage
his farm that the fertilly of the soll anall not be impalired his tarm that the fertility of the soll ohill not be tmpaired.
Impair the fertility of the aill and the capital investment is Impalred. for the real capital of a farm th its fertility. which very. very few requestas for ald under this bill will
 In it verr. very litle demend for agricullural rellef has
arisen in the last 20 years. I can say to you without the violation of any conndence or the exposure of any secrel that wuhin the 5 years that I have had the honor of servini
to the House of Representatives t have had only Imo tecter in the House of Representatives theve had only two letter
from farmers in my county. Luvingston. In the Genesee Val
 This does not mean that they have not had thest troubles
this doess not mean that the depression did not hit them exceedinaly hard in certalin directlons. but it does mean io me-and twould have thin barne to upon you-lt does mean
to me that the traditon of sound farming has been prace Itced in that partucular area so long as not only to assure a preservalion or the fertility of the will but also to asuure This resion is not done: there ase many otber refili: equally fortunate. I am thoroughly and Lutmately ac-
qualtited wilh a aystem of farming will han been in operaqualated with a ayslem of arming walch has been to opera
Hon for 120 yeara. It 4 pracliced not only by ownera buit
 bulltes of the future th connection with ith, my thought
revert to this thing with mhech I am familar: It it ulterls
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 sood farmer tit the retion where I Hive to sell an
todder of the farm: onst be fed to livestock.
the feeding of livestock the fertuity ts maintained. the feeding of livestock the eretlility is mainiained
I ana in possession of records which show that these parHicular scres-and there sre many. many farms under all
kinds of ownershtp-these acres are producing as many kinds of ownership-these acres are producing as many
bushets of wheat. of oats. of corn. And other crops as they did 110 years azo. Thls is the result of sound farming. and to put carefully sectected men upon them. As you aly know. I am constilutionally opposed to undue regtomenialion this anancing of commerclal under takidngs mad is to risk 100 durpensable for the state to see to it that the property in the purchase of which it has nnanced is not injured by unsound practices. Unsound rarming extended over 3 or 4 succes-
sive years can just about destroy the present productiveness of a farm. Unsound farming extended over 3 or 4 years may require o, 6 . or 7 years or anremilling exart far the realora This is not an easy thing that we are altempting; we shall not solve it today. I am wallung to hear with great interest
the discussion of the amendments to be offered by the genthe discussion of he amendments to be offered by the gen-
Heman from Iowa imr. Brimaum. one of which I beelive implnges upon this question I have just touched upon. Thit is en enormousiy difmeuit thing. I amn not aifraid to have
the Congress tackle it but we would better nod tackle it with a hysterical enthusiasm. an excessive conflence that will lead us to make all kinds of promis.
that agricultural U Uopla is at hand.
There There gre one or two things in it which I thank should be
changed. In general I acinnowiedge that this problem hai become so great and so slignifcautt with respect to the future atould make it his business to do what he can to help. IApplause 1
Mr . JONES

Mr. DOXEY Mriss.pplam. Duxtri 1 , inutes to the posal I cannol enter into an exhaustive discuassion of this measure. but I cannot repress the impulse to comment upan the atmosphere of good feellng that $x$ manifest in the gen Commitlee on Agriculture, appreclating that we had but a limited timie in which to discuss this bill. Look but tew minulesome remarks were recetved by you with marked at tention. Our distinsulshed speaker made not only a logical. oound, and etlective preancalion or the rarm-tenchey prob convince even those who are atrangers to the problem that II is most serious.
that have been made. Includug the apeech of my distin. aulshed friend from New York (Mr. Waps wonthi, on the other side or the sisile, who ealked in such a convincing anc
sincere manner. 1 say we do appreciate hearing these gensincere manner. II say we do appectiate heoring these gen-
Ulemen at thit time for thetr apeeches ahow not only their Interest in this problem but aiso theis arm arasp of this interested.
Mr. Chalrman. realizing that the time for sencral dcbate dealre to apeak on the bul I propose to be briet in what wish to say here today regarding the bill that we are now
considering. H. R. 7502, known as the farm-tenant bill. considering. H. R. 7602 , kno was reported by our Comamiltee on Agriculture to this House some reveral months ago.
The reasion we arc now considering H. R. 7562 instead of
H. R. 6240 it that in our ellorts to get a rule to bring H. R.
$\mathbf{8 2 4 0}$ before the House for a vote we had to compromise wiln
regard to the amount of the appropration. regard to the amount of the appropriation.
Uuder this bill. H. R. 7562. Ruthorizalion Hons under ulle i iof the bill cenaniz provistion upirouria
 Under tille II (rehabilliation for the nical year 1040 authorization has been elliminated. but lise the 575.000000 preshldent to allot reliet funds for the purpere rematns. wish we could have secured funds to hetp the farmor $p$ puy
at s low rate of interest the murtgage that rests on his finl but we had to take what we could kct
Onder thlic III (acculsition of submarginal lands) the ap-
 Our original bill (H. R. 6240) carried an appropriation under uthe I of $\$ 50.000 .000$ for each of the fiscal years ending habilitalion loans an authorization for an appropriation for he nacal years endinue June 30. 1938. and June 30, 1039. Under this ulle II of H. R. 6240 each of such flscal years he farmer whose farm is moritaged and give him the right to secure money at a low rate of interest to pay of his present indebtedness but under the new bill we had to eliminate 8240 (retirement of submarginal land) carricd an authorizaLean to be appropriated the swm of $\$ 10.000 .000$ for the fiscal haree Accal yeara thereafter.
Il will not be my purpose here to discuss the reasons for
the authorizalions for reduced appropriailions. We did the beat we could and surmounted our many obstacles as best we could. It has been a hard lob to get any bill at all. On Thursaday. April 29 . 1937, I made a sperch on the fixor
of this House wherein 1 discusied in detanl $H$ R 6240 . That was atter the Rules Cuminitite dented the Housc Commultice on Agnculture a rue for the consideration of 11. H. 8240 . by section and utue by utie. and implored the Rulis Cornmittee of the House to glve us a rule so we could tuke this Iegisalion up in this House
I am indeed Eralined that we have been abie to work out
compromise and obtain a rule for
 This has required time. ing and tazing on the part of thase who have haid this farniAt the outset I want us to bear in inind that the post tion the House Commituee on Agriculture lakes, as evildenced by this farmerially from the position the Senate Agri. culture Commitlee takes as evidenced by the provisions of the Senate farm-tenant bill. s. 106
Ot course. I do not know tn what respects thi membership House Commiltee on Agriculturc has workid so hard und long on.
We hav
Ore have brought th on the flor of this House wide open be read under the 5 -minute rule. and I I kiow vurious and
undry amendments will be proposd. undry amendments will be proposed.

 our House Connnultee on Agriculture. If we do anend hus illl here I hope that whatever amendinelus this House tackle this farm-tenant probiem.

 If the proposed legisiation reaches that stage 1 am likely to be selected as ore of the House conferees. and 1 feel now and turdamental questious tnvolving the particular legie hatioti.
N.1. one knows just what will be ninally agreed to. and is of Congress. no ooe knows what the Pheris Becturity Act af 1937 will really contatin.
I am sure aill of us hope that we can set somere real con-
 complicated fanm-tenant problem
We minow it is a vital question and one that certating presents a most serfous groblem to the premet and futuro
zenerallons of thil country. To my mind it is certaing
reaching at to require hatudly 2 brobienm the perious and tar and supervision of thes problem sthould be of a poetcal, practulcal and rencoasble nature.
As I have formerly evid on the goor of thin house in dirshould be cauthousty and thoughtully uoder taten.
 to the bul. H. R. . 562 . Ne much betcer than the provisiona
of the Beante bill. ©. Cos. However. I am aware of the fact What the Presidents Bpecial Farm Tenancy Commilter an
 vided by our IIouse farm-tenant bul.
and the polley of the administration In hanoling this anate. that wid be sliaped if and when we inally agree and pasa a farm-tenant hill is. to my mind. one of great importance.

Dess.
Dnder the Senule bill the Covernment buya the land in fee
simple and in turn sells the land to the prospective hotue slmple and in turn sells the land to the prospective hotre
scekcr. The Government retains utte. and the tenant doee not and cannot recelve absolute tute to the property witlu aticr a long pertod of years.
grave problems in regard to taxation an to tocal. serious and
State requirements. and

 legisisation has been considered on che foor of the Benato
thu far this sesstion. thus far this session.
As my ume is pas.
to any of my col passing rapldy. I ahall be glad to stela to propound relaung to thie yul that is noy belore the
 is the best we can do under the clrcumatances and is a
step in the right direction. it is the policy pe have ats step in the right direction. It th the pollcy we have agreed
upon. I do not hesitate to yleld to ang Mermber to answer What questions 1 ean with reference to how thic act io supposed to be administered. I shall be glad to enswer
any questions 1 can with refereace to the et-up under
this gat. the benefle of which will bo brought to every district of the United Btates where farma tenancy exart tar as the funde will go that we provide.
Mr. WALSWORTII Wul the gentieman yeld?
Mr. DOXEY. 1 yeid to the gentleman
Mr. DOXEY. I yieid to teie ec nilemanan from New York
Mr. WADSWORTH. May I call the reoterani attentlon to the language on pase 4. Wise 13. paragtaph in, witich
reads as tollows:

Mr. DOXEY. Yes.
to addrese myseif a tew moments ago. It would ilike to have Che zentleman state to us. Is he wim. how far it to have
templated the Becretary of Agriculture wil obligate the
 Lo refraln trom unsound tarm practices and, it he does
not to refrala, what will be has fate? not to refrain, what will be his fate
Mr. Doxisy. 1 have an oplinlon.
indlon on my pare because 1 cannod and it many be apect-



 recelve the beneats of this act. The county commintiees will select applleanta by tating lato account thefr erpert-
ence. character. standing. and aso whether or not they



 incluaing laborern, athereercoppere, and thone who get whe big-




 corunty cornmitiee and the firm that he is supposed by the
or be placed in charge of is selected the contrict in mate or be placed in charge of is selected. the cantrict b3 made.
i may say that what would be a real practical. acnsible. Alz.
 deep south or in the county trow which my distingushed
triend from Now York comes. We know this bll con only scratch the surface. but it will enable people to enfoy the
benent benentis from thit particular bill if they will Indulge in
sound farming practice. When the man is elected and sound fanming practices. When the man is selected and
passed uppo by the county committee. and approved by the pessed upon by the country committee. and approved by the
Becretap of Agrieulture. or those zecting uncer him and the
farm is agreed upon. 1 imagine there sill be an undenta


 scribed by not only the Apenker of the House but by the
chelrman of our Conmitlee on AETculture. as well as tho senternan of rour Nemmity
Whth reference
With reference to that mecinc paragraph and what will
congtitute waste and what will no constute Fante. that ts

 Lo an extent it will be rigulated by the Becretars of Agmi-
culture. There is no Member of this Congress or no member of the Conmmitiee on Arriculturo who can dedinitely and have to be worked out by hie Becretary of Agriculture ind Mr. Marsing him in the eedministration of this bili. Mr. MAHON of Terene Pium ure gentleman Jeld?




than str
Mr. Doxey of course I Histened very atent wa any one Mr. DOXEX. Of course. I I Istened very attentively to the
senteman's spech tuis morning and 1 wish 1 had tme to add something to what he sald. The Committee on Agri-
culture has discussed every phase of this bull we did not culture has discussed every phase of this bill. We did not jusa bealin during the present session of this congress io ings on the farm tenancy problem becki in 1935 . We have
worted arsiduously on the measure and. as stated by the worked auslduously on the meanure and. As stated by the
chal ranan of the Asriculture Commitite. there is a great diveralty of optioion. This bill providea for a county comI have enumeraled and I imagine if they ind an applycant who is able to make a down parment. that will be quite a
 the eiligible list. Applausel
I Here the gavel rell.
Mr. Doxey. Mr. Chasrman. I have heard our distinthe tadlea are to which he refers and ido not know whether he sa joing to put them in the Rxcoond. However. I have a breat-down of che statistics on the lenancy question with
relerence to Btates. 1 our distingulshed Bpeaker does not
 narks and include theretn these tables, thowing not only the
number of farmers in each state and the number of cenants. number of farmera in each state and the number of tenants.
but the number of nome owners, the number of farmers who but the number of nome owners the number as rirmers who
actually operate farms todey but do not onm them and the
number of tarm owners who do not operate ther fams.
 of the House.
The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may state to the gentleman from Missisisippt that it would be neccsary for him to obtain
the consent of the House for the inclualion in his remarks of the consent of the House for ter
the tables to which he reters.
Mr. DOXEY. I luat ask to revise and extends my remarks and sec out these lables.
The CHARMAN
The CHARMAN. The genilemun may extend ths own of the House to include the statistics to which he refers The consent of the House havinus been obtalned the tables relerred to are as follows:
pecerat of trent


 he benefle of some or the things which have been put amuers of my district For instance. hese rectiprocal-trade
 isfute. I know that is the case with dairy and tarm prodIcls. and in that is atd and asss sunce to the farmer thea lion is tryinis to efect. We must keep the American markets tor the American tariner.
In this bill. sceclion 412. provision is mede that the

 We should have the merit system in aovernment rather which they stul hupouspri have so frequentis objected to but Why uyas onlyport

 you say you are in favor of clvil service. It is lust 100 bad that a mote could not be hat on the cirth-sertice proo-

 risting vote only hive Demucrate
unable
oo get a y yea-and-nay yote.
It is approprnate here $w$ add a ree remarks on the stato which have been enacted we will penent the tormee more We enacting this present bill
We wanh to get down 5 sound sold frect rather than ${ }^{2}$

 urity under our Constitulion
 epablic: In It impossible longer to conceal he frects about

 avery huruan being a bunderer who obstinasely That great changes are about co como in uhat country ately come upon us and the abmolute nadiferercee of a large
 have seen law and order give way betore the assaults of


 New Deal agencless nave. at Limes. themselves become the
principeat volotors of the practices they so loudy condemn in oliners.
The American yorkingman looks over the present stluastion and in the privacy of hils home comes $\mathbf{t} 0$ the concluston
that lic will be the uiltmate victum of the economic breat-
 nadi idint itere has nerin but itue of substaniual value acMr. Chalrman the woikineman of
vive ris more hina 530.000 .000 .000 in inerces now knows that



Mr Chairman, white here are stil many in the country
ho will not wilungly give up thelr hereditiry notions of the

 Power has beren tollowed dme atter time by ralda upon the
public
till
on ther own accounte The hue army of public publc uill on hecri own eccounty The huse army of public
 trade barticn between each other. We sre about to drive
 by Elowing them the ecquiltion as moderate private forThe demands of the Covernment tor more and more caxes
 tresulus into retirement or to seece other mources tor the in Bo the altution can be summarized. The people of the

 Mrosperty Tepresslon. Lest summer in was he returm
 quleuy ecculeace in the demands of the Presdident that he
be allowed tull control over the purre strings of the Naiuon


 To end the uncertulny which cloudse the mustizen sis right is mork whinout interference froan elther uhe hand of a Pederal
 Uniled siater.
In that way and that way only can we give sccurty to the

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman. byeld myself to tio.
Mr. Charman. I do not beieve it $\Delta s$ neecessory tor me
 1 only resretet it tis such tenancy atuation in this country.
 kegisibiluon.
There are those this atternoon who tave expressed ther

 passina of thit measure. However. It inink also therc approach. Whatever we may want 10 do. we know we can
not throurn the expendilure or hie lendina or





 the probien. Thereiore. 1 It vor the mesure we have before
 that this 4 a dave netuonal problem. In is not eprober Then we hed our hirt census nume on tirm back inc 1 ithe
 3-year period, from 1033 10 no 1 1335. when the proportion o

one at all. nor is 1 ts gravity new. because during the iwo


20-year perlod we had an increase in the number of tarm
lenants in tuis country of

 broush int the firm acreage of this country From 1800 io 1033 we had an increase in the number of tenanh percent. In other words. the percentase increased from 35 . ${ }^{2} 042.1$ percent.
percemagage of tenancy. the greates thncresse however. $\mathbf{o c}$ curring bee ween 1223 and liso prom 1930 to 1935 he per. centafe or tenancy decte met inem was an act cent in incresie of bbout 200.000 in the number of furm lenanis in this coun. try. However. during the seme pervo of hme niere wa. tors. which accounts for the fact that the percentage has goine down slignuly.
This problem is so great and coinplex that we cannol pos-
 country. In some secluns it is not serious. in is 8 greate in the Middile West. particulariy in the states of Iowa. rull nois. South Dakota. Nebrassea and Kansas, it is a eerioun probicem. because in in percest. it is 49.6 percent in lowa 4.3 per cent in nebrastra. 44.5 percent in 1uinols. 48.8 per cent in sout in itrive problem in those states and sometarm tenancy Dise grave prosem thalf the Butues of the Nation The probilim varies even in ineereat countles wishi states.
percentiage of tarm tenancy. there is a larre varracion be wween the percentages or tann lenanacy in aiferent coumtiee As 1 recall the nerre In another county it is about 96.8 percent. In the slate
 in all the Blatea where tamil tenancy is extensive.
Therc are other approcaches to the salutlon of thts prob-
 af recommendations, ot which Government nnancling of tenants is only one. They put theer Amser on what I uninu famm land. If you so to the states in the northeastem pant he courns minceu tof tarm tenecy is crillest you will nind that in these states for many years furm-land Nebreska. the Dakotas. and olher sletes in that arrea. you will nind that during ihe ceme period of tme there have You will Rnd. I hunke that in to wody \& great aceal of the
 Tor the riean numetuations in the priks of tarm lands is the fructualion in the price of articulural produchs. It hes
 the thinc now to to inn any furthe One tings th
 which the Eureau of the Census clessinhes mas a tenent. and the
 which. In enect. is more nearty composed of farm taboreng

nid row. but sumply occupy the satus or worksing for some-
ne else. betting their conmenianon out of the crop raititer
han in cosh. Here he gavel fell 1
Mr. HOPE Mr. Chaiman it vicid myself 3 additivital ninnutes.
Mralrumil, 1 think we have to approuch the sulution of the urobien of the sharecropper. perthass. froni a dulterceit
angle than we do that of the tenant who has had sume expertence in munagement. who has his own property in the way of furming implemenis and livestuck. and who has sone a Hete further up the rung of the asricultural ladder one of whom is Dr. W. W. Alexander. Adminibitator if the Resetlement Administration. conctude that it is practicalis or to become independent. The reasons which are siven in support of this concluston are: First. The agricuiture that cannot nnance the tenant because they are scared to the needs of the plantations: third. the cost of neerchant credt eeaves uttle or hothing for captial accumulaton. Yout th. the mapreting tus crop. Not only do the reasons given above seem to make the problcm in the south more cisilicult thun hat of the Nation asper particularly does not at this time have ellher the education. experinice, or backsround to nable hitm to graduate into the ranks of landowners. Many
audents of the probiem belleve that 11 will never be possible to make independent landowners out of this group und that whatever atuempts are made for the retief of this situatuon thelr status as sharecroppers and tenants.
The bill which we have before us today is based upon the
dee that whue we cannot help all of those who are deserving of naslstance in Decoming farm owners. we ausilt $L$ do what we can to help the most deserving thone who are more
Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman. will the gentieman Mield for a question Just at that point?
Mr . HOPE. Por a very britef question: yes.
Mr. WHTINGTON. Since
Lhe Qovernnient, manifestly. ts unable to help all. Would it not prevent discimm ination it here were some quaisications so as to enuble the aid to be
exicended to the most deserving and thereby give all the xtended to the most desery
seme opportunty to qualf?
Mr. HOPE. 1 think that
Mr. Hope. Ithink that is true, and this bill does provide
some qualincations which will enable the local commiltees Lo choose the most deserving. I be more specinc by saying
Mr WHITTLNOTON. May I Mr WHITTZNOTON. May I be more specinc by saying
that the qualincations should be that a man it able to fur-
nish at least a part of the purchase price or is better nuallined by experience to operate a farm
Mr. HOPE. Of course. that is an element that the local
committee should carefuly conslder. I think the succese or fallure of this approach to the problem is soing to depend very hargely upon the local commiltecs. If we have
local committens the membirs of whell are conscientious and will give their time and their criort to a job at which they are going to be very poorly vald. and who will cxir cise proper Judsuent and discretion in the selection of the
lenants. the plan has a much betcr chance of belng succeasful. Local commitueas can also be of great assistince in
ine siection of deasrable farms and in secing they are secured at fatir prices.
In conclualon let me say that ithink it is particutiarly im. portant that we rieounze bles form wily one ungle. Thic are many other things which need to be donc not only by he Federal. Btate. and local governnisinti: buit by individ ual and community eff 1
IHere the gavel fell 1
Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chaliman. I yiced 10 minules $w$ the ecu-

Mr REES of Kansse. Mr. Chatrasa, Hrat. I want to $\mid$ and do not Tant that bill wo create a further deach in the
 Wh. which we have up for considertition thts aflernoon. This is. after all. a biqanitc problem and the meapure we are
cunsider ing now, of course, adnititedy is an experiment at cunside
best.
W.
 the United states, geis pretty smani. betion approximately
 so it nalurally resolves iselif into an enperiment mbich, afthe all it weil worth trying. Wren we apprecite teno

 extenl at least.
The general intention of the bui before us todny in wo
reduce to some extent the number of form owner pho
 ween catied to the fact that worne so greer aso 24 percent of
our farmers were tenant farmera, but that now haif of them



 I want, however. to call pour atention thit afturnoon to
measure pendini besore Congress that 1 deem in of cona measure pendini besiore congress that it deesm in of con-
siderahie imporance to the counsry
 with reftrence to E. R. ©763. Which passed
Tilus whi provides for the exteoston for 1 zadilionn year of the 3 3/-percent interest rate on Pederal hand-bank loans
and for a 4 -perceat rate for the following year an linad-

 loens will po beck to the pemment of the old rute of intereat as it eristed 2 yeers apo. In outher worde. 20 jumt 3 days the present extension explires, and tho timmera the owee these loans will be charged wind.
The uning that causses me to caul your particular atten-
tive to this bill is the text of the Pressdenta letier. dated
 culture of the House and w certan Membera of the Benate.
whereta he opposes the reduction in interest rates on Franm whereta he opposes the reduction in interest rates on Farm he is "dururbed by the provisions of this buy" and belivent inc Mcmbers of Congeress should be adrised of the siltuettion
 says. andony other thatere tormery provided by the Federal land bank would create a gift to the farmer from the Pred-
eral Treasury. And he also states hat he nornowera from

He further states that the reduction in the intereat rates to the farmers by he Pederal land bank and the tend Bant



 hrough rxire appropriations or oblurellons.
Fyist.


and do not Tant that bat io create a further deact in the
United 8 stien Treagury.
I propase Arsit to Show
 predion trom the treasury. by fresion of the extenslon of


 country. tn why sense ot the word. However, let me suw-
sent that even the croation of a the pall suberidy of thin bilu athould result in










 ube ral recommendatione of the Appropititions commitice
of the House in mans indencea, emountias in all to manay of bue rouse, in m
mullunsis of dollara.
I do not want to take too much of your ture at thts polnt
Tou wil. however. necal that. without much oppoultori



 in couliforule lbat is to be edded to a zatlonal park. I am


 ern slatea. There are to many insiances
exceeded the commultee recommendations.
 about the erpenditure of a large amount of funds from the Federà Treanury even in many hastances beyond the
amounc surgested by our commatiles. amounth sugrested by our committees.
Do the Depart metit of Agriciliturd. 27 to statistics furnished onnersi in thio country loat their. ferme oil tor the reabon that

 clumakences over which they had no control. Thouandie of
carmers in the leat 4 yeara bave hoat their homea. Thiey


We nave here a serious stumation. I elte these Aswres to
 for a while at toent. sf be tu quectid to itve on his owa tarm
Now. I thoutd ure to call pour atiention to the fact thai







mately 4224.800 worth of hand. This number would have been greater had th not been for
heretofore aranted by tha congress.
We are dealing with is stupendous problem this aftersoon. It werms to me that it we are goling to save the furnis for
 misestoner loans for another year. erde the reason 1 call your aluenuon to it now is because the suil is in ibe bands of
 lamportant.

 in a varage, are loang their fornis ench year. If yourn. on


 Fhereby and withoul. in cray opdinon. any expense to the a cood deal has be
aranted to fanmeri by the Pederal agencles during the preas
 rate, but not al compared with the retiee "rinnted to ralroad
companjet and corporations which have been seatsed by the une of Covermmeat fundos. Purthermorse. When these loans were Arst made the shiereat rate was 4th apd B per-
 loun: and since we hene io B percent of the amount of his we have approximately 100000.000 of the farcnere mone pald to the Federal land banks that helpe to guarmice tad pas loen, he pald the secretary of the local organization a the loan for him. Pederal sand bank for the year 1036 , and the Arsi quamer
 gaginst losses of anrinkage on account of pudementi. fore

rendy ahown by the Federal had benk, and the pronte tha should accrue organizatuons that there will be more than enough profit to
 bank is concerned.
If the farmera of this country can salse a sood crop ints payment of toterest and taxes mill be at a mindomum in a year from now. It you want to help the farmer to help himesif, here is a chance where you can scasta a great num ness of agriculture tin this country. They are not subuing ior aima in any wense of the word. Ail they are abting for 4 an even break. Lets help prondee it to thems if we can.
ar. Doxiy. Mr. Chalrman 1 now yeld to the genule-
 of ledislation enacted during the pantif yeans by the DemoAmertice and with in. a revival in an business Restored purconsing in the cities. The wheis of finctordes. mulus. mines and rallionde are again turruse. and all than gained in the iace of unusual nakural dikather-the dioumbil and noode
of reenn yeara. But the consequencee of thene unurial
$\underset{L x}{x}$
 overtook the American farmer and his eariungs were sweph
 Reod and the prostess made by ubriculture has bech of cremendoua masistance to the enture Nation in recovery frun
the depths of deprespon wes the teystone in the arch of the Natlon's recovery. A present. We have the Soit Conservation program. supule commodity mana. nood. and drouklit-rcliel measurcs. We have iald the foundation for an econ, mikeally sound mbianal samm policy. The Commiltee on Agriculture. oit
 come. We hode to draft a bill that will mate: passible lex
 Lechand to tucrease the tammer's income. This proposed the House.
troday we deal with the farm-tenant bill. We provide for
 - Lonanl. Today two out of every ave are cenants Slatis Les Lelis us that for the past 10 years there has been an
cinual yearly Increase of tenants of about. 40.000 farmers annual yearly increase of tenants of about. 0.000 frarmers
This must roi conunue in the future. sound hezssation must be provided by which unfortunate people may be abl
in eecure land or credit with which to make a crop and
 Thelal warest. and econornic inscrurty will be eluninated The tarm-tenant bull. now under considcration, proposes
rempedy
this condutian and provide money for dis ressed farm
 become tenants, and lenanta to become leborers, and labor
era to became oblecta of charty. The bill authorizes loan
 a period of 30 yeara. Wiln which io buy firm lands. The
appropriation made ara) table in the bill is $\$ 10.000 .000$ for
 Lhe hex
fear
190.
Only
Only furn owners, farm tennents, farm haborers. and share-
 To eecure legistation of hats Eind betore our conimittee We have held extensve hcarings. Which are niow in the
hande of the Members of the House. My territ and disap
 economy drive. I hope by next year th aill de pushble to
lacrease the appropriation and to umend the bill tronil sea to year that more money will br mude avilliuble for thase in
zeed os this astatance and to prevent the furtiner lusime of farm thomes and lands wy their uwners
There is provided in the nieasure a hawal culuyy cont







 to the exititence of ell other buskess. The fations theds wild
clothes the world. He produces oew wealui fruen the soll hic
 of latustry stop. What would happen if tope farmers in the Unilled Staces should go on a sit-down strite as we wiltness
Uuduy in innay of our furiories? Who would feed and clothe the clly dweller and the factory worker? The answer ti. He
would go nuked and hungry scekling relief. with none to be would go nuked and hunury scelking rellef. with none to be
had: yet the farmer works longer hours and more days per weck than any mill or factory.
Not han any mill or factory.
Not only doest the farmer do but all the members
of his family have their lorig hours, from early morn untul
 the drcught, or the food, overtikes hum, he must continue
his eftorts. The tax gaiherer and the banker levg thetr his eftorts. The tax gatherer and the banker levy their
tirume just the same. whether the season is good or bad. withether the prices of farm prodicts are high or low. No
delays or stay of Judgment is tolerated by the interest coldelays or stay of Judgment is tolerated by the interest col-
lector, nur can the payment of taxes be deferred. The one lector, nor can the payment of taxes be deferred. The one
basic industry that must carry on is agriculture. America must be fed Happy homes are the only guaranty that lib-
eriy ind freedom possess. Without them anarchy and commmumam overtake us.
Oit the Unton Rrailway Station bullding here in Washinghome for the fanully. ure main source of national wealth the toundation of society." How true are these words. Fhim-
ing is the most sailsfying ife of our people. Here contentIng is the nost satisfying ufe of our people. Here content-
ment and happiness are most often found. It is where the young men and young women are to recetve their frst and best training for future citizenship. The securty of our
Nation and of our people tia wrapped up in the farm life.
 tin the coumry life. The love of home and the farm is the
basts for the love and devollon we feel for our siate and

 the farm and country whe. This fact was well-known by
our forefathers when they setlied Amertca. It was their our forefathers when they setled America. It was their
purpose that every min should own his home and farm. purpose that every min stould own his home and famm.
West ward they went and setted the fertule acres between West ward hey went and setled the rettile acres between
the Atantic and the Pacithe. They fought for more acres to have nore farm homes. Today, amilst all the friction
and strife that obtains in the industrial and manufacturing centers and cities ta our country, the farm home siands as
a beaton light to calint and stul the waves of discord and a beacon light to cainm and stult the waves of discord and
disconitent. If the larmer cun have equal opportunity with industry
aid reeeive parity prices for his crops, and if he can receive his share of Government eredit and protectlon, that is all
he siks. lic does not seek a dole. He seeks only equality in canmodity prices, in interest rates, and in taxes. No
faim nome in this cuuntry shuuld be required to pay a tax
 Too many in the citles and towns all ready. Many of them
 and il all the things worth while in ife. If they would ex-
perience the dignity of honest toll on the fanm. The clty perience the dignty of hoarst toll on the farm, The city
ife weakens, rather tuan makes strong. It menanical
and machine like. Every day like the preceding one. No diversity of eniployment, no change of surfoundilngs. no
 from the hills.
The 30.000 .000 farmers in America should continue to or-
ganize tor their own protectin and sceurity the ganze tor their own protection and sccurity, the same as has
lidustry. They are entuled to a fair and stable theome.
the suiue as the the saune as the laborer in the mill or the factory. They are
enillid to the simme convellince to oallity home needs.
 chraper frrulizer, and cheaper interest rates.
Thuy ure entitied to a forelign policy that
pruace with other nutions and a greater alarket abroad for
therr tarin products.

They are entilled to a soll conservation program. Lands
unsuited for cultwation or land that is uniprontable should
be laken out of uctive cultyaula be teten out of uctive cultivation.

 sharecroppers and greater incentive to laborcrs to becoms
home owners is provided for in this measure. The bill is a step in the right directlon.
Muh better and more far-reaching is the measure that
the resellemen and homestead programs. They have been, the reseltlement and homestead programs. They have been
and will continue to be, an expensive experiment. To my mind, the so-called homesteadd will result, a nd have alreadd
done to to treat waste of the taxpayers' money and a done to to areat waste of the taxpayers' money and a sull
greater disappolnument in the future to the homesteader
 tnexperienced. so-called experts and blueprint farmers and
bulders have been put in control and permitted to expert-
 ment throukhout the years and will not succeed unctes and
untul men are put tn charge to superitotend these protects untu men are put in charge to muperitatend these project
who are actual farmera by expertence and who have made
 the value of a dollar, and who himself is a taxpayer. No
so-called "braln truster. or theoritst can successfully carry so-calied "brain truster" or theorist can successfully carry
on a developrent of this kthd. as they have tried to do tr
the past. With any other resul than a waste of the people's the past. with any other result than a waste of the people The farmer may and does pront by advice and expert
assistance. but at last he must be an Individualst and work out his own salvation and be the author of hy own
 past 150 years. It will likewise be responsble for oof
development in the future. Every farmer and busincasinalin

 ald the farmer and business, as it should do. but at las
the farmer and businessman must bee responitbe for re sults. Thu a alone encourages him to carry on. Trift
economg, falt dealing. and the good-nelghbor policy will economp, falt dealing. and the good-nelghbor policy will
make him sovereign, It wull head to success. Service and
henest toll bring thets honest toin bring thetr own reward in the axcal strct th of
years ahead. when the shadows fail in the evelung actoss
uie western slopes. It is not casy to
against the drought. hood. About, by leg pisisation, protection
and teamwork upon the part ocriperation and teammork upon the part of the farmers themselves will
largely make this possible. The Congres aid by proper legisiation and the pendink bill, in lis provisowers and new home owners.
rent
h hikher standard of uving wllt be gradually expertienced
by the less forturate by legistallon of this kind. I regret by the less forturiate by legistation of this kind. I regree
that the appropriation provided in the bill is not sumbien that the appropriation provided in the bull to not sumpien
Lo do what we would like to for all the kinant farmers and
ite the home owners in America. but it is a step in the ring
direction. It is m milestone in the march of probress. Much direction. It is a milestone in the march of progress, Much
haa been done to aid agriculure in the pasit few years, and much more remains to be done to the tuture. The home
owners and the farmers are the last great hove in Amertce owners and the farmers are the last sreat hove in America
I contidenuy belleve. 17 we are to be saved from communimm socialisman. and the Reds, it will be because of the stabillzing
induence of the farmers in the Uniled States. They will be influence of the farmers in the United States. They wis be
the defendere and preservers of our $\mu$ berty and owr institu
 Industry ooves lur lite and exilitence. Business could nat
exist, nor the protesslonal nain uve except the farnier who erist, Dor the protestonal mand ive, except the farmer who
feeds and clothes him, and providess a market for his me:chandisse. and pays to it and to ham his bilts from the earn-
ings of the good earth. Let the Congress continue to conIngs of the good eath. Let the Congress continue to con-
cern tiself with the furniers' probiems. The prescnt admin-
 atrind in court. let him demand and rceetec cqual righis
and equal opportunities with the manufacturcr, and all other

thrmer a legislative prograin that with aliord him economid
accurty As was to well sald by Prealdent Ruosevell in the recent message to Congress:

-ill be goneraliy approved. The Federal Coucrnment canno
This to certainly true. The Federal Oovernment cannot
slone sccomplish the ead destred. We must have the coaperative elport of local and Btate institutions. We must make posalble farm ownershlip to tenants who have abilly and expertence. but who cannot become owners without as to those who are about to lose their farms and who need
credil extenslons. The passage of this blll will ald the tencredil extenslons. The passage of this bill will ad the ten
ants, sharecroppers. sad ferm laborers to become home ownerrs. This to certannly to be desired by sill of us. We must endeavor in every posilble way to increase the income or the fell because of the price they are required to pay when they buy. We must aiso endervor to have land velues became more stuble. Too much fuctuastion in the price of
隹 real estate has existed in ree past,
atble for our farmers to recelve thare of the national income. This is a national probiem. The publlc welitare demands it. We must provide the normnal requirements of the people protect the people against the hazards of weather. droumht. flood. pests, and dilease. and also agninst the dan-
gera of internatlonal crisca. We musi continue wih added genterest our soll ercosion and will conservation proartam to protect our tend resources. We must abo provide for the
rettrement of submarginal lands of the country from cultivation en provided for in thiab bul, Boll fertuly of the farmlands murt. at all unines, be maintained and increased. A proper tine with the demands of consumption is vissential. The Ooveritment must assist in alding the farmer to control the movement of bis crops to markel after they have been pro-
duced in order that the prices he is to recelve will be staduced in order that he pro always insure parity income to
farmera and falr prices to he producers
Natlonsl prasperity and secturity exist only when the buy-
ing power of the farmer ts made secure and certaln. The consuming opublic is enutiled to have the normal grac and the food reservorr sumelent woet iss demands.
The farraer needs to oreanize for his own protection, as
bas tndutry.
His producton of farm zoods must be adjusted to adequate home needs and to forelgn demand, an increased market abroad for our farm products is demanded we must aford beller apporlocesed security
 sure abundance to the wage earners and farmers a itite. is
needed. Within the past fow years and during the Roosevelt
 than under any previous admanastralion in the hiling oo
our country. Let us continue this policy of making more secure the farmers. who feed and cluthe ub.
Let the farmer contunue his fight for equalty of onportunty. He deserves to win. He has had many lons. lean
years. He ts the owner of the greatest indubtry in Americe. yeara. He is the owner of the greatest industry in mence
His success preans your success. Let we pass the pending
bill. I am proud 1 was born and ralsed on a farm. I ain bill I am proud I was born and ralsed on a farm. I asn
proud of this hertege. My father was a farmer. My people have all been farmers before me. I have elwaya
engaged in farming myself. I am honored to represent the people of the Pourth District of Tennessee and farming
the priciple busineas of my people. it is a great acricul-
 stock. and ecneral form rebources. Let us undertake, for
the orst ume in the pistory of the Nation. this constructive

whlle history for the future lin the passage of this newasure
Mr. HOHE Mr. Chuirman. 1 gheld 5 blaulirs to the ser Henian fruin Minuesota IMr. Anuhrsen
Mr. ANDRESEN of Munesota. Mr. Chairman, the dht'm
guished chafrman of our Commitce on Asiriculturi", Mr

 Commitlee. The hearnuss which are avallatic covering

 A. R.
the bill now under conserderation. H. R. \& provided that thi
Ooverament thould go in to the land businsss and buy tarm

 the bild before us today provides that the Secretary of Agri
culture chall make loans to farmers who desire to puichise culture thall make loans to formers who desire to parchise
farms and who recelve the approval of county commitites
 slance will immediately get thte to the land they purchase.
while under $H$. $R$ t. o. which was nut feorted by the cummiltee, they would not have recelved
operaued the land from 20 Lo 40 years.
operawd the land from 202040 years.
I do not belleve the bill now under consideration ... ind
 form when th gets to the United SLates Benate. I Bn satis.
fed that the bill will be amended and that the old Bankhead fed that the bill will be amended and that the old Bankhead
bill will be substituted. In other words. they will put in the farm-tenancy legisisation. the original bill. which ray re-
fected by the Commitiee on Agriculture eifer 11 wreks of Jected by the Commiltee
aebate in the committee.
aebate in the commitiee.
Bar. KELIER. Mr. Chatruan. will the geatienian yictu7 Mr. ANDRESEN of Minneso:a. 1 yield
Mr. KELLER. Will the gentil nail ell
Mr. KELLERR. Will the genti nant tell us the diferciuec Me. ANURESEN of Minnesota. I have Just slated that
the Dill the bill which was before the cummittee. whith was rel ciry
by the Commaltee on Agriculture, wets the Government up in
 buy land and select future owners to occupy it and that they
would be from 20 to 40 years in paying for 11 . white in this

 make applicalion for a loan and if this anproved by the
county coumittee and the cclimutiee tuinks tie furm is all right and the value is all right. thrin he can bet a loan up the farm if the valu the county committee is the sanue as the purchase dirtic.
Mr. HOOK in other words. the conmulie decided to Write its own legisiation?
Mr. ANDRESEN of Manesula. Thie gentleman is corretet
We tried for 11 weeks to wrile this bill. The ehatrinan of Whe committec trice his best to get a majurity or the narin-
bers to write the kind of a bll he wanted. Lut after all these bers to write the kind of a bllt he wanted. but after will these
weeks of debate. the cominnitce nially wrole the bill which the committee decided it watited. Thut is the bill that is before us.
This bill
This bill has been termed "no experiment" That it not
exactly correct, because the Resetitement Adinitisisation under the Department of Arficulture. has bern conductine a
similar experiment tor the tast $2 \%$ or 3 yenrs. They huve similiar expeniment for the tast $21 / 2$ or 3 yents. They thate
purehased thousands of farms throukhout the tunted states in all sections. They hine selected lenants or
 tion and the unsatisfactory results. I kiuw of an mitiance. in my own congressiotial district where they conpplited a re52 tenants, or purchassers. do not tnow how much they are solng to pay or those
from the $\mathbf{O}$ overnment.
 Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chaliman $\mathbf{I}$

Mr Case of Suuth Dakola. Mr Chatrman, will the ben Mr. ANJRESEN of Minhesuta. In Just a moment 1 will Ihir Adiniutsis ratur for the last $\theta$ mionths to have the Reseltlement humisteaders will have to pay for hach home. They sill want 10 kiow, Still he faits or rufuses or 13 unable to give the
tiluturation. As a consiquence, a great miany of those homestruders have become dissiuted and have moved of of the
pie inisej, because they do not know whet her they have ple thiser, because they do not know whet her they heve
litic or ever will get tile, or how much they will have to pay for it in the end.
 wion thin my own congressionat district. Which 1 have in nind the tenants were ted to belicve that they would pay so pour and there were so many ideallstic things that the
Resetllement Administration thought homesteaders ahould have, such as a new $\$ 10.000$ comununity house and a great many uther thangs that ralsed the cosst. that now when we
duvide the total number of homesteads by the total cost of the project. Instead of the individual paying 82.500 . the cost
has nounted up to over $\$ 5.200$ for each homestead. 80 haroughout the United states where these individuan who were to be helped. thought they were going to pay a medium run tip to five. scven, ten, or tweive, or, in some tanstences. $\$ 15.000$ for s litue honie and a few acres of lend. The same group ahich has hondled the Resectlement ad
minustration will undouttediy handie the administration of this art. I hope it will succeed. 1 am for the bill because it is the best bill we could get out of the commiltee. The
 todiay picture the condition of the tenants down in his seche truth of many of the tenuilts and sliarecropyers downin that section, end 1 say parts of the criural west would not let our hogs live in the housts that the tenanis and sharecroppers live in in that somerne: whether th is the United siates Oovernment. The indis sthall, ur tuic landowner, 1 do not know, but whoever ha Whe umpinsibility in connection with the present status of
this farge class of peopie in the Southern states should as this harge class of peopie in the Southern slates shoula a
sume the responstibity and not blame us in other parts of the cuntry, for we ure trying to fulfill our duly by esving thell ", willir kind of help to make them contented
Ament antizens.
Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the semlerinar yield? Mr. ANDREEN Minnesota. I yield.
Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentioman spoke about dily. in payment. I smm wondcring whether thas bill, providing. as 4 does in subparagraph 5 of tue IV. power for
the secretary to make puyments prior to audit and settlement by the Oeneral Accountling Omice, will correct $1 t$ and
wheilicr it is a Euod correctliun. Wheiller it is a Euod correctlion.
Mr. AfDRESEN of Minnesota. No: 1 do not say th will
cuirect it. and I do not think that we will set away from governmental red tape and delay in connection with this piopustion.
Here the


 red lape lat us take the case of a tenant sharceropper who
wallis to buy a furm. He koes over and looks et John Does faria. They agree on \& price and he tella Joho that he will
buy the farm if he can get a loan frum this new set-up of the
Governmetat
 berore the committee and niake his applicalion. They will
look at the farm. and 1 they feel that the purchase price is alt rilht and that the man is all right, they will recommend him for a loan. They recommend him to the Secretery of
Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture will get \&t after 3
 up the thie, and this takea snywhere irom \& months to 2
years. The sharecropper gets the sction or approval in
 man who was going to sell the farm has lost his sale, but in the meanume he has had all of has land tied up, I think it it
wil mo dumcult to get any individual who has land to sell to enter inion an agreement to sell his form contingent upon the purchaser getung A loan from the Becretary of Agriculture
under this but, it will take too long. We cannol do much sbout 11 except try to put through a plece of legislation that we belileve will be helpplul to some of the tenant farmers and
others who desire to own farms in this country.
 Mr. Hope. Mr. Chairman, I yleld such time at he may
dealre to the gentleman Irom Michigan (Mr Horruan!. (Mr. Horrman asked end was given permistion to revise Mr. HOFTMAN. Mr. Chairman. the gencrosty of the
House House th unanimously granung this time is deeply appre-
clated
The kindineas and the friendillness shown ty the ger,tle-
man from lilinois imr. Samithl. in pronipuly, when his altenlion wa celled to the ract. withdrawing the erroneous atestefent which he inadvertenty, made and which numes advocaling unnecessary violenice, is ackiowledged. His
 entlemen.
He, who by word or decd when strife in abroad in the land.
has sough nag sought to stir up class hatred dissension, of stitife, serves
no the cause of patriotism. II his act bc inoughtiess, he deserves the reproval or his associates. In his aet be detiber-
ate. he deservea their censor. and that in no uncertain terms.
Tme wed soul Tme was sought to correct an error made by the gentle-
man from Texas iMr, Mavincki. nor because of any feeling man from Texas imr, MAvenick 1 . not because or sny feeling
of personal hurt or chagrin, but for the reason that today
throughoul of personal hurt or chagrin, but for the reason that today
throughout the countrithere are two schoola of thought hrld
 nowird a dcatlination which, when reached, if to oblectlives
now sought ale not changed, can but lead to bloody clvil strite, These are not the words of an alerinita. The fact io
tnow to all. nown to all.
Por that re
Por that reason there should be no misinterpretation of
the sidns along these patiliwys. iherc sliould be no misundir-
 regret at the our choice his seen made Let us look, there-
fore, at the facts as they exist. On June 22. Conckesstumat Rrcono, page 6162 , the gentienian from Texas IMr. Mavin-
cer 1 , speaking in the House, among othcr things sald:


 The statement by me, as reticred to by the genticman
trom Texas. will not be found in the pruted Rscono. as

 obleined from the stenugreph
sadd on the foor. 14 was this:


My basks for that statement was taten from the remaria of the Rucomen, from pegeaned to be ingerted in the Appendir entlemen, if you are interested, to read as it it in notable contribution to presecht-day knowledese. The mddrem wed Americe. an maty Creke Patk. Deutroll, Mach.
The gentleman atated to ble aualence, among other thinge:

 Sou krow mis triack Till

On the subecquent pase, ho culd

 A. me aela; The accuracy of the sutbor, bistorien, and atalasman from
Texe and ber nature or his reanoning may perhape ho
undersiood by two quotation from the Recone. The ominence of the gentlemen from Texat who confors whit the President. Tho, eccording to the papere, announces whe president's will upon his relurn from the wand mukes dulosophy.
In pasaing, let me note, that on page 15 to of the Appendix
the Rxcame. In the apwech dellvered by the gentleman. In of the Riscano. In the
 entreme.
Mey I moat humbly venture to my to the speaker and to
the Members of the Houne whel thera to somevhet endin stetement. Arnilea went out of thelr way to meet and dectroy each other. The seniteman from Texes edded atatement.
nemain I find on page 1sse of the Appendix of the Recond, of your soldiers. The rentloman from Texis, referting to the herolkin of Oeperal Pictett and biem men. and
 Agaln, is memory perves correctug, Plecetitis men went sormounced the fence, but they vare on foot. and the bull aure as lenders of this charge, that brave Armistoed and Carneett diled
guns. Cushing gave up his ufe at the mume tume. But per-
hape
 the factis hould not be cineegarded and truth ispored ove
where the object to the atialnment of some worthy end, The record of John L temis writiten so wah al men may read it all men may choose whether they vill follow, hin
kenderanip. It would be prenumptuour for me to muggen to the gentieman trom Texas that be should follow any man a a I cader.
the woutd not bo improper, however, to call hat attention to 1922, 25 unarmed, defetwelowson men, who hed darriongerd to
all were dead. In thould not be forgotien that. Whill, Lewis
has collected meltons of dollara in dues from workitimin. has collected mullons of dollars in duas irom workthirinin.
be has beft behild a trall of lose of wages, reducuon of prounctlon, volencace, bloodebed and death uniqualed by that of any other hasor loeder.
it might bo noted in report chowe noted tu prosilas that a Deparinent of thitior $0,051,70 e$ dayss' work were lost, and this by labor while Lewis Fram 1822 through 1926. and period of 4 years, 17.050 .000
 becaume of striten
It Will bo noted that, while Lewla was in the saddie organwers hot through mutiken in a period of 4 momithe as were lose in the 4 yeara form 1027 throuth 1031 .
It the the genueman'




 Ior the Nation.
Jube 22. to the
1 anp getung the House, the genticman cald

May I moat bumbly apolorize to the gentleman trom Tut Ind nearure hime that 1 will endcuvor wavold any contikis. for the ercellence of bisest peformance in the Hiuse. in inking in Mey 1 conct to comple with hin to rantine or rouring of eych a concede to him all the hureis which go to the willur that he might have retired to the clookt roon for a few me menta and aved himselt a bit of wearitess.
The gentleman then
The gentieman then continued-




Most assuredy a Congressman has no right to violate $1 t$ In of the land. He should. and I have always riled to be
extremeis carelum to obey not only the laws of the federit. extremeis carelul to obey not onlg the lews of the Frderia
Oovernment, of the State. but the ordinances of all cuinmunliles.
Never but once have $I$ even taken advantage of the pritu
lege of a Congressman to purk where others cuuld noi, ex


 cloar, it to to be doubted whether any true, patriotic Anwert-
can
wil
dieagree
with what was sald or
Hie purpuse incended,
 out of a total or over $A$ thousand had called $a$ strike tu the the Newton Biced plant and \& small group of pleches, whirh
hed tept the puble blehway blocheded and ine inen froin


C. I. O. had announced that $1 t$ would lavade Moaroe. It had
tircaterned to hold a dcmonstration ta that citg. On chis sunded y saw bonest, respecteble businesmen and wuns, sianding guard to repcl an invaslon. That ameme day. according to the news papers, some 8.000 men from other parts of the State and outside the shate-for Monroe is less
inan a half hour's drive from Toledo met in the park jus
outside the clty himits threuteninu advances on the people of hnan a hal
outside th
Montoc.
I cothe on iny may, and Monday's papers quoted Butner.
oue of the $\mathbf{C}$. $\mathbf{I}$ O. organizers from Chicago who handled
 Monrof today
have if we took tl who ever heard of Monroe untul \& tew days ago? It ls a fly spot on the United States." He threat-
encd the C. I. O. would be back, and he satd-I quote: "By encd,
oull.."
Having seen the stratined, drawn faces of the men at monrue: having heird thelr expressions of anxiety, of tear; hav.
ing sensed their dctermiration to protect their clty and their people; having in mind the tnvasion of the planit by hun-
dreds of armed workers from outside the state. knowing Murphy stood back of and encouraged lawlessness and vilata-
tion at Fint. Mich. I sympathzed with these men of Monroe
$M y$
My heart went out to them in time of stress in thetr
heiphessness analinst the arnys which the C. I O. could bring nualinst then. so I wired the mayor of that city apd I ziso at the same ume whed my secrelary in my home town
"to nave rellable cilizeng who are wilung to go to Monroe to and in defending the ciry from invasion promised by C. 1
 list of arms, tents, and cots at oatce." For that acllon
have no apoldegles to make. The orier to the major of Monroe was mude in good falth. It stands.
 small businessmen of our country, the people, women, as well as men, in the smaller communties, wuil whed their
bloout. will give their lives, before they win be dominated. driven from their working places, from their towns and clles. by the C. i O. or any other Communist-controlised sroup.
Another instake which the gendleman and the $\mathbf{C}$. I. O. workers make ts he mssumption thet, fike the fanocent medi-
cine man of old, thcy arc immune from tie fatalltes which workers make is
cine man of old,
overtake others.
If is the privilege as well as the right of the genucman trom Tcxas mir. Maviaick 1 to go up and down the country-
side assisting the C. I. O. and its andiatcs in organizeng to Aght and march under the banner of Madam Prertins in her
criort to force businessmen to acknowledge the supremacy criort to force businessmen to acknowledge the supremacy
of tevis. It may be ht ppeasure to sddress crowds which
boo the mentlon of the supreme Court as was dope at boo the mentlon of the supreme Cout, as was done at De-
troit. They will make no lmpression: he will get vilue sympathy in his preacliment of the doctrine that American
citikins citlicins should permit becir towns, heir clltes, therr indus trlal plants, to taken over by those whom he e
The banner of the C. I. O. and the Communista,

But I call attontion to the fact that 11 was Homer Martin. acting nidder the leadership of Lewis, who stilled the whetis
of indu try; who closed the factortes: who dectroyed auto unolilts in the miking: who provented the orderly execulton

 It wis members of an organization which acknowledges
the leadership of Homer Martin. who turned on the power The leadrishtp of Homer Martin, who turned on the power
in the Siginaw valuey decrtving hundreds of thousands of
ctions on the necesbler ctherns of the necessithes of hife and who undountedy
would have kept the people of that valley plunged in dark-
ness, had not the sherifs of threc countues notifed mich1-
gan's Oovernor that he cllizens would take the law tata
their Wheir own hands. if power was not restored. For that We have come to the paring of the ways, For the mo-
ment the brood and the easy rond, pollitically, may be the one pointed out by the genulcman from Texas. Along that
road under the banner of a aghturg leader with almost road under the banner or a Aghitus yeader with almost
unilted funda at his command. with an orzanization the
 hundreds of thousauds of arim, delernined men who have
been led to believe. who are told frequcitly, that they been led to believe, who are told frequantly, that they
are the slaves of thdustry, of cmen who would deprive them
of their just rights. of their Just 1 Ithis.
Small
Sman wonder then that they are earnest, that their
actuans are vigorous, that they are wiling to sacrince. But bundrede of thousuands of men have suffered and have died
because of erroneous betiel. because of tille leder because of erroneous beyef, because or false leadership.
Lewls is halled as the greatest labor leader of the century. ands is halled as the greatist labor leader of the century,
and at licue that he hes ka bered milions under his benaner, but he has gathered them by the holdding out of
false hopes, promuscs impossible of pertormance, and by allse hopes, promiscs imp
intimidetion and violence.
And where has he led them and what has he accom-
pulshed? Examine thoroughly. palnintakingly, the hustory planhed examine thoroughy, painstakingly, the history
of the recent strike in Ocneral Motora. Compute for yourself from reliable sources the tircerease in wages and
sgeinst it sel the total pay-check lose of the workera. against th set the total pay-check loss of the workera.
and to that loss add the amount which Lewis' organizatons collected for indlige an and dues. Then balance your
books and note the result. Asceraln the working condibooks and note the result. Ascerniln the working condi-
tom and the boura which previlled before Lewis cntered
bo the seld, exanine subsequent conditions, and same methe-
what, if anyining, has been galined. Apply the sal ods to the other industrles which have felt his bughting
couch, and you wil have a fur and true picture of what Louch, and your
has happened.
That the c
That the $C$. I. O. does not always represent the workers
has been convinctigily and spectacularity hna been convincingly and spectacularly, denonstrated at
Youngstown and albo at Johnitown, where, when the workers were assured of protectlon, they went back to their tasks, the culla were op
 hight is Detween the workers and the craployers, All know
that this to not true. His faht is not only egainst the hat this to not true. His night is not only agatnst the
eupployer. but tno that batlie he has thrown his workers against the unorganized and the organizcd workers who do not belong to his organkation. From the beginning he has
constantly attempled to drive cyery toller into his orran-
 dapute, so that under whatever banner the neht may be tis thai the C. I, O. ts nishuns not onty the employera but ais other industrial workers.
Even this does not complete the storg, for astide from che workers in the industivies where Lewish erinorts are con-
centrated, he New York Nimes in an edilorial of yestcrday telles us:

number of gal
And upon
larger part of targer part of the Immeasurable cost of his !ndustrial war-
 and with him march Homer Mortin, Prankensleen, the Reuther boys, Browder, and a host of Communists wilo sneer at the Supreme Courr, scor at law ond order, and boast of
the ald of Siate and Pederal omecials in thelr enterprise.
 parts of the country, from the uneducated end the educated.
from uie wan who dictates his jetter to the man or woman

Who writes rst tablet paper or a post card, from the edthorial Triers of the great natlanal dallleas to the moat otscure
 demanded by necessily.
Tsue than to quote ooverty. clearis, and conciacts atate the
 He lays down the doctrine that those worters who winh
in remaltr on strike "certainly are enultiled to do so and to continue any snd all lawful protesis", and that in equal farrness, he gald, "those who want to work should enjog that
priviege without betng molested."
Speaking of governincnt. be said.
coverelen pow crovernincnt, be sald; "It must not abdicate its
Here is a declaration of prificlple witch itreeds fisuce for
Onited states or the Qoovernor of Muchlyan in December of L236 when these sit-down strikes begen in the Cleneral Molors plants, would have avolded controverity, roience. and
Dloodshed. it is the applicat lon of this princlple in folloved by Governor Davey. Apprilliow of by invernor Townsend, of Indiana: Oovernor Horner, of ilinnols; Governor Croes, of
Comnecucut; Oovernor Hurles. af Massachuects Democrats All, wither mut be ahthered to is peace to to return
Another thing which must come before ore will have lartof peace in industry it the repeal or the drastic amendroent What tis purpose may have been, hat proven to de the enterng wedge wblch has driven apart organtzed and unorganleed The unflourmess of that ace, as enforced by the Netional
 glves to ambllous, self-seeking reckeceeris, have demonsiriated beyond all questuon that it adds to, rather than diminisishess rrite, Could hose who passed it havo foreseen the interIt would be enfor ced, and the dilisuster which has followed in Its wake, it is more than
reached the statute books.
We have the Nallonal Labor Relatioass Board telling us hat it the duty and the obulgution of employers to algo a We have the Pressident of the Onlted Btates mating the bald declaralion that cmployern should wisn with the C. I. O. to he stec) strike now on. Hut listen to the argument to the promalses Which were made when the buw was before the nong other things, sald,
 Weferon
Senator Wacaner hlmseit wrote on November 2. 1935, that Here weld further and the law to compel an emploger to alen. pose such $s$ requirement. coeling saturday's papers, we find


 making of a
of Its terns.
Aside from
the Coverioor the use of Prnnsylvanis's armed forces by most outrageous dremand ever prom thert work, perthape the mave, sald whe made upon him Dy Madam Perkiph, who, be Torporation, and Prank Purnell, of Youngstown Bheet Tube Co., and "Krep them there untll thel them an agree-
ment" with their meed varkern

The Oovernar characterzzod Bocrelary Pertins subse.tion as the exerclse of the most autocraute and dielatiorial
powers ever Ateempled" avd min privato iffe it would bu: bdinuping.- Let wi pause here, ous a titte commion ariss: and constder. Just assume for the monient that the Giverror hid the aulhority and could and would call in Girdinr
and Pumell, and ouppose he called in Iewls and his rinit yeuteriant, and he appose he calied in wewls and his hilit tratl they aurreed. Just whut agrecment could he force them 1 am
 you must aten, Oirdler and Purnel山 say we will not sils n.
The Oovernor says sten; they Eimn; sign what An alrie-


 not poy it. Shall the Ooverament say, you shall pay it re

 asy that they canoot meet the unjon demand for a dollir
and can pay but 50 cents per hour. Iewits snys. "WC will
 for 50 cents an hour?"
These are exlucme wustrations. Neverthcicss, the con. stanty increasidg deniands of habor for a larice share
the eross emues price, the ever-present dcsire of the manutac turer to reap a proft, are in continuous con inict and if Gal
emment, as polnted out by Donald Richberg, asumpis conur ernment, as polnted out ind liself begsimg for the night to sell tha wervices to the hishest bidder, rather than tu a Goverin ment-controlled market
 Jone without oovernment compubsion to burgain conlect
Uvely, and meet in a sprit of reasonabienuss, thy wall in the future, as they have to the past, find $a$ connming round
 industry,
Lo exist.
Denimet
Denunctation-critelsen without the suggestion of a remt
 gin and the President are permilline, if not sanclivilisu: mob rule, From that day to the dure when Governior
Daver, of Ohto, announced his polley of pritectunk the main
 nea wants conthoue.
nepidy widenline.
The genteman from Texas sald he was getung a ultir bit The genteman from Texas sald he was geting a witlic bl
ured of constanuly hearng this ranting gnd roaring. May I call nis attention to page 6213 of the crongressiunal
Recono under date of June 23, wherc the Democratic whio Recond under dale
in the Senate said:



Turn to page 6284 of the Recoad of June 24 and whl there the statement on prosent conditions by a disitin
suished Democrat whose loyaly suished Dimocr
Viloon ts clear:
 It wes wh the
 provided among other things. for the regstrathin of Liveir


Orike: made labor crnantzalitons I That oll has remaloed wembers. wlute condiluons have steadily grown morse It wias on June 21 cheal 1 orrered H . R . 759 s , making it a
and s.luny to transport in interstate or iurelgen commerce per-
sons who are enguzed to going from one state to another to close facturles.
EEch of these bilits, It enacted into iam. mould ga a long
wiay toward alding to the sofution of some of our industrial croutics and there is nothing in elincr that would be unfala to lubor. or that would in any way prevent the erowh of the enactinent of the British labor lew-and there is no rea son to belleve that 11 would not-the enaciment of these two measures would strenstben yabar untions. ald in driving out
racketers and create new condence beiween emploger and unlon organizations.
These two bills were foliovied, on the 22d day of June by a resulution respectifuly calling upon the President to de-
clure that no cillizen of the Uutled Btaces should bo deprived of the apportunty to engage in his usual and cut-
 a pertod of 2 days. to give protecticn to any person desiring to pork, that right should be secured to aim be the action of


 blood hed. the right of men to wort
ing the dirclaratlon of courapeous Governor Deances followTherc, inimedfately upon being assured of protection, the men recturned to their work. dernonstrathere as 1 have sald
before, that they do not wish to strike; that they are driven
 May 1 not appeal to the Democratic Membera of House to conssder the aiveation as ti exista lodeyt And bers: 1 do nat mcan New Dealers.
Banny of you sat here in the last session. You heard that
most eloguent Member of the Hout most ellocten make his remarikabie plea for masbems. Mr to be rikht and just. amd you remember how. becalle he dared to oppose hiese fanatucs who were advising the Presspatriutic service lirre.
Nuw. niluke no mistuke and do not decrlve yourselvcs. Yuu gentlegenen who have the courasc to experss yours con-
victions are marticd Ior political slaughter. JJm Purleg and
 You nasy have thought in the past that you were a part of
the nationul administration. Noothung is further from the
 nation ed edininistratlon. Of aus the laws which tave becn
cnacted since the president was elected probably cnacted since the president was elected, probabiy not a
hundredth part of the thought expressed is your thought.
 their tilorious charge on the hill at Gettysburg. and. In truth
 saclifecing drvotion.
But in another way you gentlemen of the south have.
durins ine past 4ycars. shown a logalty to your seader equai to that of Pickel's men. You have aubnierged your indlvidual opituons. You have followed blindly, unhestaungly
and uilwaverinuty the commands, the suggestons of the Pred uinway.
Yuu have whatched with doubt and apprehenslon many of
Hie moves which te has made. In your mind gou have




You have been gitung here watching, waltinge noping. and
innow many of you praying that ne would ccase in those I know many of you praying. that he would ccase in inose ment witch you lowe.
Today you kiow. you understand. as you have never
underatood before. ine road which he is tollowitur the dcatunderstood before. the roud which he is tollowithe the destinallo toward which he is trayeling.
With amaronen and alimost unbelet. you sam his attack agalnst the Bupreme Court unfold. You recelved his re-
organization bul and you sensed its purpose. You given the hour and wage law and you reatizece. ity import.
 Lewis. who publicly demanded that whe President of tho
United stales pay a pollical debt. You have observed the President of the United sutates atuing allent and. by his allence. giving approval to the act the land. in depriving men of their right to work
You have heprd the stectement of a great Democratic Cov-
crior of the great suale of Ono crow of the erreat siact of OMO that thic Prestlcat's Becretary of habor called upon him to kidd
Ladusiry and hood them unill they yeldad.
And, whatever mes be
And. whatever may be the controvcray between the great
Oovernor of that State and Mme. Perkins. you tno Oovernor of that State atd Mme. Ferkins. you know that
the President has noi intertired when Indusitifas have been Eldonaped and hell to ransom.
Oh. I appeat o you Domat
Oh. I appeal to you Democrats of the Bouth and true
Democrats of the North. Democrats of the North. to act before the to too late.
Do not beiteve that the toyalty and self-secriacling
 wid tollow in the wake of that lonks. Long list of patrotiou
Democrats whe have been kicked out of the parts organLeathon.
Have
Have you forgotten what happened to the Denocrats of
 dent where his organizatlon thought ti potiticerlly expedient?
in Lhe Benate and Mouse. Sucked dry like an orange. having no more to yleld, you
wiu be careleany but delberately tossed aslde tnto the pointical euther. Jonan: inpmates tossed him overboard mith no more disregard of consequences than wib the Administ ration
 hat. instead of a retculna while.
machine mill be on your neck.
Why not from this day on
Why not from this day on make the fight. not only tor the
princlutes of truc democracy. but for your
 pasa upon your fate and they wil have in mind the President a assault upon the supreme court. upan our form of
government. na approval of the sti-down strikes and of inwirasness.
The people of the United states will not quilety submit to the wrecting of their Constltution: to the assault upon the
integrty of the suprene Court: to the destruction of their form of government
Lei the President
on the course which they liave marked out, and you will have civil strite chrouthout the Unjon.
gard of all of his campalign promises to an repudatition of nis oath of oflce and his obligatlons to uphold the law. and this he has done in order to obtain his objective. Which now
stands disclosed is the domination of all industry and commerce and the centralization of all functiuns of government in the execullve depariment.
Writera like Lewrence. Bullivan. Thompson. and Walter
Luppmann. and a host of editorial writcrs from the great
 polnting out the cnd to which his course wil lead, and long
have they been saying that they did nol belicve the Pretidcnt

Thus athtude wes chariteble. but it was inarcurate and
smplied that the President was a man of smail Intellectuad
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aluainment.
atulsed him.
wothing bui
Hothing put a was decelved and masled by those who ciples of justice, of equaliny. of a square deal far every man or a raflure wapply that knowiedge. can account for the fallure of the president to deciare for twow ond order when
these artikes hrat came about. 1 ask you to reed the artucle of Ldpornarn in gaturdag: tosue of the daliles and nole how he. anwaya a friend and an adiniler of the President. has at hat arthed aid dictatornhip. All this welter of volence and of bloodshed which con-
 great Democratic Party bere and now indat upan the apgreat Democratic Party here to the present dituation. of Pennsylvania: Murphy. of Michigan: and to follow men of Pennsylvania: Aurphy. of Muchigun: and to tollow men Horner. of Iltinois: and hat and most unilochline of all, Governor Davey of Obso.
get mack of him. deciare for haw and order. pass the ble tade like mial before the moming sun. Mr. Doxiry. Mr. Cnairman. I yletd 10 minutes to the Bent. BIERMANN. it is well to bear clcarty in mind uhe pursoce of the thersle tion and not to lose ajght of that. The purpose of thin hesishith is to make owner-operatiors out of peopif who bcen owner-operators, have faliked in that capacity. calculated to promote the purpose of thus bul:
Patie $b$, ultur line 3 tinsert: Pate b. whtur line 3. insert









The Arst of these amendments provides thut for the frat nctary of the act he shall be elven tue advice of the Depar ment and also a crrtain amount of supervision by the Depariment in order that he may not only conduct his farm in
a farmerlike manuer but that he ahall conduct it in a buat
heard or
I heard or read a statement many ycars ago which I have mas wwere in the posiltion of angin employee aganill that years of are acainat mis making a success. It does not foreclose his succeas. but $1 t$ makes the chances of surceas aranat him Tho never owned a farm or forpier owneras ans formont cause or another lost thetr farms. Is submert to the committee that the chances are against these people paytng a $100-$ percent lonn unless thef have the most careful supervilion
and advice. Talm amendment provides that during the Mrut
reass of this relationahip thes shall have the Letuent of cound advice and wise supervision.
My aecond amendment provides that the be wethriary of in act cunnot allenate this ferm: that is. be. cannut sell it He cannot pay off his othisatilun completily fur wl l ...
 ar. BIERMANN. I yield to the genteman frum Ket
 yeara?
Mr. biermann. Yes
Mr. Borgion of Kentucky, Why is that?


Yorkr mTzapatruck. Wuwd that be mandatory? Winlld he have to carry out the edvice of the Depurtuent? II

 ought to be manda ory.
We are not entering into at aticuly business retautimsthip
 of the value of property. It is not builnesslike to lend
money at 3 percent. because that will not pay the co:t
 the borrower. mate it mandawry?
Mr. BIERMANN. 1 think it docs. Ycs.
 mia. biermann. I yted to the genlichian from call Mr. VOORHIS. Has the gentlcman conside red thes Pus-
albiliy in connection with uis advice and counsel. whict

 Mr. BLERMANN. No: Thave not cunsidered thart
Mat. Wangwortu. That would be lending nore than
 oc uese.

 mith he would actualy kcep the man troin
seluag this farm for a period of 20 ycurs?
Mr. BIERMANN. Yes: exachy. Would min hat di...nin
Mr. MTCHELI of Tenncssee. Woul age ine idea of taking advanturce of a Guve
Mr. BIERMANN. No: I do not thiluk bo.
 yield any more. as my remalnink time is shori.

 yeas kind of people who seriously want to inake lisis t...in their tons-tlime homes. and not we enter into iveculan in





ie farm and. of course, he win. Instead of getting a long-
nie owner operator of the farm who looks upon this farm lis home and as his dwelling we have a speculator. wec arc going to get the Government into the business of hriancing the purchase of tarmis. The Government. In Atect, beconirs nathother land buyer and each added buyer hatit will as far as the beneficiaries of the act are concrmed. take the biand the oovernment fnances out of the
int uliulve clasg for 20 jears ut least. It will make this inc ulatue clast for 20 jears at least. A will make thas slu. Wd be the nailn purpose of the will
Mr. BIERMAAN. I yele to the genticman from rilinols,
Mr Mr LuCAS. If rie take this man out of the speculative arims and deprive him of any proat they might make on
heirs?
Mr. BIERMANA. Onder this bul we are considering Just to that one type.
Mr Lucas.
Mr. LUCAS. Would not the gentleman consider a windather than take the pronts on a single farm?
Mr. biermann. Yes. I would be in favor of any kind practical lestia May I say further that the amendments I propose are May 1 say further that the amendments in propose are
prectsely in line with the fiddings of the Frim Tenancy Commitlee which the President of the United Btastes ap-
pointed to investigate this problem, not only in tuis country but in toreign countrits They have orititen a report in houth they suggest wha, an among the things they proroblem of farm tellancy, and among the things they pro-
Dosed are thesc two ldcas which I have erabodied in the two
Mendminits. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. BIERMANN. I yield to the EEntleman from Ohlo. Mr. ThOM I am lit sympathy with the general object us suppose this insiance by the gentlcman from Iows, itere is a family who locates on a farnt and the husband suddculy becomes
carive continut the opcration of the farm.
Mir miElimanin. Thie bill coucrs a siltuation of that kind In asolher section. My amendinent would siot preclude Ihat If a man bucromes un nvinald or if he dics or if A. . Ani, You would have to have some discretion in Mr. BIERMANN. The following is a simple hlusurstion mortgage program as now proposed in H. R. 7502 is put Into effect and the purchasers are allowed to pay thetr debta Let us assume that the reasonable appratsed value of the farm is $\$ 3,000$, and that the seccretary secures the loun by frst mortgage on the property which is to be amortized
withln 30 years, at 3 -pcrecnt titerest. Under such circumstances the annual payment would be $\$ 153$, a part of which
would be wed to rcduce the amount of the loan. Withla 3 would be bed to reduce the amount of the loan. Within 3
years the tenant purchaser would have repaid the Covernyears the tenant purchaser would have repaid the oovern-
nent approximately $\$ 195$ on the princtpal of the $\$ 3.000$
Suppose now that land valucs have risen and a local real*
rstale operator knows that he can sell this particular farm for 54,000 . Obviously, he can make a pront if he can buy he furm for $\$ 3.500$. Sincc the tenant purchaser agreed to

 in casth. of whach $\$ 500$ ts clear pront

Both the speculator and the farmer have made a $\mathbf{3 5 0 0}$
pront cact on the double transaction. But what has happened to the Covecrument's provian of alding the tenant
farmer to becoming an owner? Obviously. It has fallod. The tenant purchaser whown the Giovernnicnt staricd toward home ownershitp no longer has a farm. The man who now
owns the furm may be another spectlitor or an absentre owns the furm may be another spiculititor or an absentse
owncr. he may, of course, be an operating farmer, but owner. he may. of curse, be an opcirating farmer. but
even so, he has pald $\$ 4.000$ for a sarmm at speculative livels
 Unics therc is some kind of restriction in the mortage
or Ioan contract. which will prevent such a sluation from
occuring a Oovernment progrann of this type will ald in occuring a oovernment progragn of this type will ald in
bringing about an increase in land values. $1 t s$ greatest adbringing about an increase in land aspes. its arealest ad-
verse efeet will be at tmes when specuation is Hfe. and
hence the program wil be a direct impetus to speculative booms.
IHere the gavel tell.

Mr. Doxey. Mr. Chairman, 1 ylcld 5 minutes to the sentleman from Nebraske tMr. Corrizi.
Mr, COFFEE of Nebrask. Mr. Chairman. ulle 1 of
this bill provides authority
 to loan $\$ 10.000 .000$ tor the frst year, $\$ 25.000 .000$. the second
year, and $\$ 50.000 .000$ the third year to farm tenants, farm year. and $\$ 50.000 .000$ the third year to farm cenants, farm
haborers. and sharecroppers to purchase samms. While this Ls a lasge amount of monevy. 1 t will be onlys a drop in the
bucket lo comparison to the amount that would be rebucket to comparison to the amount that would be re-
quired to make farn owners out of all the farm tenants in this country. At present there are 2.860 .000 Cemants. There are 40,000 people beting added to ulis class annually. As.
suming that the average cost of a self-sustaindig farm would suming that the average cost of a self-sustaining farm would
be $\$ 5.000$ and it runs much more than this in the Northonly 2.000 tcrants in the Undted States could be Snanced

 those dropping into the tenant class evcry year. and it
would provide a farm for only one of every 286 tenants and would provide a firm for only one of every 286 tenants and
sharecroppers in the United States. The $^{210.000 .000}$ will provide loans to purchas
tenanis and sharecroppers.
With 2.207 countens in the United States having 300 or
more farms each and regardcd Wy Hie Asriculture Departmore farms each and regarded by the Agriculture Drpart-
ment as agricultural countles, it is evident that it would

 States. It is cleariy evident that only a vcry snall per-
centage of the tenants can be benefited under this legisatoon and that the vast manority. who milht be ted to believe
that a generous Frdera! Oovernment will loan theri money that a generous Frderal Oovernment will loan therm mone
to purchase $\AA$ farm. will be disappolnted. If you are going to purchase a sarm. will be disappointed. If you are going
to treat them all alike. it woud require over si4,000.000.000
to finance the purchase of farms for all the tenats and to Anance the purchase of farns for all the tenants and
sharecroppers In the United States. Obviously this canno she done.
Under the bill as th stands, the Secretary is authorized to
und 100 percent of the purchase price. Such an unsound loan 100 percent of the purchase Price. Such an unsound
loaning pollcy by the Federal Oovemment, in my judginenh cannot be jusuliscd.
The serlous qucstion involved is, should the Federal Gov-
erminent embark on an unsound prograin that will in future years bring demands on Congress to approprlatc billions o dollar for thess purpose. or should we approach this probiem with a more pract cal looning pollty that would in itself limi
 be in cxcess of 90 percent of the viluc of the farm. I do no contend that this will make all the loass sound. but it woill b a great improvement over the present provision suthorizl
100 -percent loans. It is a mistuke to encourage tenants assume the burden of ownershlp before they are funancially
ande

By requiring the tereat who ts to be ananced to flato down payment or 10 percent. the Covernment wil be seved inccess of chils pros in possible future lossees and the future encourage thrift to muke loans availabie only to those tenants who are better able to purchase and asaume the burden turthermore, by requiring the 10 percens payment the And pects are greater for the purchaser to eventually pay of the Thus bull will not soive the Government.
Thus bil rather than cause of an ceonomic melem which $t$ if we could make farming proftable, the farm-tenant probI have 32 counties in
gritcultural nature. Thie state of which is entirely of an pon agriculture as tit has no natural resourceat other than ertile soll and watcr. Of the farmers in my district. 49.3
percent are tenants. I do not believe there io 4 better class or a more worthy class of farni teannts in the United Slates helther are they asking. the Federal Covernment to in ocunce the full purchase price of a farm for them. They realize that some timitailon must be placee an Federal texpenditures share of the 36 bullon dollars of bonds the Pederal Government now owes, not to mentlon any further lacreases that nsy be incurred. They reallze the Federal Oovernment gend more than ts revenucs. They are more laterested commodilles. hat win mallin Nebraska last year sulfered a loss of $123 a, 000.000$ due to
the drought. This is more tlun one-half of the total lose sustained by all of the states ln the recently flooded area of the Ohlo Rlver. In 1934 we guffered a drought equally at
evere, and the $a$ years were the worat droughta to over 40 years. In spitce of alls this. Nebraska as a s Bate has matn-
cained its credit and is onc of the few states in the Unlon hat has no bonded Indebtcdness. It has no slate income cax nor Ssste salps tax. Nebraska balanecs Its hudgel
When we do nod have the money we do not spend it commend Nobraskis:s record to you in chartlag the future anancial pollicy of the Fuderat Ooveriment.
Because of the areat distress in the drought area, rehablu-
otion loens, as provided for In utie II of this bul, have been of great assistape in Tehabiutating many worthy venants. no many cases a ioan ohatew tund clen dollars has made it sustaining on rentec firms at lesse expense to the Federal oovernment than woald have resulud had they been belt Undcr tule III funds are authorized for the purchase by
the Govemment of submarglnal land. This would be a conhe Government of submarginal land. This would be a conHonal purchases are necessary to block together the pur-
chaves already made. The objective is to retire this subhases already made. The objective is to retire this subturn li back to grash snd into exazing and forest arcess In purchasing this land the oovernment will have something
to show for the money spent. It will help to rclieve crop to show tor the money spent. It will help to rclieve crop-
surpluses. espectallity in whent. since in good rears this submarginal land helps to sweil the price-depressing surplus. retary trom percent or the net tevenue recelved by the sec-
ret lind wwill be pald to the respecrelary irom
tive counties for school and road purposes. This is suite
essellal essenulal linasmuch as a grcat deal of che lixable property n some countles has becn or
ernment under this program.
I am supporiting tilles II. III, and TV of this bilu, and I
urge that tutle I be amended to ilmit the loans to on per-


Mr. HOPE Mr. Chalrman, I Held 10 minutes to the gen-
 10 mloutes outect of order.
ren
The CHARMMAN. Is there objection to the request of the
sentleman from New York? There was no objection.
was no objectlon.
nomoctren man the amencan pantion
 of the dairymen in the North and Northeast. This pirture
he painted was not too pessimistic. The Anicrican dillyman, be it sald, is muking a more important contribuliwa to the health and wcluare of the Americun pcople than any ton to the physical growth and developnient of Aminition chllahood and youth. It is lapportant to renicimbur in in these
days when we are spend ing hundreds of millions of dilles on soil conservation that his is the only type of furnums thit conserves soin fertility. Nor is his any seasonal jow ill
 ally in taxes. The datrymen of the North nud Eint lurr
spent $\$ 250.000 .000$ la perfectlig their hords

 American leadership in profsssions. sclenec, art. and polltic:
Desplte su this record of scrvice io the Nation. he is todit Despite al this record of scrvice to the Nation. he is todi,
treated wih soclat and coonomic extinetion if prescit condilions continue he and his will be seattered to the four
winds, and the professlonals, explotiters, and eco whads, and the professlonals. explotiters, and econowic para the roncortion daistman
The condluon of the cors cotion, and what futhers promoted. But on the head of the darryman has tallen in nese troublesome times all the evils of an arroxant a ind products as one of the basic commoditles. Under the urge of the hate Rex Turwell, noo gone to sweeter campink the daryman by destroylng the solldarty galned turrough cooperalve organlations. This procedure called. but it left
the dalryman exhausted and with no sovemnental rume dies applled to ths desperalc condluon
No sooner was the prosram out of the way than the
daliryman was placed on the allar of foreigil trade ty the present scheme of trade natercments. Hu thuse agrieth. ints he was sold over the takes and across the seas by the for
elgn trade pollcy of the adrunlstration. Yeur wy year thi forelsm encroachment on the market of the dalryman. woit from this contInent and Europe. has becin incrcasiling in
vorume. Last year the shipnicnt of dury products 10 . volume. Last year the shipning of dury products to the
Undted states from sources mhere sanitary production is entirely unkown, mounted to $\$ 118.102 .934$. The forcroin Pacta are now history. and I merely review tham
Houme may have a pitcture of these recent years.
 price for h/s product. Thas has not been due to oyverym
 ucts fust about balances the national denand. The fact
that fhis marketing of dairy products is th the \&rry of in Lurrestralned mavage manopoly which reachis t..i.
 which corporation, acturg in cotuboration with th. Histdy co. and the Piymouth Cherse Board, of Plynouth, Wis. A duker shall get for hal product. Thise outfis twidd the
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urative in an stluations. The Commitlee on Agriculture of didering practically nothing but farm tenancy. It was the longest discussion of oue phase of the farm stluation that
has ouiurred ta that commitice since i have been a member has ou
Whilc I do not conslder the probicm a major one, nevertheless. since farni tenancy tncreasea year by year. It is a
nattcr of concern and should be studied. Ii will continue. In sitct of nul the bils of this class wee may pass. Major niere are two theorles advanced for corrective lezisianito There are two theories advanccd for corrective legisiation
on the firm-tcnant problem. and each was forcetuly presented by its propolitents who appeared before the Committee
on Abriculture. The one pressed hardest was the plan by on Abricullure. The one pressed hardest was the plan by
which the Government would buy tracts of tand in tenant sections and resell farms to selected tenants. The original Idca was to invest $\$ 100.000 .000$ a year for 10 years, or a total
of $\$ 1,000.000 .000$ to be provtded by the covernment for the solution of this minor problem. The paralitres the Russian
sgstem. making the Oovernment a superlandlord system. making the Goverament a supertandord. It would
have been a great help to thase who have found themselves in possession of enormous holdings of land of lithe valuc. Idoubt if it would have hclped the smanil farmer. This plan tiain of nill wisdum supervision of the tenanterture, namely. Washington. D . C .
 Recettlenicnt, the cenant would have been obliged to secure
approval from the National Capital for every improvement

 ment and wide practical kuowledge. My observation leads me to suggest that man and women engased in advising
ohers should frrt
inaility thicmselves by successfuly operatOne idea discussed at great length. incorporated in some of the primats to sell the land once he entcred the "service". and made payments thercon, until many years had passed. Those who proposed this kind of treatment acted upon the
theory that tenantry had been brought about by the carelessness of the tcriants: that thes had not kept their carnd. had wasted it and what it hat produced. The facts arc that
tenantry has grown. and wall continue to grow. from causes tenantry has grown, and will continue to
that cannot be corrected by the tenant.
A substitute bill was ofered providing for a Government oan fiund for thosc who wanled to buy and and become
landlords. This bill, now pending before thit House. ts compromise bill and proviches that 810.000 .000 for the frat
year imay be funned under certain conditions to tenants year may be hoaned under certain condilions to tenants
selected by tie Depariment of Agricullure which is Blven the unrestricted right to acquire the lands for the experiment. The second year 855.000 .000 to be devoled to suct
expendlures, and the third year Alty millons. There are expent 3.200 counties in the Undted Btates: it is safa to ary
aboul that portlons of this money will be desired by nearly 3.000
countles. This would provide one farm of 33.000 in value fountles. This would provide one farm of $\$ 3.000$ in value
fore
some owner in each of the 3.000 count es, provtded the mones is
cquitahy distributcd. It is ulke trying to dip up the ocean
 With a b becket, it wid not make even an impression. It will bo
dinticult to admunister such an act impartually and to the
salisfaction of the poor farmers. satisfaction of the poor farmers. Next year there will be
$\$ 25.000 .000$ to speud, that wul be two and one-half tarma \$25.000.000 to spend, that will be two and one-halt farma
in cach county. and the third year tit will be five farms to a county at a valuation of 83.000 . The facts of the case aree.
that in most of thic Pacinc Northwest and much of the North. Lhat in most of fic Pacifc Northwest and much of the North.
not very much of a farm can be purchased for 83.000 . stil
 or thus type of legbslation.
I am tree to admit that I opposed the nrst bille for the I am iree to admit that I opposed the nirst bille for the
cioveruincnt's purchasing tracts of land, and then trying to

It the tenants into the pieture. I think that was the height of folly, especlially for the West. Inh have no accusations to
make and no time to state the tcars expressed to me but
 tracts of land to make the proper showing to certrinin owningals
and to secure from them the sale of thetr lands to the Covand to secure from them the sale of thetr lands to the Cov-
ernnient. How easily the worn-out, valueless, heavily eroded land could be sold to the Quvernment for real money and then unloaded on a poor tenant compelled to assume the
burden for repaying his "patemal" Oovernmeut. The poor burdcn for repaying his "peternal" Oovernment. The poo
fellow migh pe bilkcd by the very Oavcrument that was pre tending to help him. There might have becn very Erea
danger of fraud or charges and suspicion contaminating danger of rraud or charses and suspicion contaminaling
every movernent of such a plun for solving the tenant prob-
lem. I dreaded such results more than 1 teared the situation
plectured by our colleague from Iowa. and others, that the farm tenant. after buying a place with Government help. would sell the land when he could make a few doliara, We
ought not to prevent the tenant, who has struggled through ycars without sny margin of proft. fiom realizing a 1 ittil proat of his own. I. for one. would not blame him when he
can have $\$ 1.000$ in the clcar. or whatcver he may think sufcan have $\$ 1.000$ In the clcar, or whatcver hee may think suf-
ncient. ti he should sell his furm to another. I see no lurm in allowling the farmer to be a free agcnt.
The raal diffculty of the whole agricultural situation will
not be even remotcly affected by the passage and cnioric ment of thit bul. Ainong the farmers serious probiems
would list ifrst the uncertatity of price for would list frst the uncertatnty of price for hls products
When he plants a fidd of corn or an acre of whicat the farmer has to take all clances on weuther condtions tha mny ruin the crop at any time from planting to harvest
and then. when the product is rcady for the markets, he obllied to seill it in competillion with the same produci fron all the leading cuuntrics of the world. Especially is this true
of wheat. somebody has said the farmer is a gambler of wheat. Somcbody has snid the farmer is a gambler: in
deed. 1 nnow of no one who takes biterer chances uian the whent farmer. with smaller opportunity to make a winning
I can see no botution tor the future except some sort on ixe I can see no sotution for the future except some sort of nxx
and suarantecd price. I do not know that the country and suaranted price. I do not know that the country
ready for nit I do no know hat th could be entorced cven we enacted it into law: but certainly from ocean to ocean
and in every mecting of groups where farmers' problenis are and in evcry mecturg of groups where farmers' problens are
discussed. the question of a rcasonable price for leading agrt
cultural producs should be und
 devoted to consldcrallon of the probicm of prices on leadimg farm products than so many hours spent attenptilig to pel
the Covernment inio the real-cstate businfss by purchaitul the Goovermment into the real-cstatc businass by prarch
tergets for the purpose of sellting tenants thercon

The ever-normal granary th not an Idle dream; It is
suggestion worthy of the moit careful study. There sliuula
 wheat. to carry us over aty reasonabic peried of crop fallure
Wheat. corn. rice, and other products of this nature lind Wheat. corn. rice, and other products of this nature lind
theaselves easily to storage and can be carried over from hemselves easilly to storage and can be carrited over from
year to year tor a reasonable length of trme. The plan
vould would ald materially in wiping out the agricultural depres
sions and leveling down the nish spots. When the farmers of the Pacinc Northwest harvested their crop in the fall 1936. all creditors immediatety commenced to push hard to thetr money. Wheat st that time was about so cents
bushel at local seations. Many of the tarmers. perhap mosi of them. were oblysed to sell. Wheat thers in the fall
and early winter went up above the dollar mark at the locnl and early winter went up above the dolitar mark at he
alations. That rise of 40 to so cents did many of the producers no good- 4 t was money made by the speculatiors, the warehouse men, who had been able to buy of the distrcusc
tarmer and hold for the hishor prices. Por several weeks, normer and hold tor the highct prices. Por several weik
now. in the leading markets of the United Blates the price



Many of the farmers will be ohr
 of proft. If any. That leads ne to the concluslon that thero it cannot be puld. The termer, belieg the ultimate consumer must be some ferisiation Wiping out the speculation in graine
During the years of the World War I was a large praducer of wheat in Or, in. We had a set, Arm martet in Cuicagso at that ume. , the gamblers, were not buptng or selung They wcre not ullowed to operate under the law. I wotk
chances when I planted $m y$ wheal on the quantity of the crop, but 1 knew the price 1 was going to get for it when t1 was ready for the market, Those were the 3 most happ had nixed the price at cost with a reusonable marsin of pront. Ever since 1 have wondered why if such hawa can be
possed and enforced in umes of war they wil not serve in
 and major farm problem.
Another problem, and one that seems 20 grow worse with the former has a good year or a bad one, whether priceas are
 He can see Hivestock and land and at the mechbinery that the farmer lias. The ascessor nxed the value. and the
farmer pays on a hlgher percentage of velue than any other Iarmer pays on a hlghcr percentage of vilue than any othict
Laxpaycr. All government activites grow more expensive year by ycar. The merchant must ask a ultle more for his goods that he farmer has to buy because he, woo, pays mor
Laxes. Parmers' mowers. reapers, or binders cost more because that merchant has to pay the extra charges. In ather words, the extru high taxea in clty. county. state and
Nation are passed on to the man who cannol pass them on-the rarmer. He goes ahcad and does not and cunno qucstion the price of anything. nelither that whitch he buys nor whit he seclis. An investigalion of the trusts which
makec farm maclinecy has been too long delayed. Wby does Oovernment permilt these prices to man? Recently I made a study of the cost of electricits to con-
sumers. comparing Purtiand and Tmcoma. I asceralined that the ctty of Portland pays about $85,000,000$ a year more tike that in Tacoma. Those $85.000,000$ sre patd by the clitzenis and businessmen of Portland. The merchants of Portland collect them from their customers, some of whom
are the farmers, who pay muth of that is.000.000 in increased
Several gears ago, when Govirnor of the Etate. I started a campaign to rconove all stale Lases ironi rea estate by cullles. 1 am dellighted to note that now. some 15 yeara
later, the soal towerd wheh I surugaled in the gears gone
 property for the maintcmance of slate goverument. Rcal
property ahould pay a reasonable tax, but much of the ex property ahould pay a reasonable tax, but much of the ex
pense of city and counts governmenta should come fron sources other than real estate.
Another ever-present problcm on a farm is interest. I have spoken $\mathbf{n}$ oublen on the subject of interest rates, that probably there is nothung new to be added. I do destre agaln to emphasixe
my pelief that interest. unconacionably high interest, is Largely the cause of our dimiculuce today. Our capitalistlic aysten. wintion is based on interest higher inan the increase of wealth. It is such a cancerous, decp-seated growth that the onily way the present capitalistice cimilization can survive
is occasional peroods of depression in which large amounts of capitanization are wiped out by repudiation and coniposs)tions. Businesa starts up again and goes on until interest
has once moro broukht 1 to evil reaults, and snother depression rollows. In other words. the depresslon cycle scems
bo a part of the economic ssitem. for when ooblugitoms traw
 to bear the brunt. He tatea the heary load resulting from
these intereat charges above and beyond the increasc of wealth. No Interest beyond the increassof wealth should be
charged or collected on long- L 隹e obligations. The one who charged or collected on long-dime obligations. The one whio
contributes only his money and demands 100 -perceut securHy and takes none of the risks of the busd ness should justiy recelve only the amount that wowld approx Lmate the in
crease of wealh which is usually calculated at about 2 percerase of wear.
cent
I decply regret the rcfusal of this adminsitration to nssist In hoidng the reductlon of Interest in the Federal lund biank
to $3 / \mathrm{p}$ percent for another gear. I realize tic fact thit the Fedcral land bank has severas millions in outstanding bonds which are drawing 4 percent and more interest. and nios
of these bonds are not yet callable. The farmers of todtiy oushi not to pas for the governmental mistakes of yesturdity I cannol see now, and never could sce, any Justhfication th of his loan in stock to the loaning association. The sulite exaction is made trom the producer who is obliged to borrow hrourg the Crop Production Assoclation. I never hive Litration as to what portion of thut 5 percent exacted fiont borrowcra is lost through bud loans, but my observation 1 That the lass of this stock is 100 percent to muny borrowirs.
This to not the fault of the farmer but of the nuethod Tlut result to that many who borrow money on land thom thi Federal Oovernment at 4 percent pay more than 5 perricnt
or that money. Those aho utject to the reduced int irst or that money. Those who whlect to the reducer
rale never mentiont the 5 -percint furced investment.

 have no way of comparing these figures with the umbunts lent by all agencles prior to 1839 . I daresay. if ngures couth be secured, it would be found that the amount lent thriuph
he Production Credit Corpiration and the Farm Crrdit Administration is only a snisil perceniace of the unvuiu. oaned to farmers
private indivtduals pritur to the catastroplie of 1929 . 17 he Oovernment. Uhroush its lendiny azencles, has niade rules
 to do so. Many a tarmer who would like to negotiate a toin hirough the Crop Production Asoclation is unable: $t$ s set
 every force and power a viallable to kecp farnt lutureat hatis
 an not even
this bilu.
Transportation is anuther cever-presetit mo mintern to th: average farmer. The whill from transportation line, whicl
to nex Lerminala. When the Worid War was on. freight rate's wire on an averaze of about 50 percent less than they arc today. pormeny, before the war. 1 could ship a buahci of whrat rom my ranch to tidewater for 9 cents Those rate, h.ive
been advanced at diferent tinu's until todiy it cosis ovirr is centran a bushel.
been ald
 vincect that their chicf duty is to recergnize a ruic s.thirstuti,
 the water could be souezed out of the stork and boinds of
the trangportation unes. fretght rates could be reduced by ane-third.


 undcr the same liandicaps now nakiustersming dimeuttand 1
vidc.prtad benent cone form leersiation of real walue and
 ftred and pressed for passage to stum the dcomand tor real
 Firnl steurity Acc i fail portion of a brond feld. Parm sccurfty legistation has not yet come before this session,
Applause.) ${ }^{\text {Applause. }}$


 io the problem hece precsented.
 respect to the provision of the binl providing for the tending

 full price it was not a loan any more, but a zaice and it we
 wei must reauze there is an element of thritit as welici one ot abilty, to be considered by the bocal cormmites and 1 do sion to lend up to the fuil value, althoust the poed conmintlee maj approve a loan tior less than une value If the
 which is tutended to be used, and. tollowing the example of venmirk, 90 percent would be the limidit of the loen.
AS have sild. 1 am in enire accord with ine suggestion a amendment limiting such a loan to 90 percent af the archasc prite is a suod on
Ib it it it is absolutcty nceessary for the Covernnent to
 nutre Nation, will be ver. small tor the frst year. However, bus iucriviturnis throushoult he country il wil be a start and provide an experiment which will be helpful in aplapplause:
Mr. DOXEY Mr Charman. I yletd 5 minuics to the nticiman trim Norith Caroilina imr Cooirti. Mr cootivy. Mr. Charman, on Beplember 21. 1938, the sams surgesting prcparatiton of of plans to met the farm
twait problem, and tin the letter stated: tivant probiem, and it ine letter slated:

 and



On October 10. 1938, the Fresidecint, in a speech dellivered
in Omaha, Nebr., sald:



 annual message, in which he staled
 And further sald.


 $23=5=5$ $\because=\square=2=$
The frares in the 1935 ccinsus of agriculture show that
there are aporox
 they operate. They represent more ihan 42 percent of all
the $f$ anmers in the country. In addition to these $2,865,000$
 owners are termers who own part of the land thry operate
and rent part of It. They represent io percent of all our

 states rent all or part of the land they farm. An addi-
tuonal 1 percent ot or farmers ane hired managera. Consequenty, only 17 percent of the hi. 82.000 farmers. enu
merated by the census of 1935, own ell of thelr merated by the census of 1935 . own all of thelr land.
Realizing the magnitude of the problemi, the President Realizing the magnituue of the probiean, the president
appolnted a spectal committee hcaded by the secretary appointed a special commen of hamm leaders, experis and
of AEricuthre and compossd
other distueuthd other distinkulsh ditizerns, and dirrected the commiltere it
mage a careful study of the problem to the end that certaln
 plecing is investigation and atudy ine commiltee Hied its
report and recommended the cractment of legislation ai the prescnt session of Cone cress. Enent in in that eesslon
H. 8 was introduced by the distingulshed charman of H. $\mathbf{R}$ a was introduced by the distingulshed chairman of
the House Cummiltee on Agriculture and was refcrred to the House Commitlee on Agriculture and was retcrred to
and rcetived the attention of that commutee. Extensive
 interested cillurns, and groups of ctizens were heard, and
the committee had the benent of the findinga of the commiltee appotinted by the President. Several members of the committee appenred and gave us the beneftio of their
opinfor mat to the kilud of measure whith should be enacted In the seventy-tourth congrcas the House Committee on
 8. 2387, but no action was taken at that time. The bill
now under conslderation is the outgrowth of these long and covenalve heartngs. I am sure, therctore, that the member of the Commiltee on Agriculture who have sat through these extensive hearings and protracted cxecutive scsaions
are impressed with the profound importince of the baste end tundumental problem involved and of the absolute neer sssity for its ultimate solution.

This bilt seeks to dcal with a grave sselal and vitally
 undertate the Imporiance of the problcm wilt which we aro
now deallis. I am nal afrald that we will forget those in
the rural areas of our country who are not able to scratco
out even a bare celistence on amall and infertle furma son in arcua whlch have been devastated by boods and drough and erosion, those trom the atream of commerce and the eses of the world. I am not afraid that ampld the conalich and bewldermenis of the worid in which we wre thal tes uttion and poverty of those who are helpleses to help themselves in the rural sections of thts great country, but, on the this Government to lift them from their submerged insecurity and dire destitution and taike them from submarimal lands and ald them in reaching the goal of ever home upon whleh he and his famuly may earn \& tuvelitood and cnjoy some of the blesslngs of modern lite. This adlie dectaton alid quick action While we mey not senfor an tanmediate solution of the problem with wilch we re now deallige. at icast, we must take this step to brita While the amount herein authorizco to be appropriated Is wholly inadequate. it will at lenst ellminate in some de our population. in population. thon of the problem which today feces these desutute rur well-rounded programe for agrculture. it will do much chrough the years to retard the growith of cenancy and io relleve a altuation which has been accentuated by an eco
nomic collapse. I i realize that even a gift of fertule farm jand will not in itseit meen seecurity, We must in addition stabilize farm income and prolect our formers from wild
apeculations and extreme fuctuetions in commodity pricea and fand values if we are to find an adequate answer to this prissing probicm, The evils of farm tenancy are a national aliserese and land speculation and price muetuacion are the
greatest toes of farn ownershlp. We have the the past few years had at least some degree of atability in commodity prices and lend valued and now in amodest way we are
seeking to lessen the evils of turm tenancy and to improve our system of lead tenure.
As a remedy for the prestnt wls his binl is, of course,
wholly tnadequate and tinsumancient. Por this reason 1 pre whally inadequate and lasumecicnt. Por inis reason 1 pre inal bill but as most ligislation ta the result of compromise 1 shain giady support the measure at reporkd by the comsome security may be brought to those who will recelve the benests of tile provisions of this measure. Even thourh we may not hetp many, we wis to those who are now helphess
lem, may I call attention to the fact that 2.885 , the farin were operated
tween 1925 and 1935 tenants in
tency has increased $40.25 s$
annualy and during the years of $1930-35$ licrease has been at the ratilude of the prubicm if we sssume that st.000 per tenant farmer is to be invested, it would require, at the rate of increase during the past 5 yeara, an approptintion of
\$180,632,000 per year merely to tate care of the incrased number of tenants, to say nothing of the 2.86s.15s other tenants in the country, Even if we could stop the increase the number of tenant farmers already to anuatenge spending sti00 on each tchaitt furmer, it would require 230 years to eiminale cenancy in the uniled bites. in is. heretore and is one which will not be solved in this generatlon, yet ais 1 alr-minded men will agree that we should do something to help thooe who are most worthy in this great group of our
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progrem, which will make the chan
eand thetr securty more certain Many of thase tenants have once $k$. pride of ownerahip but, due to no tault of antir own. wir
forced to fall back tnto tenancy and apricutture to made proncy If our system is ingroved will agaln lake their proper pabe, these min arid winti must, therefore, improve and perfect the syst mandt which they are to labor and sive thenan atisther thanct to
prove thetr real and develop our domestic markets, and givt to those wil Iebor th the neld a desree of security yet unknown. This
must be done if save these who are now fichting to hold wato dieir sarm gagora in ponyesastor. landlords are now only tenunik, inort
tor those who hold ereum brances upon their terns. The plight of the Amtirccir
tamer is a chatenge to our statesmanship. When our arta President pointed out that one-Luld ol our population is
 that large group of our citizens who are puvery-stricit:
upon the farma of our Nation. In May 1935 upproxinately 1,000,000 rurnil tamilles were on ritlet if we ussume tha there are 8 in the average family we have the spectacle of public charrity. Even if we go back to 1829 there were absut 398.000 tanm less than 8250 for a year. This hacludtd the products which they wold, traded, and consumed, their meat and bread, trult and veretables. and all that thay had to eat. If we assume hat the average daze of the fumiry was 5 people, we ha
$1,090.000$ people, each one of whom had a grose income tor the year of 850 , or less than 8 cents a day. Ot course, many of these farm famliles are twice as large as the ficure usce
and. therefore, the Income of many individuals would $D$ $\underset{\text { less. }}{\substack{\text { and } \\ \text { Cens }}}$ Census figures show 918,000 farm famultes with a toial familles of b people, this means sso annually for cach persod in the fambly, or 840 annually for members of familics ot 10. and this no unusual in mans sections of the Bouth annual gross income. Including the value of products grown and consumed on the farm. of icks than 81.000 . These 11 s picture of real American Iffe? is it the Anverican standard of living? But, you say. this bill will not bring about the of which 1 comp must de taken without delay.
I rcaluze that there are some who will say that this is
continuacton of the Resetitement Lhat zome will bay that the Resetiltment adnuinistration hua apent huge sums of money, much of which has bet A wated Whie I hoid no brief for the Rasctuentil indilultralion, it high objectives merely because those who first embarked upon the protram wcre ill-advised and are gullty of fuull my stamp of approval. Thit Restitutnicnt Administration undertook many $1001 / 2 h$, unsound. and extravaramit prulects
 I am pulung. therefore. and ankious to vote for this bill whut Quthorizes the complelion of the Risetllenicht projiti been tnvested muy hoo be wially loit. I know that there are thoac nrtsent who woill like ta act
 emersency prorram set up by thi Prisident for the rthubiniIntion of agriculture and the rescillement of somic of nu


 halidjustments in land use end in maxing farming mote proftable. Even thoukh be Reset mement Admunisurnition
has nide mans mistakcs. let us not burn down the house to has nade mank mistakcs. let us not burn down the house to Which have been made and as forward with a broadside athck uran the problem of rural sum clearame bil to cnicourage and premow conaldering it R. 7562. Ls a and to make the possesstion of auch homes more mecure. 20
provide for the general weifare of the 0 Nited Etates. 50 rovide for the general weifare of the Onited atates, wo
providc additional credit faculues for agricultural development, and for oher purposes. The bul aulborzes the Eectcwture a Porm Becurty Admh intre Departent of Asthe excrelsc of the powern and dutes conterred by this act. The act authorlues an approprition of not to exceed stio.:
000.000 for the prst nscal year ending June 30. 1939. not io exceed $\$ 25.000 .000$ for the Ascal year ending june 30 , 1930. not to exceed $850.000,000$ for the fical year ending June 30 . 1940. to De administercd by the Secrectary through the Phrm
Becurty Administration in making loans to farm tentints farm laborcrs. sharecr oppers. and other individumbs who obtain or who recently oblained uie malor portion of their his effictent farm managcment unds sufficient to enable a
 locallty in which the farm is stiusted.
Reallings the misdom of deceniralizzing the functions of federt of counts commiltices which ahaill De charged with the duty and responsibliuty of recelving appolccations of with the deciring to ninance the accuusition of farms by means of a
loan from the secretary under the provisions of this bul and with the duty and responsibuly of examiniog and appradsing the farm or farms which are to be purchased, and
in general to pass upon the elletibilty of the applucant. tha In general to pass upon the elleliblilth of the applicant. tha
charactur of the farm to be purchased. and the emount Which the cominultlee
properiy to be bought.
The Secrctart is authorzed to loan the fun tadr, and reasonabie value of the farm for an ampred period of not more than 30 years at a loan rate of 3 percent per annuman and to make cerraln other provisions for the protection of the pali and prevent waste and exhaustion of the farto property
and its fertily. The amount so sppropriated shall be disand is fertility. The amount so approprited shail be dis-
tributed equitably among the several Siates and Terriciles
on the basis of tarm population and the prevalence of on tee ba
tenancy. program or morizes and directs the Becretary to develo thy the retirement of lands which are submargion includ primarily sultable for culuvation and chargeargimal with no the property so mproving, developing. and mdrainistering the property so acqured and authorizes him to sell. ex
chenge. lease. or otherwise dispose of any nuch praperty upon such terms and conditions as bo deems will best accompulsh the purpose of the ulle. Tite un further directs the sectetary to pay to the county
in which the land is held by the secretary under this ulle. 25 percent of the net revenues recelved by the gecretary from the land during such year. This is a pagment in lieu
af tares. The payment so made shall bo made upon the

 o be appropriatcd not to exceed s10,000,000 for the nesa
year ending Junc 30 . I038, and not to exceed $820,000,000$
tor anch two discal years thereafter. year ending June
for each two discal years inereafter.
Tlue IV provides for the establishument of the Farm gencral provisions with reference to the edrunnistration a Uhe ect, focluding loce committees to be composed of ihre Title IV further authorizes the Secretary to continu the acturlues of the Resetulement Adrunntitration to the
extent that may be necessary onily for the completion thd extent that may be necessary only for the completion and
the admunistration of those reseutiement projects. rural rrebaiditalon prodects for resellemencent purposes and land
development. and land uturation profects for which funds development. Ahd and ut maziloD he peen alloted
I destre to remind our Repubucan brethren of the fac that the repubucan platrorna adopled in 193 h has thls to asy with reterence Lo ngriculture and mit
tarni problem now under conslderation:
 Agatn I quote from the Republican platform:
Wour propoes-


 a farm an a bome
In this connection 1 destre also to call aitiontion to the
Democratic piatform of 1936 in which we find this language


Our hills and valleys and fertile lands are ladened with Iits quite beyond the comprehension of man, While it it
(rue we have extended our reographical frontiers unil now
the stresm of commerce fows into even the remotes section the stresmo of commerce flows into even the remotest sections
of our great and common country. yet we are now tace to of our great and common country yet we are now face to
face with a problem of further extinding the soclail and
Hed economic frontiers of modicrn Amertcing ine. Here is
problem and here is a fied of human endesvor whereln the probiem and here is a field of human endesvor whereln the
ungiung thrill and an the tremor and tarob of eagei and tamest emotions can be used to the rreacest and grandes advantage. While it is true that Amyerics stands out today
as the greatest force to world progress. when we thint of the as the grealest force in wortd progress. when we
problem of farm tenancy we must be consclous of a grea lack of tull and complete accomplushoment. In passing this
bul we are embractag a fundamental problem of Arat magni-
 Arericans wil and must some diay solve.
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Mr. DoxEy. Mr. Chairman. I yleld s minutes to the
genternan frumi Minols imr. Lucest.
Mr. LuCAS. Mr. Chairman, regardiess of how much money murpose of apropn the by inc Federal Covernment for the that under present cconomic conditions that such would bit an impussibite task. Until there is a stability of price of the chasing power on a purtiy with all other industry we are attempling to do something which may ageravate rather than
clarily the lisue, as I see 1 . Nevertheless I amf for this farm lenamey bill as it stands at the present ume, and I sincerely hope that the membership of this House will atand arm and posst this bill as reported by the Commituee on Agricuture terms and condilions of a hill which is proposed at the othe end of the Capitiol. Out committee studied the provisions of H. R. 8 for nany weets. Which is in sibstance what is re-
ported out by the senate at the present time Extensive porarings wre held upon that mill, the result being that a mujority of the committee ravored the prisclples endorsed in the legislation betore you. There are many probtems in the not be embodied in any bill which is destigned in the frst call attention to what secms to me glarinia defectes and not to keeping wiul the spirst of Amercan Institutions.
First. The restriction of alientation is unknown in Auner ica archles prevall. I undertake to say that any tome a man has the money $w$ pay for his farm he ousht to be able to get a es orikinally wroposed. The gentlienan from of 20 or 10 Mr. Burs, mannis sceks to cnforce this restriction and bases his arguIf you want to kcep spe question of speculation restrained of the If you want to kcep the question of speculation out of the
picture. why penalize the owner of one of these Govcrn-micnt-loancd tarms and permit the man next door who owna iand to make
the country?
Pass the windfall tax which affects all land alike, a whe Hows Con the Presidchis the H .
Sccond. If you pass the senate bill the Oovernment will
conirol the flasci of every farm in every community in control the j"ase of every farm community are soing to compel the landiords to go along
with Uncte Snin, who will be the greatcst landiord tin with Uncle Sian, who with be the greatest landord till be centered around the Icaser Fihth are beting promul.-
cated by the Oovernment. If a londiord cannot compete catcd by the Oovernment. It a landiord cannol compete
with Uncle Sam he will de forced as a matter of self preservation to sull his land, and the dovernment will be the ulltmate purchascr.
Third. On the question of texes, the senate bill pro-
vides amone other thines the tollowing:
 or political subdiviliou'
Mr. NELSON. From what bin ta the gentleman reading? been reported out. In other words, if the ooycrament accuires a farmi it 15 excmpt from taxation so long as the provision being incorporated in a bill. Think of the bit terness and the rancor that will be engendered in every community as a risuit of this unfuir dilacrimination. If that permit the Sytriate Members to have their way, guntlemen
who vote for it may have their poltical future somewhat Who vote for it may have their poltical future somewhat
Joopardized. espectally if the United states Government is permatitued to have its hands exempted, and the farmer dowa
 prourth. Drath of the purchasier: Here we nuad phinty of enanta dies, if the senate bull becomes whe hiw of the theed
One of the the the One of the best lawyers who conme b forc cur conmantlie and he coutd not tell whire the Frderal jurindiction sinirlid jurhdiction began and the rederin furioniaction theded in that statement I concur. Whether the contruct for a deed
would be personal proprry or would we coltdercd und the doctrine of equitable conversion ts nol clear.
The CAAIRMAN. The ume of the senticman trom lunois has explied.
Mr. HOPE. M.
Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chatrman, I yield the Eethluman frou Mr. LUCAS. Another matice of imnartantice in the sinate
 The tenant be charged with arson for burnius the tain
on Covernnacnt property, he not only can be provecoted tr

 cute him again form the sanne onense, Jut luke they used
to in the prohibuon day.. to do in the prohibtion days.
In conclusion. Mr Chutro
 he type of tenant that the Covernment secks to keep il the tarm-tenancy prograin, will never go in partnership
wth Uikcte Sam is he thoroughy understands the bill ulat
 groviding it should be cnacted into haw. I undertake to say
hat if I had the opportunity of cxplating thut ball to the that if I hat the opporturity of explatinna that bull to the
type of tenant worth while he ncver would sibn a contriact
with Uncle Sam. with Uncle Sam.
It is only the
Lain. or the tre man whom we call the cove th the nounn-
hing to nimselr
 who whil take hold of a cuntract of that kind and attumpi
to carry on in belait of himself and the Coverninemt Mr. Chalman. the buying of land by the Ooverimest danderous phidosaphy of Government ownership of tuat it is estimated that within 40 yerss the Governnient would have under their control or jurisdiction a million ternants.
The next step wilt be to cake chell all in as they do under he powers of a dictatorship. It trust the thane nuay newer come whicn such may happen, but it the setrate bill should pendent and frec owncrship of hatids in this Re Public. Mr. LANEETTA. Mr. Chalrman, in connection with the from the secretary of the Interior to the chairnam of the Committee on Agriculture iMr. Jonesl together with sume tablcs showing put
Unived states. The CHARMAN. Without objiction it is so ordered There was no objection
The matter recterred to is as fullow:
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 Mr. HOPE Mr. Chairman, I yleld B minutes to the een
acman from wisconsin IMr. Oreamann).



 the money I make bere on the farm to pay tor loseses in.
 We had sbout 12 wercent rentera, and now it has crept up 20
nearis 40 percent. Cerataly it was not throush the taut
 at whe farmers are elther Oemman or scendinavian ex
traction, une type chat certainly did not counder their




 the rietht direcclon.
Wo alrendy have the Resetuement Administration with
 are for the most port vers. nell ncquanted whith all
farmers that ara to dustres. They could plck out tho worthy of conaideration when applications are recelved and drop those not worthy, without crealing the expense of thAesilgatung each appiticant. I believe that the secretary of
 hit the nall on the head when he sadd due the prre--anilne
monopolite bave driven the farmers of the country. eapectally the dalry tarmers, to their prisent pulbht. I know

 chese tor the whole Untited states in nxad at Plymouth. Wiss
This is true. It hes gone 10 such an extent. he monopois
 the consent of the Ooverisor, appointed a speciel comimitteo consisting of three produceri chosen by the farmere and the
cheese producers three men selected by the processor, the packera, and the large cheese buypres, and the sate ate ap-
pounted the seventh member to represent the state as pointed the seventh member to represent the slate as a
whole. it happened to be the unfortunate victim that had Whote. Ih happened to be the unfortunate victim that had
co act as umpire between the proqucer thut wanted all he could get and the buyer luat wanted It as cheaply as pos-
aible. We met at Plymouth every Fridey, that being the aisle, We met al plymount every Friday, that being the
 hrighest siddar seta the prike of cheese for the Unitud 8lates,
But there io very meldom more than one bud for a certain


 happened to have a batch of cheess they manted to unload
on Eome utte fellow tho
 vo the very eldom anytody deree to bid.
wo the very eldom angtody dared io bid, up that ring with The commiltee suludied the atlubion for 9 monthe. We

 tound we could not tolve it. for they sald they would simply
move their otices over tnio anocher state if we tried to
 the gentijeman tram New York has put his anger on the
 producer and the consuman. I Dinange the in merti, of soursit:


No attur industry in the world todey allows the price of
the product, Herir money, their investment. their breins theur foll. to be nxed by others. Agriculture is the oniy industry that selms willing to produce, and then Lake what
ever price somethody will offer lor their goods. The farniers, ver phice somiciou wresight to orgentic and control thel own productlon, allow a monopoly such as the Nalional Deiry Co.. which is a holding company and controls every the prices of their products.
The Untted states Attorney and the Federal Tradcs Commission should have taken steps tony azo to dissolve this
gairy trust that holds a strangle hold on the price of daliry products.
But the larmers showl become better organized 50 tha these products, and unless you pay me that price. you can not have "1." Yes, producer and consumer must eitminate
 Mr. HOPE. Mr, Chairman, I gleld 5 minutes to the gratleMr. LORD Mr. Charman
pending bill may be good. bu some of the provistions of the Io not aspree. I betieve., with the gentleman trom Ne aska IMr. Corrist, and the gentueman froin Pennsyl vanue imr. Kimzan, that the purchaser of a ferm, should
heve some franclal titereat in it and should provide some Dortion of the purchase money.

- or $\mathbf{~ m y ~ a c r e s ~ t o r ~ t h e ~ t e n a n i s . ~ M a n y ~ o f ~ t h e m ~ c a n n o t ~ o p e r - ~}$ ate a large farm but courd a small one.
about in the triet tume allolled to me that in want to talt that in volunne of thousands and thousende of acres are belny taken from the tax rolls of this country, Most of thia the profit derived fram these ands to returned to the counHes where botated. for hashways and for achools, but there drawal of thas tand front the tax rolls will gad fust that nurch more to the burden of the tarmers in tile districts York appilces to all states. The state of New Yort buy land lor rctoresting at a cost of it an acre. It Yo asseased
 provision, for fust as soon as you take land out of laxallon lage It of of the tax rolls. . 11 and 8 a great deal more to the tax burden the remaining land must bear. it is nuy intention to offer an amendment situallon, and I hope it may have the support of this House. as 820 an acte. In sume instances where chere are mood working fnctorins, acid tacturies, and so forth, they are diamanhing he factoris, vill harning dawn dweillngs, and for yeari, I suppase, and let the umber continue to grow but during all this tine it will be out of taxation. It seems to me this creates an unfalr atitualion, and 1 ask your sud
port of the amendment I shall offer ai the proper time. Mr. Chairmen, i yield back the balance of my tume. Mrit Doxey. Mr. Chuirmen, I yield 3 minutes to the Mr , Hope. Mr. Chalrman, I yield
hleman froin Oeorgia (Mr. Taivan),
Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chatrmuna, my onty purpose in using
this briel allotment of tume is to evdeavor to cali to the attention of the il wuse three emendmicnis which I intend to offer when -milute rule and whith I intend to ast unanumuus consent b-minke rule, and which i intend to ast unanimusus conseni
to mave printed in the Rrcoul in conmection with my remariks. It is unaniteaty impassibie to discous auy of the
amendments in the bries time I heve at my disposal Two of my anjendments, construed together. have for thelt
objecuve the removel of a condilion provided in this bul




 and sale under civis process wlithous the constite of th,
Eecrelary of Abriculture. There are onlke objectives sonki, obe achueved by the umeadnents. but that is the pitmanit
${ }^{1}{ }^{1}$ thank you will agree with me where a nian has becculle overburd dened with debl, wirhapo, und is sivila a nuw chlume
by reason of the extensiou of the bellells, provided by this by reason of the extensiou of the bellells provided by this
legeslecuon, and enters upon a farm purchasid tor ham Ly
 some payments thereon, as a resull of which he urquiris
an equity in the farm, we should not permit tumn to to

 thery whose debls inay have Deen exisciing at the Lutue whe
the farn was purcluased for tura by the Goverument Che ghan wase purciased teast 5 ycara in which to stramshat,
ought out his affairs end we should provide that duirng the
years any trierest or pauty he mid acquire years soy interest or equity he may ucquire it ine lan
shanl not be subject to levy or sale utuder ctivi prucess. I understand it to insisted by sone tnembers of the cum mittee that that matier woula b. talken cure of by th.
hamestead taws of the vatious Stat ss. That untortunateiy is not true so far as miy own stule is concerned and 1 anin

 pose, except as to 8300 worth of houschold sud kithen
 sherecropper or tenami, seriuass hea lly turolved, who mitht be given the opportuality provised by thas bill. atud alluw wh or caulty in the farm is concernied at any mine atior at may have been arquirid to sat ,ify the clitun of any credrin, dued to judgment. It would be true, of course. Hiat 1 the instrument Laken Ly the Guvernment wire it hat

 might be in eood fallh mecting all of lus cbisisathotis th the
The amendment also prohibits the usisnincit of the in.
terest of the sharecroplxer or tunait not fur a purkud of 20
 It does not go as far as the amendakent winch his bern nin posed by the genuleulan fiom Iowa IMr. BlamannN. It tho been accurded ihe opportundty to buy a taunn ut luat it 5 scui,


 Ifinceraly trust that after you hive done so und have fiwt oo the subject mater the consididration whith 1 teil :






 ond No Mcmber of this house is more dceply interested in
in Hitently for its passage. whether miy amendments are hiry wiul timprove the till. My frst emendment relates to the proviston in section 2 to that no county committee ohali any nucmber of the conimiltice has any property interest, My nicmbendient broadens this so as to explude fram consld. eration tarms owned by close relatives of the committee-
men, and wihout it a cominituceman might have the $\mathbf{~ O o v -}$ ernment take ovcr for sale to a tenant or sharccropper a farm owned by the committ teman's wife brother, tather, of otest ncar ielitite. The propricty of so amplifylng this
restrition is ricarls apparrnt. No commatiteman should be alluwrd to pronter ton rimself or tanily in carting out his
dites under this prosram. itites under this program.
The two amendments- one in linc 1, page 4, and the other
in line 3. pare S 5 posscu upan the aliennation of the sharecropper's or tenant act or by sule urder civili process. Under the bill as drawn the title to the land is to vest in the burrower, who may flie executes only a mortisage, there can be no durstion he right of sudunient creducors to sell hes no quik tor the stissaction of their debss. If he execules a deed of trust,
under the laws of my Elate, such creditors could have tevy
 anount due the oovcmment. With elther instrument it does not appenr possible for the oovernment to prevent vorsifiction sought to be applied to such procedure is the right of the Srcritury in such an event to declare the balance of
hir lcan inimediately duc and payable. This mould not inciflus wh a transiction in which the purchuser of the burpw.'s equily mught be able and willing to pay the bal-
anee duc the Governunent. and thus secure complete tite Thi. 'cmulayiva of u borrower who had been hard Dressed all of If: it he found himsesfic to possestion of f farmi which t..... Ahtivacd in value since the Coiverninent's boun
was made to him. or in which by his own paymenta he had acoured a substantlas equity. to sell out. Lakee few hundred dollurs pront, and reloln the tenunt class, might be over.
aitining in many instances. Bince the purpose of this bill is to scek to bring about the e eradication of uronacy, and have the nien who work the farms own the farms, it cerrainly years ugainst alienation of the borrower's equity, either voluntarily or involuntarily. This I do not understand that we Government furnishes the money to buy the tarm. If that tis donc, then the Oovernment may nx by contract with the buitower such restrictions as to the character of inlerest subject to alienationt as it feets are proper. The amendment on page 5 will theretore not be offered unless the amend(intumint, is agried to. If that amendroent is agreed to, there can be no doubt as to the valldity of the restrictions It will ic notcul
 counsent of the serectary can be secured. That whil tosure
pruper conildcration of cases where under unusual circuma stinness it milkht be proper to permit such allenation. 1 huve long becn tinkerested in the problem of the lenant
fanmer. I have herctofore been heard many times in hit
behalt on this noor, in connection with farm legislation of
various types. In my Judement. he wisualis gets the hot end various types. In my Judgment. he wsualisg gets the hot end not think this bulw will solve hiop problear, It it is, however,
bona-nde, conscientious efint to start toward solving it bona-nde, conscientious effort to start. Lowerd somiving it
ond so far as I am concermed. I shall support such a tie and so far as I am concerned, I shall support such a atep,
although it may go only a lituc way. The solution of that probicm is essenual to the welfare of our entire country.
Blatistica have been placed in the record showing the srowitica have ben placed in the record showing the
brow of tenancy and share cropplng to point where Erowin of arm tenancy and share cropylng to a point where
b2 percent of the formers of the United States ere ferming
lands which to whote or to lands whith in whote or to part are ownce by others. This
condution cannot continue and the agitcutural population
 American clitizenship. Nowhere is the probiem of greatict
importance than in niy own Biate and in my own consres. imporance dist tret.
The importance of tcunncy in uie Sevenin Coneressional District in Georsia varies considerably from county to
county but it is relatively Lmporiant throughout the are county but it is reatityely mportant throughout the erea
Only about one-thrd of the formers are tenants in Dads County while almost three
Bartow end Polx Counties
Bartow and Poik Counties. in the seventh Congressionalcs District th Grorgati, It shaw
the number of owners and tenauts and the percentage of the number of owners and t
tenancy by countles for 1935 .


The following tuble shows the parcentage of tonancy in the entire State of Ceorgie
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 is with a grateful heart that I supporicultural welfare. ction now betn the solution of this pration wo at lcast make a sters Mr. Hope. Mr Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the
genticman from Kentucky [Mr. senticman from Kentucky [Mr. Rosston Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairnan and collcagues,
we have under consideration $\mathbf{H}$. $\mathbf{R}$. 7562 , which purports to encourge and proniote the ewnershmp of farm homses. and fo
other purposes. I liave enjoyed and fecl that I other purposes. I have enjoyed and tecl that I have been
greatly benented by the speeches I have heard on this bill. greatly benented by the speeches 1 have heara on his bing
Splendid speches have been made by Mr. Jows. chairman
of the Africuturc Cominite: of the Agricuiture Cominittee; Mr. Horc, the ranking Re
 of these speches ha
been very informing.
The policy declared for in this bill-to make farm owner


The declared purpose is to to the sympathetle is m meck nod lowly. There are many wonderful mien the min who. becuuse the breaks were against them. have fariakrs. To my way of thinking, there is nothing that can
 homes.
Accordink to the ccnsus reports, the total number of farm
the United States is 6.812 .350 , arms is 154 acres, and the average value is $a$ mitue less the 5.000. Thcre are 2.865 .000 tenant tainiers. It can be seen once that eimost half of the farms of the United states utal farm population is approximately $32,000,000$. Nearis 6,000,000 of these are made up of the tenant formera and
hiclr familles. It can be geen at once the bigneas of the hclr tamilles. It can
cnant-farm problem.
The platiform of the Republican Party last year expresssy rats made similar prom-tenancy legislation. and the Demoecause of the principle involved and the policy deciared.

The thing that worrtes me, however
The thing that worries me, however, is the meager sum to appropriate $\$ 10.000 .000$ for the nscal year beginning July . 1837. 825.000.000 for the fiscal year beginning Juls 1, 1930 it authorizes the appropriation in all for the next 3 years of onty se5.000.000.
 it would atlow to euch one of them less than 85.50 . no taking anyithing out for overhead and the udministration of the fund or in yon shiguludivide it among a intle less than
$3.000,000$ tam-tenait familles it mould give to each family less than $\$ 30$ aver $n$ ineriod at 3 years. or an average of less
that $\$ 10$ per ycar. It can be seeta at oncc, so far as taking carc of this tik problem is concerned, this measure ts tess ham a gestlire.
There are in we shound andily 3.300 romantes in the Unitica be apporaprialed for the fiscul year beghinhing July i, 1937 allu cnuing Juite 30, 1938. It would glve in the neighborhood of $\$ 3.000$ of firin tcuancy rellef to each county in the United here in Wusthingion and a coinmitice consisting of three nelubers in each county In the United States, It will add caxpayers of the country. and if this group of offcehulders andie these funds as olher funds have been handice fo 00.000 for the coming fiscal year with which wo loan tenant farmers to buy farms.
Ins is assumce hat on an avcrage cach farm will cost no not be one furm bourht on an avcrage for one tenant farme in cach county. and therciore not more than one enant have a chancc to get one of these furms fnanced by the $\mathbf{G o v}$ ernment. That would mean one tenant farmer out o ans woney and buy and equp a arm with it the orst yeur and the second year there would be on an average less than hiree farmers tit cone county that would have a chance to be over nve tarincrs on an uverake to each county that woild be ublc io borruw of this fund and buy and equip a ers on an average in each county in the United Statcs that
would kn uble to borrow of this fund to buy and equip a furni: or, in ther woids, it none of this moncy was eaten up by an
army of oflceholdcrs in the 3 years. these funds authorized In this sulu would furnish 83.000 to appruximately 20.00 farm lenants and
We nust bear in mind. however, there ure huw 2 aics. .co. of sueh tenant firnerss and sharconppers. In wher word
in this ycar. under this bill, if ull the hioney was tuins: over tor the purpose of loanting to tenunt farmers and shuri croppers not liss than 83.000 cach, It would only altid 1 out of every
siates.
The The Democrats promised tule tenant farmiers and shate
cropers
 thon during their cainpalgn. proves that therr plutforius und campalgn promisea are made to run on.
In Clay County, Ky, several hundred firm. Let us a ssumi appllication for a loan under this bill. They inust first find some fellow who 18 whlling to sell his farm and get a tutle
bond or some other written obtigation from the owner of the land expressing the price to be paitd. There will be a cortimittee appointed by the auhiorities here in Whshingtion to that count thate bonds and turn them over to thits county
tale comnittee, and then this counts committee gues out and examber they could not select more than one for the coming hacal ycar, and it they then approve one of the applica Ilons, this is sent to the secretary of Asriculture "Wash Ington, and he Investlgater the recommendation of the coin-
mittee, end if he soproves it. he will order an abstract of the thite.
 2 years. and can be seen at unce that perchubs. nut mpe teinut
farmer and it can be sald without fear of succcosiui cont radictlon, there will not be 200 cnant farmers in the Unintl-d
States in the next fiscul year that will have coniplet-d thi stansaction and be in possession of farms under this bill.
ir Yes; this bill is less than a gesture. It whil be a great dis
appointment to the tengat farnurs and stharecicurrs of Nation. I am supporing it because this is the onty bill the administration has permitted to come dip. 1 want my con help to the worthy tenant farmers nat sharerropkers whip dicsire to iniprove their condition.
The Department of Agriculture will adrumister this bil
 per family. If the overhead in tdminist iering hiss meisure funds will be swallowed up by overhead expenscs. To those who are sincerely interested in this problem this measure is a very grievous disappointment.
We have pointed out how few farm owners thl lewisluthen in its prescnt form will inake. The is. O. L. C. has becuin in has already foreclosed on 99937 hoines throush toans madr by that Corporation. More thun 26 farms cut of ceery oreciosure bankrupty ind delinquent iox sules thriut words, the owners of 178,483 farms, invoiving nearly 25.000 changed and with a value of more tham 8860.000 .000 . ures, tax, and bankruptey sinfes. It ctan be spera nt oncc tioviv Hadequate the mcasure brfore $\mathrm{us}_{\mathrm{s}}$ is. Uuder thus mill wi.



I have before me a numbire of the wrekly county mon:-

county．sity．and school taxtes．severen hundred in each
covtlity．And our of the eddora comment on the fact thai not in
thone．
of
or course maty of these are widows．People are becom－ IMR discouraged on acrount of the constant merease in laxes． purpurss widl collect 810.000 .000 mure thls year then th ever
cutucted in any other one year in its history．The pederal coucted in any other one year in its history．The pederal

Givernment．the States．the countics．the cilles．and the | towns |
| :--- |
| taxes |

I pothted out the other day in a speech that approximately one－thitd of the intoone of the American people on the
averuge was Luken in taxes． 1 would not have any unit of the Governmeatt to neakict those things that ere escentital
 or peoples tax money．
Mr．ANDRESEN of Minncsota．Will the zenuleman yleld have about 100.000 forectlasures of Oovernment loans by bye it．O．L．C．．and 1 understand that before another year there will be．Perhaps． 160.000 farm foreclosures by the
Fcderal land b：luks and other credil agencles of tho Cor－

 or fath ald hoine owners und
the gentiluman fioul Minresota．
Mr．ANDRESEN of Milluesots．The argument the gen－ Climun sust nade wiuld hidicute that in nuany Instances
tenents are teeter off than the men owning furas．I tulnk the geniteman is ripht．


 us helw to make farm owners out of tenant farmers，but at
the sume tuine wit us ucip hose who have farms to hold their
 IApplause．
Mr．yoxex
Mcman from lowa Mi Chis Wiman．I yield 3 minutes to the gen－
 on Ayriculture was the atsing itm sedect of henancy isub 1 udrussed the House al sonie kength concerning pending under various citrcumstiances in mantiy perisis of the eountry
 matur for a long tinie past．
There is no questuon that
Congeress to poss csnancy ticsistaturn of sonie sorp．As is have

 Disythogical wifte of the terni is beter．


 the tand now now the scerctary of Acriculture shath recelve the land now awned by the prderal land banks and shal comituet busis．The anturnuminnt will not be fonge nor will 11 It has beten ed it can be printed on one typewratien paze witteil the val unt Members upon at lrabl two different ocea sinths on the subject．and have discuised it velore the House

1 sumply lake this opportiunty of calling the attention of
the nurubership to the fact that at the appropriate ume the
 Hire 5 －runute rule．

## Mr．Andrege

Mr．WEARIN．Ye
Mr．ANDRESEN of Mindesola．Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the Peteral land bank han in the poast gear
sold two three tlousand farms wo tenants til this country IId has hnanced them？
Mr．WEAHIN．
Land bank has suld am furge number of the furt the Federal
chasers who ware fiaris to lend pur－ chasers who were frannielly able to buy them and to make
down paynuents．However．I want to atd the tenancs who are

 solve．＇Applause．］
The ameadolent I

ari）Actule the real pruperty in ine Unted Baties that the red－


 ment
rent
poont
mont
mand

\section*{Cut} | The |
| :---: |
| ine |
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## Brat Bra pro

Mr．DOX Ume to the distingulshed ectitiman fitum alaboun（Mr． Srankinil
Mr．Hope Mr．Chairman．I yleld the remainder of the Hme on this side to the gentirnian from Alabama．
Mr．SPARKMAN．Mr．Chaimant for thr arst Mr．SPARKMAN．Mr．Chairmal．for the frst ume since
bricoming a Mernber of this House 1 have anked for ume to breming a Mernber of this House 1 have asked for the to
spatat． 1 have done so now beccuse the measure under consideration strikes so near to the hearit of the dist rike and
sfl＇on wlinh r nave the fonlor to rrpress．ne and because
 ne other＂eclisiation has had such a widespread drmand． During the recrnt past the press evcrywhere has been point－
irg out the need for it．Edtors and preachers，sudents end ucachers，farm linalers．Jndustrialists．businessmicn－
 farm tuthant lesisiation makes it majeraive that this con－ gress enaat II．
Thus great cry for farn－tenumt ingislation is not unnat－
urat．arunclat，or arbitrary．It is the natural outgrowth of
 at．the dauger point． 1 think it requires no argument to
boick up a statenient that houne owncrship by farmers is hitriy desirable．Ouly in that way can we obtain stability ot our wocia，order．Whacspread tami tenancy is ulwiys the vilais of a democracy and undermlies its vecy He．it hea reached than cancerous stage in the Wulted states．
The ferm censu of 1935 show The farm census of 1935 showed that of the $2.865,000$ ten－
ant farmers of this Natlon 34.2 perecrit of them werc singlo year lenants．This nicans thni in thic sunte of misssisifippi． whicli has the hich st percentape of faim tenancy－70 per－ ecnt－ity nove on to other farms．In my own siate of Ala－
manity bama whth \＆B4． 5 percent farm tcruancy， 22 percent of the Iarmers change farms every year．And it means that in
my own county of Madian－－one of the areatest atricul． my own county of Madian－oone of the treatest atitcul．
 in eny farm symmuntity，assuming the everage to hold．
moves every．ir irom iarm to farm．The result is in． evitable－run－win houses，ramshackle barns，broken－down
tences，buscd soll herosion and waste of the worst kind． tences．abuscd soll－erosion and waste of the worst kind
in this way our Nation is belng despolled of one of tis in this way our Nation
But as bud as are the crosion of the soll and the waste
of the improvements，hat ts nut the worst part of it．The of the improvements，that is nut the worst part on it．The
worst feature lies in the leck of communty conactousness word clvie oundedness in the tenant humelif．How can he feel any pride in his cummunity－tn ths schools．ts churehes，
tis movements for conmunity beltermant？ He cannol．nor tis movements for conmmunty betterment？He cannot．nor
can the communuty．
nope for any permanence in ainy worth－
 rourth of its people moving evary year
of the others noving every 2 or 3 years．
Prom the furm ctnsus of 1935 we lcarturd thmi there were 3．899．000 form owners as compared will： $2,865.000$ tarm tin－ ents in the United states as a whole．or that a intle more
than 42 percent of our farmers were ？chants．and hat in the South．Where tenancy ran hishest． 11 reached 34 percent overage，with the prak with an average of 84.5 percent，is countics have 75 percent or more of tenants．The percentiage for Ala－
own bame．county by county．ts showit by the following table

|  | Niumber | Nuthes | Pement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aumate | ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ima ${ }^{\text {ma }}$ | mm | 40 |
| numb | i． 2.4 | － |  |
| Shame | H0w | \％ | 80 |
| Pubum | 20 | 退 | ${ }^{\circ}$ |
| ymiler | N | 边 | ： |
|  | \％ | ，${ }^{\text {ma }}$ | \％ |
| cres | ， | \％ | \％ |
|  | 10 |  | ＂ |
|  | \％ | \％ | \％ |
|  |  |  |  |
| （anturtur | Hid | ce | 018 |
| Crinumbu | ， 1736 |  | ： |
| limim |  |  | 48 |
| tman | －0， | ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | ${ }^{1}{ }^{\circ}$ |
| Frat | ${ }^{2}$ |  | $1{ }^{1}$ |
| cowe． | （rim | \％ 6 | \％ |
| Pema | \％ | （1） | mo |
| yimere | \％ |  | 12 |
| 边 | ${ }^{10}$ | \％ | ， |
| ｜lums | \％ | \％ | 00 |
| Sunt | ain | A | \％ |
| 2．atin | ${ }^{3} 170$ |  | \％ |
| Lursm |  | ${ }^{\text {um }}$ | n |
| 1．inue | \％ m | ， | 39 |
| hiteme | i， 42 | 2， 1,1 | No |
| Anmirum | ，if |  | \％ |
| Heplat | 0 | 2， | \％ |
| Artar | i， 1.12 | \％ | 30 |
| Aismam | itir |  | $3{ }^{3} \mathrm{in}$ |
| Nurnt | 1 | ， | \％ind |
|  | ，ind | \％\％ | \％ 3 \％ |
| Stern | ${ }_{3}^{2}$ | 2，${ }^{2} .11$ | ${ }^{20} 0$ |
| kin thir |  | \％ | 4．0． |
| Fillicit | － | 號 | \％ |
|  | ， | ${ }^{2} 109$ | \％ |
| Wnitur | Tisum | 24id |  |
|  | 2\％ |  | 处 |
| tued | $\mathrm{T}_{2} .46$ | Hasi | ${ }^{3}$ |


 problem there as the following table shut：s

 rimedial legislatum．And it bromers even miver．ularnilats

 nereased is shown as follows．

should like to see under tille I a proving period－a time for uri－that they misht be capable of becoming an omer：aleo shloudd like to see a inethud of assuring protection from and simuns But as I mily this bull aste trand boams and dialing with submanglual hunds．I beleve 11 will do three Huniss that are budly needed：
First 11 will clicck thut cer
furth－tenancy lacriase．
Second．It will encoui
 ing of owinrship in the soll．in the community．in new fecti－
Thind．It will rethabilitatc and glve securlty to the tenant． at the siane time giving protection to the landlord end to thai
 nough cash mm the crops to support himseif and bis ten nis，sces his soll becing stripped，powerless to put into effech Ing nway his tciants with no means of support．They have
buth wecuinc the victurs of an economis condiltion from Hich they carnot escape by themselves．Fehabilltatlon will ive telict to
Thic urogram is not cnilicily untricd and uncharied．The
 xperimenung with ulis same thing and testing the size and alue of the econonilcal farol unit．These experimenu have
cen cartied on in 10 Suuthirn States．The cable speaks for Lsculf：

| 8100 | Numi＊！ | Averay |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| nn | \％ |  |  | 718 ${ }^{\text {m }}$ |
| ORersf | ${ }^{113}$ | ${ }^{10} 8$ | Oin | \％${ }^{10}$ |
| Numbiputum |  | ${ }_{6}^{6}$ |  | ${ }^{30}$ |
|  | ${ }_{\infty}^{\infty}$ | 出： | in | ${ }^{18}$ |
| Teliteres | ${ }^{\text {\％}}$ | ${ }_{\text {¢ }}{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{i}$ | \％ | 号 ${ }^{2}$ |
|  |  | 4. |  | い |

A break－down of the：e experiments in the 18 countles of
ay own Btaic where thise farms were boukht ahows the my own
rollowing

become again uell－reapecting．selir－supporting cllizens of
enelr cominunilles．A carefuly planned rehabiutillon pro
 where．the Resecticinent Adounistration has done a grea work in this field．oud herc and now I wlsh to complimen hat arency for
and couvinclugly


I cannot add to the arguments presented by the abnti
ngures．but it do wish to call your altention in net worth of cach famlly from 83.03 to $\$ 362$ in a perriod of 2 years．and also to lie allinost complete reversal of per－
 which to make thelr crops．the other 87 perecnt using stecrs． 191937 we Ind over 61 percent ustng mules and less than crcased trom less than one to every two tamiluce to ucarly rour to every five familucs．The nunber having hogs in creare thore than a third：the number having brood scw
more than doublith，while nearly every fanily now keep poutry
In Alabana duriag ince cotad to know that of the loans
 of 81.818 .878 h
65.82 colected．
Under this program the United states Covernment has inen a way it has men rellet but the cheap：s relief farmers In a way it has becn releef．but the cheapest rellef that th
Governm：nt could give．Far better than mere rellef．how Cever．has been the rebuilding of hunian character．iniualive．
ever and comununity intercst．





 | cribicer |
| :---: |
| Hont |
| Hit． |

The prescnt measure is a start．I vicw it as only the be
etaning． 1 am bappy to splak and vote for it．fecting tha
 ve shal work out and
prokram．Applausel
iHere ine gaucl tell
There che grivan．All ume has explied．The Cberik wit read the bul for aminndraccit．
The Clerk read as followa：


The motion agrea to
Accordincly the Commiltee rose：and the Speaker having csumed the Chair．Mr．Datvers．Chalman of the Conimiltee of the Whole Houre on the state of the Union．reported that （h．R．7562）to encourage and promote tho ownersblp of arm homes and to make possesslon of such homess more sccure．to provide for the general wellare of the United
states，to provide addillonal credit faclitues for agricul－ saral devclopment．and for other purposis．had come to no
undul resolution thercoo．

The SPEAKER Iald Defore the House the fallowing mes－ age from the Presbldcat of the United states which whs
ead．end．with the accompanyllig papers，referred to the read．and．with the accompan
 rceseribed thereln．
The recommendations of the Becretary of Btate have my
approval．and 1 requisit the cancument of legislation for pproval．and 1 requist the cancumethe difteully that has the purposes indicatid．in order that the dimisuly that has
arisen in retiation to the jurisdiction of tue Specion mexican arsen in retiation to the Jurtsdiction
Claims Commiluce may be overcome．
Tirs Wmir houst．June 2s． 1937.

The SPEAKER laid belore the House the ncsage trom the President of the United sistes which was Commallee on Forclin Affars：
To the Congress of the United States of America
The Congress，Ly a Joint resolution approved June 19 ． and uuthorlized ine to accept membershlp for the Govern－ ment of the United Statea in the Intcrnatlonal Lebor Or－ ganization．Pursuant to that authorizationt a accepted suited Beates．
Repres
Reprosentatuves of luis Covernment and of American employers and Anjerican labor bllended the Twenleth Ses－ Junc 4 to 24．1938．
That Conterence adopte
The Drafl Cons．wit：
fectain special syitems of recrulling workers．resulation of certaln special syitems of recrulling workers．
The Recommendaution（no．48）concernalas the progressive ellmination of recruling．
Thic Dratt Convention（no． 51 ）conceming the reducton
The Drati Couvention（no．52）concerning anuual holidays
The Recomincndation（no．47）concorning annual holldays with pay． ing to tus consutution this Govermment accepped the fol－ ewing undertakis






In ancurdance with lie foregoing undertakings，the Hew：－
 paniving report of ule sccretary of state and its enclusures． to which the atcencion of the Congress is invited．
 houra of work on publuc works．and recominind that ection be taken by the Congress on thils diaft convention at it
Tas Wiute Hoose．June 28．1937．
contratice aepomt on mif reliet bil
Mr．WOODRUM．Mr．Speaker．I ask unanitnous consen
 nigh tonlght to fle a conference report on tic relict bill
Mr．TABER．Mr．Speaker．reservis tie rishi
o oblect． Is it the intention of the genulteman to bring up the con－
Icrence report the orst thing to the morniug？
Mr．WOODRUM．Yes． nilleman trom Virginia？
There was no objecluon
the late hononale joun w．nshbotens
Mr．SMTTH of Viretina．Mr．Speakcr．I ask unianinious Onsent to procecd lor 1 minule．
The．SPEAKER．Is there objection to the request of the The．SPEAKER Is the

## There was no objcction

Mrr．SMITH of Virsinia．Mr．Speaker． 1 H brcumes my sad
orviege and duty to annuunce the death of a

 gress and served here with distiliclion．He is will known to many Members of the Seventy－atin Colitriss who seried
with hun in the scveniy－second Cuniscss．lic was beloved with hin in the scventy－sccond Cunsrcss．IIc was beloved
by them．and 1 know they will ail join witit net in muurning by them．and
lus departure．
xichsion or rematas
Mr．SParkman．Mr．Spcaker．I hik un．innous ronsent
to Include th an catenslon of my remarks cerian tables ran
 editorial relailung to the pending bilt
The SPEAKER．is there objection to the rcquist of the Thenteman from Alabama

## There was no objection

sent to extend the remarks wilich 1 itr．I ask unanimous cun sene rule on the pending willth and nlode toviay in diseusistit
the connection bill whin it is consddered undcr the 5 －minute t tule． The SPEAKER．LI bere objection to the riquist of the centienian from Texast
Thcre was no objuctlon
chtion of thercit besta
Mr．MARTIN of Colorado．Mir．Spraker． 1 ask unantinn
consent to proceed for 2 niuutes in order that 1 niay
 The BeEAKER．is thrice oblection to the reque t of the
gentleman fromi Colorado？ There was no objectuon．

Mr．Martin of Colorado．Mr．Speaker，on Ahril g． $19: 37$ ．
the


 inu led and now I am adivied ban azriculural extenilion $t$ agentist the west.


To metet this astuation. there beting no mones, whaterer

 cererels hope that
on the resolution
 commillere ereot on H. . Res. 319. that the puthoritition barred in the resolition of Aprrie. 6 . 1933 . was besed upon
 2.in no reconmended wa moleef far the cantral and ncluded Mormon crickeers and chinch buss buit the point maty ind it was csumated that $\$ 2.000$. 000 would be rroutr One million dolliars was spppropromeid 1 reseret very much Indced that recent deveclopments have bornt out ine Budgel or 115 ctif
The Bureau ot Entomology adyises me that $A$ Kkange Tre bedly Infesseed and that North Datole Nebraksa. and zanse and ouner states are in tine far tinvision that 4.000 square miles in that stade are badly intested


Be fairly bees for addilional mixture and the Bureau of ney to furnish it. A farm cally describes atis stiuation as followe

 no telling wilire they mill so. so intereat to the empmaten extermination hay no meana 4 imited to the present inouthe castern Colorato. as aganami 700 nexure mutes in in an The commit
 ficrted. the surves the campaism contemplates ihe Blateen
 of a merrevy local inreat.
 is no reluct except the appropriation of the adalitonal 1.000.000 recrinamendee by the Diriectoro of the Budsect. an timen that amount in crop losese. Dot only in the enterited arcas but in adiaccrit sections which vill aborthy be muveced
 resolution. not on my account. but on account of the dibressed tarmers and commantian mien heve bot to mucch
critimanon of michace
Mr. Bpeaker. I ast unanimous consent to Thend the remarks I inade today with reapect to H . R. 68 B 0
In There was no objection.
Mr. HOPE. MG. Speaker. I ask unnaimous consent to Itend the remark I made this arternoon on the farmThe spozakyr. In there objectiont
There was no oblection.
There wean no objection.
Mr. WEARIN. Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent to
Xitad toy remarka and to lactude herein an amendment expect to ofier tomorron.
The EPRAKKR. Is thers objectlon?

By anantmous consent, leave of absence was granted a Ton:

Mr. Bucrice of minnesota, on account of uiness. Mr rayburn of mattion tomonaw
 $110^{\circ} \mathrm{clock}$ a m . tomortow
The EPEAKMRR. Is there objectlon? Is it contempisted that wergo in with the bill at that time
or take up a conference report?
 Mr. rayburn. It nad been the thousht to take up th
conierence report. nd that is the reason for asking the We meet at that hour.

Is there oblection to the request of the sentieman from Texas?
There way no objectuon.
Mr. Doxey. Mr. Bpeaker. during the eourse of the

 erpected to pince int he Recound an a portion of his remarks
During niy discussion of the same bill I rcferred to some statistics. IJ did not have ume to go into the detals. bet
stated that if they were the same atactsics to which the stated that if they were the aame alactstlcs to whilh the
Speaker relerred II would not ask to have mine made
 break-down of the tenancy problem with refrence to vari
ous states. showing the number of taimers in each Blate. ous staves. ©howlng the number of falmers in earh slat
the number of tenants and owners, and so forth. which ar diffrent from thase which the Speaker Intcnds. to include within his remarks. Therefore I ask unanimous consen to include in my remarks certain statistics. I undersian
the efpeaker nad in mind atatistics in referenoe to resional matlers.
The gPEAKEER. Is there objection to the request of the trene wis no objectlon
athate milli han joint amol ution aifzkizo
Bills and a Johnt resolution of the Benate of the following
ulles were taken from the Speakeris table and. under the nlues were taten from
B. 2061 . An act granting the consent of Congreas to
compect entered tinto by the Butea of Mance and
 Intiontasio Bridge Authortis:
and Porejen Commerce. and Forelan Commerce
8. 2602 . An act authorizing the Malne-Ner Hampahire In-
tertate Brldge Authority to conacruct. malntaln, and operate


s. 2801. An act
co sulthorize the construction of the

 Conmisslion. atproved May 23. 1923. as amended: to tie Cunimitice on the Library.

Mr. DOXE
now adjourn.
ajounamant
Speaker. I move that the House do
The motion was azrced to: accordingly (at o o.clock
and 62 minules p . in.). in accordance with the order hereand 62 minutes p . in.). In accordance with the ordcr here
tofore adopeted the House adlourned unill tomorrow. Tues tofore adopted the House adourned
dey. June 29. 1837. at 11 o'clock a . m .

## COMMITTEE HEARINGS

committit on mazchant manine and risuraira The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheres will
hold a public hearing In room 219 . House Omce Build ind. Washingtun, D. C. Tuesdey. June 20. 1937. at io al. m on H. R. 6038 and H. R. 7309. known as the "Fimhery Credl committer on militagy arrains.
Thc Commitlee on Multary, Afrairs will meet at 10:30 7494. to amend the act entulted "An act to amend the act nittled An act guthorizing the conservation. production. ng to the nelunal detense. and to the resoure pertain commercial acronautice, and for other purpases.
committer on naval afraiba
Oprn hearing will be held belore the full Commiluee on conslder H. R. 7218. assigmment of ofiscera for duty under he Departitient of Commerce. Important.
committer on tue digosition or execuriva papers The Commititee on the Disposition of Executive Papras
 ai $10: 30 \mathrm{a}$. m . Thursday. July 1. 1932, on H. R. 7504 . to provide for the dispm
Btates Cowi runcun.
committif on machant matine and fisherits
Thic Comnittce on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will
nold a public hearing in room 219. House once Bullding.
 cept yachis. turs. towboats, and unrigiged vessels from certain provisinns of the act of June 25. 1936, as amended.
committer on inthistite and robicicn commerce:
Therc will be a meeting of the Commitce on Interstate
and Forelgn Connincree at 10 a. m.. Wednesday, July 7 . 1937 . on U. R. 5182 and H. R. $6917-$ texilite bills. There will be a meeting of the Cummithet on Irrigation and Rectamation in toom 126. House Ongee Bullaling, at S. 2681. to authorize the consitruction of the Crand Lake. Bis Thompsan Transninumiain water-diversion probect as a Predpriatlons for the construction of the Arch Huriey Conervancy District in New Mcxico.
execurtve communcations. etc Uuder clauso 2 of rule XXIV. execulive communicatlons wre taken from the Bipeakeris table and referred an follows: 683. A Letter from the Assistant Administrator. Federa)
 ne Commatitce on Claima.
Ea3. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce.
ranamiltung draft of a proposed bill w wh reference to the cxchange of two lishlliouses in the Territory of Hawall: to


 8ibs. A communteation trum the Prendent of the Unintio
 4756.61, and a suppicniental estimate of appiruprition liir he fiscal years $1938-38$ in the sum of 885.000 a amountink: in diting to exsting appropriations. for the urporimant of Justice (H Doc. No. 273): to the Commilte on Approjir BBS And orderca to be prink
 lether from the Chief of Enkineers, United States Ainil
dated June 17, 1937. subituling a report. Logether wilh sccompanying papers and thustrations, on a prelininary
examination and survey of Bayous La Louirc. Saint Muli, and Yscloskey. La. authorized by the river anid Marbor
Aet approved Ausust 30. 1935. (H. Doc. No. 275): to the Act approved. Ausust 30. 1935. (H. Doc. Na. 275, 10 th.
Comentlee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered lo be printed: with ulustrations
satices, , commmunctication trom the president of the Uniced
and civilian Conservation con estimate of and the sicapriation year the ing to $\$ 350.000 .000$ (1I. Doc. No. 276) : to the Cumnitte on 689.
68. A communtiation from the Prisideit of the Uniled Oor the rallroad retirement account. Railionad Re.tiremetit Board. ammounting to \$99.880.000 (H. Doc. No. 277): to the ob9. A witter from the Acting Secretary of the inter ransmilling a copy of legistation passed by thic mumbic inid Gouvernor of the Virgin 1slands; to the Cummitee on limilar Arairs.
690. A tetler from the Acting Secretary of the Tiensums. Compensation Payment Act. 1938, as amended: w the Courintuee on Ways and Means $\qquad$
IEPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON RESOLUTIONS 1 UBLIC BIIS ANI, rule xIIS.
Mr. HIL of Waihmgton: Comnittere on the: Puln, Columbla National Porest in the Sute of Wanhumg toni will amendment (Rept. No. 1113 1. Reterred to the Curnalttie Mr. DrROUEN: Commitce on uhe Public Lands it. 12

 of the Whole House on the state of th: Unlun
Mr. VOORHIS: Cunmulter on the Puillic fands if a demage orignating upon tands withln the crterior lannid ares of the Anseles National Forest in the State of Call Commiltee of the whole House on the state ot tued to 11 mr. Derouen: Committec on the fublir lands. It. 1 ?


 Rept. No. It6. Rccterrec to the Mr. Dantiouen: Coinnutce on

A bult to establish the san Juan Nillurial minuma




cow

Now, nay farm tenant desitritur: 10 get lictip undect inis a

 ture teriaut merts uic tequirements of the act. at shant so

 apuroved by this commitece.
1, patis made undect tist scict shall be in such aminumit "as may

 clary of Agticulurc:
 pr rumilut, -nd the payinents shal be made "n insibiliments





 Iurc 30. 11338, 325.000.000 Our the enscal year ending June 30. 1939; and 850.000 .000 tor the nstal ycis enand make with
990.

 all livect things Mierefire some bureauctat







 makturs is verecont of the lurners cesams
The simin call alention io the worming of the bil requirniz Che Sutrices on the basis of terrn popylation and ine prevalence
 lows the nundute of the laww what reter will a slate uike






 Thit wimlit nicent two and one hal farms 10 eaxh county.



 fatms, me number of fuma thants, and the percentage of



The term "firm tenaus" wsed in the nationul sense is
Tist compricusive. It is just as variod as is the terin "farm." In Chilforniu, whin we talk about farmers. We
pusibly mean grower of nuts or fruth cultivating io seres. in Kansas wc possible have in nutnd a whral tarmer. browing l:000 or nore acres uithical. of corn. white hat ore of the

 acres of diversinced furming.


 of niy locality, that any gexuine help is to be given where,
at the most one farmer in any one county in my district run
 pi:ce. Lue farans that the riglit type of tenani would wati
io purchase will cost ciore than $\$ 3.000$. Ail inis is not


 plan. Wish, 1 betucve in laboratorics and mo "xperiment
 brgins. Wc arc told tiat this is beriunink in a small way Dut that at the cxpiratian of the 3-ycar petiod wit cun then
 Like ail tie tenamt farmers tr tuc country. This 15 unsound.



 to luan 100 percent on the value of the farm. knd we an nakDidy was belure the Coigress he of durchase price of tic furin. This bill contemplates luaning the farmer 100 percect. In other words. the purchaser wim wuy it purchase the stock. The Inrm. Thery tinery, the cenant up in business. and then tel the machinery, set the thont of forward, and that the only
him that he has a home. to
persun person to whom he has to answer ins piont on the farme cich
ture, but he must make sumiclent

 tarms that the same Covcrnment will be asked and requirri



 a gesture but it is a cruel hoax on the tenant tarmer wha
reads me acwspaper beadluncs tellag hial that te conkres
 country, but in my own terriory we have no higher class they cannot be fooled
Thicre can be neo scrurthy in tarm ownership unicess larm-
 essentilut io succersstul abriculture is to matilualio a fair and stable price for the products of the tamm. Withoul tha

 no ammer has bec operailing oi a bos durnery prowastion in Elturinate lice substalis patd by the Gurierimenil and he is operaine nily ad stay. Are hisen be answered and a dcilinte poofity for nertiulturc niust be
 in dcot 100 percrat in any lipe of toudutity aind bo requited to nake a living tor his thmilly, pay taxes, thastrance. nad kncw that the todustry tu which ne was pacing hity we
 ceed untess sumethyy was donc to make hile hadustry yros-
 do an unkindiuss th the venant farmirs of thinseountry cven them to eincauc in a lostig trdustiry. We must strike at the Mindumentass The cause of the discesse muss be discontred
 of worthy tenamis.
 there are so many farm tcnants in our tainid. 11 is truc uilut periou of traum a greal micrease in tarne ternuncy ovir ${ }^{2}$ ercase since tnat dntc Imrine this periodi niany tarins have oither temporaty any payments inroukh the A. A.A. and cenant tarmers who undestand the asncculurat situation

 and Mir Lutikey
Hemnin ylidat
 wid?
mectener. Tic ucnilimun from nebraska hasbulwinkie This is fusta question MICHENER. In courtecy i muis yeld arsi io the heman Itum Nebraska.
Mr. LUCKEY of Nobraska, may I esk Lle gentieman is he lias against newspoperts uslius the seciond-ctioss malit wha
 Mr MICHENER The geculcem:n's questuon is enurcily
 air inall. A dik custion of the Unucu states moils ut uils Line EE huw. very very pertinent 1 should ike th have time


Mr. LUCKEEY or Nas "stidieind Mr bulwinire. If tie krinleman whe subsily?





 sentlr man brine 1 h ?



 Coo of protuction is much less. 1 wuid at kicat with itme to




 The tor honest service to the taratir canano be vrituriced



 is an expure.
tine a matanisanam tome

 and so torth. to thase quallifed willer bule 1 to puteth io







 provisions of tue uite and -io emble the Serertary to curry



 num have the nuonty to sivend the surth pherrs mal at sumit hey the poly mar the hey politcal or ultherwise.






The Anerican Anmer is not betulus his share of the na-













 por chity tur udancerinnt caused a migrium triom the
 wade for the first tule in nore than 50 stars.




 itbor-er

prostum.
The system of ununcy prevallum




 and therctorc is wialie to build up the soil Ly a well-rcgulated diersifed tarm preyrank His cecanomic status will
 conservatiant. Woik of this rlia raciere iaculuitid in by him vouta sure to the serseth of 18
cenant who wulld follow him Tine lana is the criptal of
 the owner. aud wirn colutumed leads tronl Madereneacnce to a. morrgage aud tran a monguse to banktuptcy und the


The furm urnaing benng esseriuully nomudic 15 unable io




 ond courage which, set ofame by vision, divectowe liadershlp nd progeses
We have wiars sed the disigno ut radical leaders in at-

 $A$ anthion ur zue reurise






 Marcil 1935. 11 was identical will inna a companilon buti win
 tarmers of kood chatructer and who wrere zood frrali rlsks 10 thable theren io buy and dpecrule a timn. therelyy chunging iniroduced difters sumewnat trum Hic bull which 1 in intoduerid but in my susment is an creelitne wula and will carry out ine purpoces soughi wo be alained by is sthatikn of this tyy


 We ask for thr winotcheurtud cewteration of cat
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 discarid. It will tiop ind insit to the truth prind prestide the anchor 10 whinh we nuss adhere in wreserving the individund ncw tailh in $\AA$ drmoeracy $4 n d$ the creaiting conndence | becer flu ure. |
| :--- |
| Mr. Jowes. | mo wrichs.


 crrs of the Howse will sion hard worter. But is the Memculize how impracilical it is at this time to molkent they min
 1 am soing to urge has in
 ane or two repursis for exiension of time there have been bers of the many amendments to be offered some by meme bers of the commiulue and some by those who are nol mem. given the opporiuniyy to exyilialn his purdevilar each Member thepe he Members will not askt for an ear amendimen. will netessituctis tor that reason. Exicnsive speating noin Ithe opportunily will not then be Eiven tor lestimat unie, and menis to be oftered in regular order. This ia a meazena treari it suspect pracilcully many Menbers are in iteresteare: in

mi. withien
last inrec words.
${ }^{\text {Mr }}$ MI Jones.
aid debate on this parutular ank unanimous constrnt that
The cifairman. is there objection to the request of the Tlicree was no objives?
Micre was no ubjection.
MiThHow. Mr.
thendmert tor the purpose of cuiling to the pro-form

 in conurol of the machin, ry of the House. tmmiedtulety In tuts anitudnirnt we are asting that

 have been staluisished by ulie Congress sulure wi havi" wher

 of redia avalubbe to tin eye betore making t2.000.000.000



















 Why do you not do tis You do no ts whurthmy wid hatit cainnol be dune now. Just exucaly why tan it mint be doul
 The chatrman.

 Mo the andzanient was refected.
Mr word.

 nonial nieeting. The net result. however, is uspually a test!proper ining tor each Meme octasions, it stenis 10 ur uri


 Thits bull is to be kithown these pronileses and exiustes.
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 prreent. Firm cenancy is greatest in the Eoulh and West and
cewit il New Enklind in Massartlust Lus and Maine oudy

 arresmi wi, bud sinulition in rigard to this question. Mr. H. A Tumb.r. of the Bureau of Asticullural Economiks, states ibat. My disungulthed collcapue $M$ Mr Borrl semers My disungulshed collcapue Mr. Sourril someume ako
 atree uninnts. By 1900 the number hud increased to 49
prrctint. and in 1935. 57 percent of the farmers in Texan were unalis, in 1935 . 286.000 fatan fatulutus in Trxas. r-presenung about 1.400 .000 , rogile. were tcuants.
2he casial nudrui of tarin tenanry mught say that sloce sarriy follow; that so percent of all larnices are land owera.








 Urey owt mare on their land than the land is worth. The rcas cause for so much farmi tenancy is low and
Inadrquate farm tncorne. Our farma-tenanty problem will largcly vanish when we have estabished a.system which
will give lice farrier an adequale price for his labur and
Washingion is a cily of many monuminnts. It is being
propased thut turre be erecied here a 83.000 .000 inonument
 To the nurmury or Thoinas jetierson I we bulla any more
ater that. Ithink we ough to bulidd one to the memory of
the farin lamul who has iraveled the rocky and pertous che farn lamuly who has ireveled the rock and pertious
road fromi furm tenancy to farin ownership duriog the udverst' cunduions which have prevalied during the lust 25
ycyrs. 1 am uot lalkuy about farmers who have inherited tarin iunds or who have bought and patd lor farms out of an
indcrendent tucoune. ind.pendent meome
hand and puid for it vui of the sweat of their brow. Surth a noinumint would syiliboinze moore actis of hicroism. sellis sactrifice, aids unheralded courage on the part on thousands of
tathirs aud moinhers and ther children than could be recoiditd in the Appendux uf the ConckLsisimat Record during thi. nexi sevcral sessions. Such a monument would symu-
buolize tiv (ait tiat in order to becomic farin owners and cease oo be tenatus liwusiands of farm fanalies had followed a
 rlitititin rarely having anything new. bui being required to
 tienthbars und weat pretlier sraduation dresses when the

 "Estis: du radtu: no aulomobile ni uill. or no new oue-work Siturduy aftrimoon whic the netesibor's chuldren had sone


 absolutely necessary for the heallu of the ramly. on the road that many bave followed and must follow It larm ownershbp is to be actuleved under present condilluns. The


 lem. It is nol t matler of urremiting boll and eell-secrince
 aboul Iarm lenancy who dues not triow by erperience some-:
ining about the chori and Eimple ennald of the poor."
 only to be wratched away by crerous illinem, death. acclde.ti. drought. Aood. siorm. or any ane of ascore of other lecturs
beyond ihe controt of the farmer. Thove who have ao palitence with the problems of the farmer and ine farine wor-
 aie condithins prevailuag amang 30.000 .000 Anoerican farm peuble. But. referring to the monument to the memory of
ine uniknown farmer. Aem dot in lavor of appropriating the the unknown farmer. I amm dot in iavor of appropriating the
money for tI unull we have supplanted farm tenancy with whulesome farm ownernalp.
I think it is well 20 point out in dlscussins this subjuct
that the solution of the problem of tarm tenancy will Le a sit lorward in the reducluon of rellel eppendlures.
We have spen billions of dollars lor rellel
We have speni bullions of dollars for reblei in recent years.
and ulure is a very defucte relailonship beimeen reliel asid and uire is a very defidte relationship belween reluef a unf
the tillapse of agriculture, espectally in the South and West. To do nothing about farm conancy and to coniunue to poproII much of that ritict money had been spent in the South
and West on a we farmu-ownershiy and West on a wise farnu-ownershily prourant, it would have
accomplished greacer good and permanent good, In pulling accomplished greater good, and permanent giod in pulting
many farm Itwailes in a posilition w wupport hemseiven. who art nuw on rellct. Much relief is of Lemporary value. Lui
money wisely spent tu the inierest of Iarm ownershlu will money wisely spent the he ine
bear good fruit lor gencrations.
If mone of the boys and girts of the fulure are born on Iarms ow ued by thicir fathers and nothers, they will havi a
belter chance in thi worto than thase who go from farm io better chance in thi world than thase who go from farm to
farni. Irom year to year or at frequent titervals. but never
anding home. anding a home.
We are spendiule about a billion dollars per year on our
Army and Navy for purpose of national delense, bui gulis Army and Navy for purpase of nailonal detense, but gullis
and ammunillon are not the ondy elements to be considerid In Iorming a policy of national defense. The morule-the
sprit and solidarity of the peopie-ls the more importaut
 have something to n\&hi on and something to night for. and a
citizenry ol home owners and ferm owners is the mosi necessary bulwark m uailunal defense.
Many men lavil their own lamm lands so much they hull
been known th hundreds of canes. to thelr mlsumided und nibeen known na hundreds of cawes. in their mbondary-line dis-
temperaie zeal. io kuil a nelghbor over a bound puee. You wil rrcall thi siory of Naboth. the Jezriville




 instutions of his count:y win nor ive in onpostion to the
 reuliz: that protably the Unitcd satues needs a new wep of
lutudurds on the furms of this Nation


 un:a thoutsh wi. spetut $\$ 10.000 .000$ to do 11 . The expertience decturd from thit expeaturc of thai moncy will teach the
 you t:ould get Congres to appropronite eataugh money to sdat quast cly deal with the tenancy problem in inis couniry on this
busis. I thint there is an adequate way and it is a simplic one, a proven way. by which ula can be handied. Ite yeatrs aro we sel up undit the congress we hation knuwn usid privilte rapusiat and the credit of The Coverimment io
 out of tenants under a plan similar to the madere handiorda Adnitnisirition. using the Governmeni is credit and private caplal. as it was to carry on a home-buidding program under
the Federai Houstng Administrailan. It thls bill will do whul one gitult says his wili du-boy a farm for one farmir in every tounty puipare is accumplished 100 wercent. what thend it thai done coward solving the tenant Hrobitine in this Nation? What would we have accomplishlud had we adopled the



 ther it mixy seurh thr nut govong to hitp the stituation except


 rup war Gaverument in arcomptishlues it. I coluc frotu ar: ..situltural country and tay distriet is talisn by the tarut tentrus situation is very bad. Statisitics
 It filt ther sinuwed that
titell noted cvery year.
Thinht what this ancals. A move evcry olther year uy
80 to 90 percent of our farmers. Thiy have to chance of so to 90 percect of our farmers. Thiy have tuo chunce of
surcriss under surh conditions. They cannot get acquasmied with the soill thry are silempuing to till. They have no
inccullive to linprove fences or buidalius. Why should they of the oiner things that we are allempung to dolng any mider the goll Coiservation Service.
Thlts bill canizut solve uur probicm in the second Distifct strath which with give more of our tenamis a chance. pro
Eut 1 mm zlad that we are reconntizng the problem and
the necessfly tor a sulutiou. Wc cannol walk watil wo





retultiable. It is rinnarka a subsidy to the furmers The tis




 11 ts

 milut have to mand thass mall ry.
Nutsidy.

 The Then II works


 this country ever gcis mo trouble. youtug satest bet will ber at those people who the on the darms. who have a knowhilut
of real yatues in life MG. ANDRESEN
enileman yleld?
Mr. LUCKEY
Mr. LUCKEY uf Nebruski. I yitid

 Mr crament
ner Mr. LUCKEY of Nebilika. If is nu a sul ady wind

The chairman. Muska has explitl.
Mr. PETELISIN
masimerasin of ciporta


 in reality a duplicatioi of agrocit's which nuw rxast in our
Fedcral Governanent. The Federal fand biat
made today but hurc purpise that hus phisipuaial is lius
 sands of employees throughous An Wushinitition with the
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|  |  |
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|  |  |
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|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | posal. The bul wim then go to the senate. The senale win |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| a authority to employ sich persons and mppoun suth conirol of a Washington bureau, then truly regimentation of |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| anollg many other thines he may do, and that is he and a iargi: part of th wut be wasted in overhead. As 1 eat |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| niy part. I have terl that these agenis could get |  |
|  |  |
| Mr. Charmian. I have listened during the last 2 days |  |
| both sldes of the aise as they bemuased the hopelcss |  |
|  |  |
| Wie undersidudazs is jobs undur thas act. Now. from a uress standponnt, alariy Resetuenent projecta have beet inwh in the nosirits of the sound- Hhinking puber. Wheimis trum ten to stxiten thousand doltars have been Ird to rent to luborcis aud persons with dow incomes, and this out of the tuxpayers' money. The Alaykan colony uluther txample of Tugweluan dreams. It is true chat <br>  rulted with bum and who are stul carrying on his policien, <br> duct of the ceribess and Pharlsees <br> the starting to me to and unat men who are supposcd to nave dedicated lons yeara of their tuves to the probiem of unc american farmer and who have windessed of the American 20 tarmer are now Dringlog betore thie Aniericun peopie a plewio of tegistation which, et is mest. can be considered nothinz but a hypocritical prekrese. [Applause.] <br> 1 have studied this measure to the best of my ablity, and 1 refer to particular to thle 1 . I do not find therelu ond |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

cuts or prespris a pulty winh will lind the Amercan Esilu in a posili ion of econumit nudipndence.
 wiouc that therve is mow periuliny bectore inis boody a neas.
 pathway by whirch ine $.000,000$ farm famplics sur Americu and
 sot out of this wilderness of economic despa
placed in a condilion of economic indep: indence.
Why. Mr. Charman, the pending blit is a farce, and you know 14 is a tarce. It offirs no remedy for the diseasied
condition of agriculiure. Why, the only tung it docs tor the few farmers who will: recelve the so-callied beneflis is to place thers 100 percent in debl. And the very next day they Mr. LuCAB. Mr. Chalrman, wili the gentlernan yield?
Mr PETERSON of deorgia. I ylela.
Mr LUCAS Wil
Mr. Lucas. Wull the gentieman explatin to the House the
major fenlures wht his bill?
I am soriy he nas not beors on the may state to the gentliman it on at keast two urcastons, and in the 5 minutes now allottiod pinte explumatimut of the notasure is exullabere, und a hope
 wre which is nuw briory tuctur and if the pritteminh has a opeti mund und is really merested in the witare of the Amer-
 AApplanse:
1hhre the gave bull
The proturna nur

titisit








> the iorm is aluated

Mr. MAItON of Texas. Mr. Chamamen, I olfer an mand
Mrnt which is at the Cliok's desk.


Mr Mallon of Trxas. Mr, Chairman, the nunymantut
 Mon. The present tith placess the adminiseratken of the ucl in thary of Awicullere and We turyus owiluse wive the hia





 istration.
 has uready lime on farim nand ublum $\$ 3.000$.vew woo, ath
 this lime.

 we make a big bifinder in the adonimistrutlun ot his att :at






Mr CRAWFOHIS.


 Mr. MaHon of Trexs I cirlainiy nare
Adinintstration is cloing init coday. The tand biank cimn massioner ioans draw 5 percicit und thir land-bathk wans
percent. Of courre, we have hat an cmergency rate of 3 ,






 parsuge of this measure. Under inn roducints whith I hime
 aderuate maney to finamee it. Under the bill as daxil a direct approurtition trom the Treisury is ri puied da*13

 a solutiotit.
Wc luid
 panded at haterrab unth now it eniblicis a past empure with






"That this art many de clled an to Farmerre
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 Hic) 1 Improverion
ysice The counity comantites entabithed under section 3
 "imy make nithurirat in ine county ne 4, reat property whikh



















Sive 6. (t) The corporation to trux ime
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 that in no yrir shan the faimer be obl:ged to pay more
than 25 percent of the cast valuc of the crop produced tor sule upon his farm. So thal if there should be. on account of a droukht or westiltince or for some other reason.
a viry small crop, in no tne year will the purchaser be obliged to pay more than 25 percent of the crop produced salk upon that farm.
You mily say. Well, how do you know you are going to
nually muy on this indetrdacss?". W.th thest vatishe pitymints of not the excered 25 percent. at
the rad of to ycars the purchaser has not pald all of the tanies he ts oblized to pay under nis contract. an addilional Wriod of buse will be given. during which period he shal
pay the averabe amount that he paid to this corporation durne the mircecding 10 yuars. So that it may extend This pernud of 40 sears for a ficily yrars more
Hiceie linds for at lesist 45 or $\mathbf{5 0}$ ycars. During that uprig cf thate they can nequire ownership. During that period of time they carnot be disposssessed if they comply with the
tirmis of their cuntract. During that time they will have an opporiuaty to ruhabititate themselves and their ramsics. I subnit to ytus that with the growing tenancy probient in
inis cuuriry. with the increase of tenancy sear after ycar. such as wichave setn the the last 23 or 50 yeats. hicre ts need

 The Challuman. The thine of the genleman froin Wlst ann hut going to prens inc pint of order. I will withdraw hic pont of onter. illthuath i thiak it is very doublful. The
 Me poinh of order reservirit.
Mr NELSON Mr Chit


 can reasisumbiby hope to get.
 nonths uf study on the part of our connumitice. is not a per-
fect myaure. it is, thourh, much better than was the oris-


 worth a erul
In the first pl:

 promizble in arriculure. as in auy other business-and furming is a businuss- prosperity is properly measurcd by the purchasing pader of the proft. If there is no profit.
timere tan be no purmanent purchaning poacer. Make the fanure secire. Give him the cost of production and a hithe
 nuncy brobleni will batiely be a thing of the past.
As a a micmber of the subconmmitee which tave

 macamare. cirryink an appropriation repress nting outy a frac-

 minctun 4 rquilaule ulistitbution of toans is provided, the sur:oug the sidits and Territorics on the basis of farm
paputation and prevalence of teunnes. This is farr to all As I have sald, conditions differ, as do turms. In Missourl.
for tastance. I do not recall hat in any talk luct wecn farmers.
 of phon I am onc. I have cver heard another refcred to ai
a telenat:- We speak of "renters". never of "tenants" or "sharecroppers."
From some of
From some of the discursions beard on this bill. one might
gath the impression gatn the Impression that the tenant. or. Lit us say. renter.
Is man of ess than ord nary abillity. incapate of succeed Ing without a great deat of guldanee and dircictlon. This
may be true of some. but it in no scnse applics to the rank may be true of some. but it in no schse applics to the rank
ond fle of rentics ti missourt. Some ol the best farmers I have ever hinown have been renters. In this chass are
many who a few ycars ago were rospcrous larm oumcre

 no fault of thetr own. lost thelr farms. Afforded an oppor-
tunity to agatn acquic turse same fanms or others they



 who knows nod lavist the dand is worth a duzen inexpert-
enced men who might be taken out of the bit cltces and placed on f:irms.
I do na a aree with the sugecstion that where a temint
of the right type is selected ti will be necesisiry to provide gicater satrguards than sie containud ta paragruy 4 of rectlon 3 of the bilt to assure that the farm wiul be math-
ratned in repair rented:- If the right fatmer is sclected by the eutnty commiltec of turce fu:nurs. as prorfdid in the bill, and after is lille dumbe but that hic will suceced without having to is millow a buok of in itu uctions or hecding expert advice Iruin
washing Washing hing or clirwhere. Thic big job is to sclect the rethe
man with whum to begin. It hare very conndence that this
 masourl Congresslunal beitrice, which inave the honor to represcnt. I know that in cach county there ts at least una
farmer-ot coursc, tuere are many-who will make a $n \mathrm{ol}$ of a Jarm to be sceurra under the loan provislon of this binl. A word a buat the roundy commintur to pass upon the farta lical farmers. who will know the man and the land. For thelr serviecs. members will receive $\$ 3$ per day but for not

Mr. NELSON. I ystid. Mr. Mlus. Llow, will these tirec men on the county buardy be appointed?
Mr. NEiASON. My undcrstanding is that they will bo Mr. NEDBON. My inderstanding is
appolnted by the scerctary of Asriculture.
illere the gavil till
Hitre the gavit fill.
Mr NELSON.
Mr Chirman.
Mreced for 5 addilonal minules. Mr. Wrrtirow. Reserving the ripht to object. Mr.
Charman. I think. in fairness to the amendment, that the geniliman should dircet his scunarks ha opposillon to it I Lhink the nmendment h very lmportant. Thus far. during
the first 5 minutes. the genticman's only oppostion till this uncudment is on the pround that it is not what we want

 The CHAIRMAN is hire objectlon to the request of he gentleman from Mlssour
There was no objuctlon.
Mr NELSON. My thought is: Is it possble to go as far
as my collcague for whoin I have very yrcat repeyt wlithis



MCr. Neison. 1 pleld
Mir. Boncend. The gentleman sald that under the com-
mitee' plan one tenant farner in cach county would be tuken care of. Docs not the genteman county would be
tank that. Us we are going to lake care of this problem. we should try to care
for at icast 50 in each county. as my bill prouddes? Mr. NELSON. 1 would be very glad it it were possible take care of more ranners.
Mr. Bonienu. I know the genuleman feels that was: on
the other hand. Ht sectins to me that we should go ahead and solve thand problen now. me that we should go ahead
Mr. Netson. I lock upon this as in the nature of an ex
Mr. BOMEAU. I do not doubt that.
Mr. NELBON. Insofar as posstbe. the go-called expert-
and sametmeat I feel that I showid uke to cee this much-
 place of greaticat prominence in this micsure. buth more Chought has been given to experleace and to the praclic al. I
would add that the excesslve usc of the word "expert" is unfust to the comparatively tew who are rcally entlited to be an-
As to llle 1 of the bul. dealing with the farm-tenant but as 11 s. there is much to commend. For instance. variable payments are providcd tor, so that in "fat" peare. years I good crops. extru payment may be made to catere care of provislon. It geicratly adopted it the matier of farm loans. whut prevent many foreclosurcs. Onike the on ikital bin. this one nertily makes provision for loans directly to farmers business. There can be no "Tugwelltowns" or eny sucb set-upa.
Ahother thing that I like about thds onft, and it was at
my sugestion that it was so draticd. is that thire are no Tennyzan's babolink brook ever-increasing sums which. like ing appruprtations. whieh bexkin at gimet size and grow to
 wait nud extrivagance. It the expertincme tinder the pres.-
int plan. which limults authorizallons to 3 years. is guccesslut. a future congress whilit of coursce. make provision for millinus of dollars may. be the plan prover a fallure, many dinuing authonzations have been written la. Zuns is good buitincss and conimon scnse.
ficturife back to the importance if selecting the right
farmer. and in the beginnting there will be tess then and age of one for each of the 3.000 countics to the United Staces, my thoumht is that he should be given e deed to when he lims demonstrated hb abiluty po succecd. To my Way of thinking, it is unfatr to the purchaser to require hun own it and really call it his hoine. To pospone can actuully the dced for 20 or 30 years would mean merely that the tenant had exchanted landlord, subsuntuling Unele sam for
the one who hand previously owned the ances. Just herc. I ditress in the triet time rema
 whic. protsion ia in some respects. most important. Loans percent and may run for s ycars. The oblect is to provide
credit for farm own credir for farm owners and othcre. so that thay may be able with the debl-adustmont frature of this esction, an carred in zeclion 22. Where machinery is sect up for valuntury ad rreditors. Tille 3 dcalls entirely with the retirement and their marginal lands. To carry out provisions as shown in aub. authorized for the frst tssal year to ext not to exceed $\$ 0.000 .000$ in aso for each of the two Ascall jears thereafter.

America needs home owncrs. If this bill doers not hine

 by Edwin Markhim. This blll. I hope. once it hat Metil President. the arcatest home saver in the histury of in ther



 atten in the past has the mistaken Idea been adranceil licit
 ony of abundance in a land wheretn approxina The tand is our gricatest natural resource. Froun tini, rous elements we contanve shetter. food. und ruiment Ph, ic cically every nicesslty and evers luxury of ure come fions ib
tand or the proper utulzation of thi tand il Sore, the system of tandhotuting and tand uis ts of vith
 as "full" or "part". a fun owner teing one who owias ill il Lands he opprates. while a part owner owiss a part and it ill. a part. Other operutors are classid as nanageri ir teremt,
The 1935 ramm census revials the number of tami was 8.812 .350 : of this number 3.210 .244 wert fall uwnils
688 ast 688.867 purt owners. 16.104 manigers, and 2.865 .155 wire
tenants. The perccntanc of thants was






 tenancy Incrcased in the oticr Ousside or the Sinth. fanm in 1930 to 306 percent in 1935.
Therc are a number of

 but also polilical and spiritual.
The folluwing are some of
fame tenancy: (1) The gregarlout cantere of the grouth er he betkre soclat and cducutional adrantaries ofrired by urban iffe: (3) the hoss of tacume and pur has lure inn 'r
the farmer: vantage of varted cmplloynurnt in cilites.
Man by nature and
Man by nature and inslim: is grekartous live sem, wim
peers. This nabural instinct has led to a moviment hatil
the fint he farm to the clity. As tandumera hne motery foun thetr farms thes have left thrir furns to tenumh tor culth-
vation. Thus we have a deginning and on exinulut if uht conter landlords. In modern days we aho have ninolitel

 Eag. Jorectasurcs and possisston of the mart faterd limis ler than those aforucd by rurul schouts. Lanarer whithond and pand teaching werle-cqutpped bulidmes. n buntor hyurl ling of chatlahooding
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190 "Jerationerty

 Mr. Boileza, Mr. Cliatrman. I ass
to proceed for an additonal 5 nitrutes. tic Chalrman The gentlemall fiom Wiscunion ask muanimous consett to proced tor 10 mulutis. is there ubjicturn
Thicre was nu objurtuon.
 ago on this same subject. The bll is known as $H$. $R$. Ge3ab

 more ctrarly follows out the reconmendathins of the PresInfut's special colitnititee than does ariy bill that was intro-
duced in this session of Congress. The bill ditera in come issirect. but the cubstance is the same as the recammindathons of the president's cummithee. In making that state-
rnnt 1 want to make 11 clcar thai no member of the prest
 inti is this bill. I was assisted by many men and woonen in this country who are vitally interested in fartn tenancy and
Uhe sharicropper problem. Mcn and women who live been ilvertilik thetir lives to this problem have assisted me in \& corpornition, the capttal stock or willes for the be subscribed 6500,000 orea. That soinds like like lot of nioney, and more hitinn is carried in this bill before the Comnititee. but 1 cull lir the purchese of liand. to puit tenants on. but will also frovide for rehabilltition so uat th will not be necrassary to
 10 do l,
The

 thory that the Frderal civee tumen' Lutwin: huy
 pers and farm tenants on relusomble trinis iner at wis






 or farm tenants. not the ma fority bitt only tur on thatin
Many men


 Then in eath county there ts an elritimit E.ech phathy In the enture United Sitates halds an elrethar, si which "h



 have no authortity to toin the have no aum buy any land in a cunmuanis fur ils Hind rin t must arst have the alifirual of the eombly chathinti,
 or farnicts cannut relabillute theriselios in athathen tu That the county commatice quil hive sunturity to brimin
 woutd protably be while to carty this hand and Hhint in.

 cropper who has nut been tirsi auproved by this hural nitumittee that is democratically ilected. Thut winlat mantr



 corporation.
Now. the frit step is a lrare Thir cinperation will hat... to exceed 3 years. with the provisum thas ary extemint in: n additional s years cen be grasted at tir tan piratum sil


 cration of the prograns frum a Friderit slundinat Thil


 Mr coolsy. Doos the grultinan sutrid to vote for



 Mr. ount out the perucular sectlon to which he so virorounly
 Hits hour which hin any manner ahowed that he was ofter-

Mr. COLEXY Lhess he fenteman unaristanat that we


 admits thut this buil ramunit succreed unitess there is passed trutriana hus ou n ryport.
Mr COnLEY. That is the nogition, I Whak, all of the niwibers uf Huc ruin The CliAIRMAN. Thu time of the echtiman from Giorbia imi Perrasont has exparrd. hiat all devite un his sitetion and ail amindinents thereto lose in 5 munuies Mr. Mills Mr Chaurnan, I object to that. I have ant Mr. JoNES. Mi CCharmill, I ask unalimous consent
 Thi Chalrman.
he Briuhman fron Texas?
ight to object. I insist that inasmur $h$ as this is a a nuraure
 bilt to thr ruturr proultatiou uif Anirrica, (hit
Mr. LiANzETTA Mr Charmann, riserving the right to othect. shuld have to aik the rentliman frum Trxiss. the cunsumpratun of than umendirnt intiodured by thi' CornilusMI. JONES. YIS Mu
ltur chain Thur chanman Ther eruleman tran Trxas is untrily Is ithert objertion to ther request of the schltenian from Trxisis
Thir CIAARMAN. The Chair recoanizes the geniteman rum Loustuna Mr. Milisi for is matule

 Mr. Mrlis. Mr. Cligurman and collcagues. I am very
nupury to rise at tuas titit in support of furm-trnunt lipts-


 eatuzution that the welfarc of a citizentry nuius Look for teg-

 senn hi to use the word "rocently", i ask that the cumnittie stike wo words word ricel The burpuse of thi umendruert is to thike care on those



 erra, 2,800,000 are tenanit farmers, with an turcuse of 40.000 each year. The appalinny conditiou is un cver-Increasing condtlon. in that 10 years ago only 1 in eviry 4 wcri larm
lenants. population are tenant tarmers.
tor the nadis agtee that Like appropriation of only $\$ 10.000 .000$ in 1940 is only e mintature sel-up. to alluiv tarni tenants to purchase ferms. Bilt i had rather for this Quvirnnient to
nuke a success. even though it is small in tuc beginnith
 my triends. I hesitate on the fioor of thts



 shither. Therclore we must conct to th. rcraciue of our un-
furtunnte members of soctety ond shuw ticin luit Conneress


 Cois nuch to eat and wo much to writ and the uiftoriunita







 aus udvucated by the eariy phitosophcrs, olso the
Purithn lorclathres. us writ as the Buble itselt.
 Mushis if tergatation that will turg sotve the aud con varims ditiuns, but I bx-teve phassurt uf thes bill whil be gotnk a lon way Levard a git atir irdistribution of weutdi. in that it hat

 I was clective in- ine that this is potatius tomard the tickit at thi: tmie to sivi you to undirstand where the sharit-our nrullt umpanily was fist usid, but. not the words. I wit


 1 want you to muderstund the: dre of the share-our-wrath
phase was a phase of Bchator Ifuey $\mathbf{P}$. Long. who ts now phase was a phasic of sellator Huey he Lons. who ts no
direased. but yet today even thourt he is dcceasod thas dreeased. but yet today even thoukh he is deceassd has
 atisenis. and $i$ conteut that this body should adaph more of

Sinator Jlucy $P$ L Long in his share-the-wcalth repily to

Thereforc. the cry began throuahout the land that the News of Aprill 11 is thecriect. Theritore, the New York Datily ought to tyok titio this question and get the true figures on America's winlth in order to retule Long. The News chien
 Washitistoli end worked for weeks heric in the Lbirary of Congress anil "isi where. to rout up the true nigures. with hat research showed Senatur long had eisentiolly thi cor ect tuformution, especially where tie nooney power is lodted I shis counitry.

According to the United Slates Fedrral Trade Commissiun as 58 percent of the weulth reported, and since that ume
 jragues, this shavestigation by the Now York Datly News shows
specincony Inal Scnator Huey P. wong had underestimated the wealth holders in Amertca and hai 1 percent owned a greal deal more than 59 percecit of all the property. Adte some delliberation. to publish them. tnasmuch as they arer alfuld by not publishing the uncovired crullis it would be very harminl and riusc and
This bug niwspaper of the United Statis further stateit une way or the othir. Therefore. niy cotcalucs. tuls ts one of the sure $t$ ways, birungh form tevancy and old-age pen-
 tos late
My coltiquirss. in tharf, Hur lanbuase in section b. Hete 1 mads as follows

 the pritithbe to borriow moncy to buy hal ins, us wi tuve thin a turm if ways and means could be providrd for to min lo minrwase a pare. I ain surc sonic of you will dlssabreve by overtmoduction. N.t; we yust so luither and havi' an
 The lands to lay illte criry serrinh ycar, as taught in the bible, theitr raw pruturts equal bastrally to due murtufuctultar pritre. Thitr by I coitend buying powcr wall be increasid cominodities with extist. Fuither, as long as masis putirhasilig power stays down aum contumes to slitiluk. therr will be an we like to think are clements in the Anielicen staudard of me like
livils.


 aree graduanly having to ristort to the W. P. A. iovis atid Is it because thire is ait








 lltking hiss sores, begking fur ine crumbs that frul troul the
 died, and the cich man thoked afiar of und sisw Abrathai

 he ulay telt my four brothers thire of the formunts with which 1 am andicted that they nay aviul thus umare." Altri the prophets; they will not billye one who tuas mustr ditul the dead and has come back to rarth.
many great truins that, U udoplid wiuld the acerpi so
The cliairman. The quistion is on the allindmitio
The question was taticn. And on a

So the unirumnictit was reftritd
The cIIAIIMMAN

Mr. IOLESIAS. Mr Chairman, I affir an uncnumant.
The Clert read as fillows:












 tund to thjut
numbsration
nullation
 nust sell the oblyatuiras of lie uburnallid

 States-the lowest rates that huve ever prevalied on ouch - Inree scalle anywhire in inc history of the world. The hive wirn krit out of it and ouly adequaticly secured credit lans bern incriuld ma yiuw waint ta fewpardize that by tak-

 betwic joud do.
This porss A

 chuoutries. II is a stirliags point. It is fatr and
wiuld da britw if wr startud on a modrate seule.
Mr. DIES. WII the genthriana yiuld?
Mr. JCNES. I yhid to the geilltiman tring Texas.
Mr Dita. Is it not a fact that the buids tssuted by


 suir:interd by the Giverimmitit. Etther, as. It principal or on. Id dut beluve thut cuindition will continue. Oovernor




The Clerik read us fullows:








 commult
Mr Tartiveit mer chairnian. 1 offer an ameidment whint I stand to the clerris s desk
The Curite read as follows:
 Mr. JoNes. Mr. Chatrman. 1 have consulted with as
many numbers of the Conimiture on Agriculture as 1 could
 Turvidurc. thrie is no obicetwn to the amendment.
Tix CIAllm AN. Thi qucstion is out the amendmen
 Thi umindinent was nistect to.

Mr. McCilillan Mis Chaimun. I Uner an amendment

 Nr. JONES. Mr
he untudnent.
mr. Mectellan. Mr. Chairinan. I thank the genteman
 accepted. I showid like. Mr. Chatrman to address my remart:
brieay to the tuerits of the bull. Yesterday in genirul debie

 to express
Uut 5 -minute rule
Uue 5. Mintute rule. what bedirve there ts anyone in this


 have heard about the plistit of the tenant farmers. I wa
reared the suil of a tenant tammer and I tnow how hard the reared the suin of a tenant tatmer and inn thew how hard the
atrugsie is and how dimcult is for one that class under
 They have not the power to give themselves a sturt. and this
bul is at least the adoption of a policy whrecty the Federai coovernment recoognizes the Lenunt turmer and offers same
atd and assistance in tus ambition to become a home ownce
 bring the in a becter bil. Certialily this measure is not au that was hoped tor. Everyone. perhaps. Would like to see
more money approprlated. more peulle benented. and more more money approprlated. more people benented. and more
peopue alded. but uinortuately we ceanon do that at this Lume Here is the Important tullig about this program. Wy
are sturting. Evcrybody asrers that this is a good pollcy are sturting. Everybody agrers that this is a good poticy
No one criteczes uhe poolicy of trying to help) this clans of people. As wos start out ithtrit it ts thippretuth that we proceed cautlously in order to nuake this experimentit a suc-
cess. because. God pity the tenant farmers of Amertea if this
 way to muke us surceed ts to place it on 28 hteh a plane as
poss ble and undertuke to adruindater the law without finumclal luss to the Guvernment.
is these
It those chatgid with adonnulatering the provistons of this
 undir a profram of this kind. In a year or two. even with this nesager start. Me mill have gainid some cxpertencer and will burtier undt stand how to $\begin{aligned} & \text { develup and expand and rxtestid this ald to }\end{aligned}$ larger numbers. When we have set up an oreanization to machlucry to diau with this problem infinivily we can then tnciresse thir napripriation and extiond thas ald to birbit numbers of hose woithy to recelve it
 sunadurd of hiviny. Therc are those: of cowse. who would
not take piopar advantage of tuis onpertunity if it wele
 ext becoine the owners of homes and farms of their uwat
with thus matc better clluens by reason of this assistauce and thus make better cllterns by reason of this assiseance
and the prutrum we are taunching by the enactunent of and the pruticn.
this tegisiation.
Temant terming and sharecropping has practically
doubled in my Statc wilhin the past hati century. Wc callnot close our eyes to thus untrealuy condition in our afticutural thdustry. This trend must be checked. and th
pumber steadity reduced. It is gulng to take tuine. It catinumber steadily reduced.
not be done at one session of Congrcss.
No doubt we will find it receusary to adopt many amicuit-
grents to this legistintion trom tiric to une but me huvi ments to this iegisintion trom cirie to ctave. in exprcsing aturted and t want to join with nainy others in expressing
thanks to the Commutce on Aericulture for lis woik lit reportuis out this bitt IAppla use.J
 - questlon of the charman of the Comunittec on Agrisultirr. Thls part of the bid we are cansldering undertakcs to estall-

makrs lice pranil provislons of the bill applicable to the duin
 1 ruter to stection 49.
Mr JONES. Section 42 as we mulirstind it. nukis the:c

Misiuns. EUMNERS of Tixus. Idtrict the atti-ntian of the gen-
 by the provisuons of thas bull. as 1 read this hurriediy. The penal provern hating hit with gists. fers. and sit that belore we conclude the blit this be given consilderation. Mr. JONES. I bhourd hite to have the hetp of the gentemun. If the genticman has an aincturnent to suggest. I
shail ue plased to considcr 11
do when we reach that point.
do do nut have tume nuw wo go inw the quesclun. but I thank the enthimun tur calling ny uttention to it

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of
Mr: PETERSON of Georpla. Mr. Ch:urmun. I move to trike vut bre last iltree worls.
muluiea aso uskidy a very partineun North Carolina a fiw whetiucr or uot 1 thought this measure was a piece of sepmoate and indepridititit crisisition. It is very evtacnt it is not. on page ${ }^{3}$ lue fuituwing
 Above that it stutes

In adaition to mils. It is evident there is now in the m:king nicasure whelt pruposes to place in a sirait haririt every posed irgisiation. It it is enacted tato law. Nie Serretery of Agraculture cani actually prevent the farmer irom hitching his nulk to the wagon and tuking his famity to church on and domination over the farn family which is supposed to ecclve these so-called benefits. yet yiu say this is placing pendence. The farm morigagris are witat got us into our prisent trouble. Thie averaze fism martgaye in America today is only a ppruximately. 83.500 , but here you are goine to Mr. CUOLEY. Doss we gentleman oppose the
Aderal atd to the mast desulute people in America-those on le farnis?
Mr. PETERSON of Georsia. No: but 1 do propose that
instrid of placums thm
tr a cundition not of tcnancy but of siridum und bondiscin to the su-cailed econamic ruyullsts that we place thoin In a condition of economte Independence.
Mr. COOLEX. What plan does the gentleman have to $\stackrel{M r}{\text { mir }}$ ar
Mri PETERSON of Georga. I may say to the genticniun
 population of Amertia to a condtlon of econounte tude


COOLEY. Winat is the plan? Ifrst the gentleman read itp
Colky. No: I huve nut



 Mr COOIEY Whurr bill a ity






 Mr COOLEY. Thin. way dow - Lhe Brathe
Here Her givet fill !
Mr. JoNES. M.
 close in a minutes.
Tme cilairman birce oujiction to the riturst of he britur man tivin Trxis?
Ther wus na ult
Ther wus nu ubtitiun
Mr. LAMBERTSON.
Mr protorinu aniendnarut.
Mr. Chalrman, I rise at this tame to taik a tutuc out of
order. with the permision of the coonnuture, wiule the


The subconimitite of the Cemantle on Apareprititurs
 amen bill ty the senate. Any hink whici pelitio til
 consrrvation has soine contact with titiong. so 1 ant sp, ak
ing on tie suljeit. ing on the sutje
The Senate














 licre the gavel filit 1
17ic Clarit read as folliws:
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Mric Clerk read es foliow


 rompryblitil!
Mr. bielimann. Mr. Charmun. the amendment which
 conim.tuec appolitited by the President. You will and thit
provistun un pagc 12 of their report. Tus phalosaphy of thi amendment is this: We are not
salvior the problem of turning a tenant tato a successfu ownet-operatur by mercty lending the man 100 percent o
the valite of the farm hic wants to buy. Sometlmes w the ralluc of the harm hi wants then he was before. We prurite tin this bill for the lending of muney to a great
varicty of people. tenants, sharecroppers. and peopie who recently gne m major part of their IVIng from fanming. and
we are kending loo percent of the value of he fam. we are kending 100 percent of the value of the farm. It
not everyunc who can pay out on such a toan. Those pro not eviryine who can pay out on such a loan. Thise pre
ple, as 1 said ytisterday. are of two hinds. They are ellor men who nree owned farms or thiy are men who, having
ownid fa mis finve lost them. It is reasonabie to suppose owned farmis, linve dase rally speaking. do not know every
thut thesc people. sener thung brut operating farms successfully. They may be just as able to plow. hey may bc fast as abe the is ranual make a sucerssful farmer-iliperawr. Management enid plan ning arre c.ssential to surcess.
In this amendment we propose that the Secretary of Agri-
culture uut of the expentence arcumulated in that Departinent, inr which we appruprate millons of doilars, and out of the expritience of the Extcnsion Bureay end the state
aprifuliural culluges. stall sopply the bencficlaries of this bill for a period of 3 years with advice and supervislon, so that they may have the best opp
In the opiration of their farms.
In the opiration of their farms.
Mr HOPE. Mr. Chalrman. will the genticman yleld?
Mr Hope. Mr. Chairman. will the gentleman yleld
Mr Bremann. I yicla to the gentleman from Kansa
Mr. Mr. HOPE. Is it the gentleman's intention that thit
apervision shall be given only during the nrat s years?
Mr BIEILMANN. Yes.
Mr. HOPE. It scems to me the erntleman ought to
thunge the form of his ancudment so as to make chal moro shecific. befnusc it is not clear. the way io make the amendnicnt. whether it is during the nist o years or durina the colire pastide
mi RANKIN
hic seaterice?
Mr. HOPE. No: 1 want to umit th to 5 years. but I do
Mu' tryye the amenument does that.


Mr. HOPE. The suggestun 1 would make would be that
be gentrman's annondinent thuuld rewd thay the horrower the gentrimat's ancodment shauld rewd that the tor rower Becretury may prescribe during the fist sy years the lon


 the amendment may be changed to conform with the lan The amendment may te chaned trom Kansss.
Mrage suggested by the gralle that. Mr. Chairm Mr. RANKIN. I objact to that. Mr. Chairman. I am
colas to oppose the genultman's amendment when the gen
 Lo oppositton to the amendment.
Mr. ELoMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman. wil the gentieman

cr. giermann. I yield to the enitiemian from missourt Mr. 2IMMERNAN. Froun the ditseussilut of this bill it
Mpeara there will be about one of these farms for cach opeaty hroughout the country
Mr. BIERMANN. Thiat would be true if they were divided
eventy. but therc is nothing in the blil that requires that.
 - Unis sime to establish a burcau to turnish an expert ad
viser for onc farm in each county in this country? Durs ina iser for onc farm in each county in tis counery? Durs
he genticman tulak we should walt untu the plat is divel oped further?
Mr. BIERMA Mr. BIERMANN. My amendment dous nut provide for in each county. The bial slmply provides for starting thi
plan slowiy and carefuly and sensilly with a $\$ 10.002000$ plan slowiy and carefuliy and sensiliy with a sate, and my emendment provides that these men be eiven the advise and
he help that is certunily necessary to the majority of thoun
 or the 100 -percent loans on their tarms.
Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Do you not uitnk it will icquite :u dylser for a numbir of countirs? Mr. Chairman, vill tic
Mr. O'CONNOR of Mollana. An scnteman yleld?
Mr. BIEIRMANN. I yield
Lri. OCONNOR of Muntana. Docs not the bill providn Mr. BiEtmann. Poplation and
Citer
Mr. BiERMANN. Pop
aticy pri State, but not Der coutry.
 $\underset{\text { Misslosip }}{\mathrm{Mr}}$ Mr. RANKIN. Why turn these fariners over to sumctionty
else who could not make a living on the farm humscif? The else who could not matimates the tulelligence of thic aviraye tenant farmir
Tenant GFMAIRMAN. Is there objection to the renurst of
The
CHie ite gentitcinan froin lowa to aniend the pending annenduent?
Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chaliman. I ubjected to tuat rectues) and I ask recounitlon in opposi. Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chaliman. I rise in opposition to the amendment. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolh Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chalrman, it seems we are in a unlque stiuation here. One Mcmber of the Llouse has jo.t Commitee on Agricullure has propased a measure which will. $n$ etuect. put the American tenant farmer into aciniplecte. Eovermmenial strangushed member of the coinnill'c:
sentieman. a very distingule senking the position that the bult which wo have reportco
place places insufticient resulations around the terson whon wi
are serking to help. ibelleve if the Mcinbers of the Heat:o
 has reactied what mulght be called a happy medlum. Section of the bill provides. amone other things:
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##  <br> BIERMANN. Mr Clulonen, will the gentlen

r,'COOLEY. Not now. The amendment proposed use in place of terra the bill is suffelinnly broad in lis scupe to authorite th secreary of incultre co requrm methuants and to we ap seiking $w$ ald to use modern farm methods, and to comply
wath the soll-conservation probrani and to protect the soll ${ }^{\prime}$ crillity.
Mr. PETERSON of Ceorgla. Mr. Chatrman, will the uen
tiemant yield? Not at this point. With further relerence to the suggestlon that there should be some supervisition. ap marenil overlooks the fact that in practleally evcry agricut Iural county in the United states we have a cuiunty ugent and I suppose that most. It not ull of thein. are sraduatc Which is rendering a fine service to the agricultural people or the Nation. Co dit
 employ another corps of governmental expiris to so on
 In the doed of trust or mortuage whikh he will accept upon bruad conditions laying down certain requirements with refer ence to the farm
and if that is dune we will accumplish what we want to accomplish.
Mr. KLEBERO. Mr. Chulrnan, will the gentleman yleid? Mr. Colley. Yes.
Mr. Klebero. Mr
vide. In addition io credit, for the purposce of enabling the
 citug to carry on a school for turming. admituing those mun berieve that we should open the whole bill and let some of the city folk, wion would like to own farme, come under the bull 1 also?
Texus. The chanitman. The time of une benterinan foom North Mr RANEIN. Mr. bosible for cvriy farniter who wishes to do so to be ablc to to
owis his home. But while we are attempling to cure the and tenaint situmulion by making landholders out of teriants we should also do something to reverse the polisy that is nuw nukiege tenants out of landowners by forvelosting mist wagrs Hang on theli own lanus and pay their debts and taxes. Whilc it is sald that thas menasure would only provide for
 raithind out, may result in enubling large numbers of people
to uw $n$ homes who have nifver been able to do so befurc.

 Hinser to gct full tule to his lund Just us sooun as he cant pay 1.iont is cariy as posisible.
 cummutes the intelligence of the average icnant farmer In
 then they become landownera, do nut need suardians to tell
thena what to do, when to sow and when to reap. or how to






 ing cotton. Aily to-year-old boy livilak in the colthin state
could have told them that all cotlon bloums ure while that first day and red the next. How far do you ithink threse thi would get teaching southern farniers how to grow rothem?
 Cemch thicm how to ralse wheat. The tumblr with this
 I feel that we are approuchlng thus farm pmotrnn fre in
the wrong angle While, us I suld, thas nue: inte will hith as far as at soes, therriainly doess not reach the furimer county, while large inunibers of landowiers are madte tentint by having their fitrus suld undir mint mate. Th. :haw, something that boes far deeper thull we can hoyn to re:chi I masilng lesistation of this kind.
them is tell you what sumn of thase troubliss are cine. of burdetisume taxes here in the House. People whit latrir in-
comes protest that their inconic taxis arc tew hish who hinerti enornmus estates protest usulase pivion aut inheritance tax. Manufacturers of luxutiles protest :bbiluast

 hether he makes any hicone or he, or se hise has hamband he owes 84.500 on ta, the hus to pay thturist un the 4. 500 and pay haxes, not on the 8500 equaty whach hat 1, 5io
 his stock die of starvalinu. as has hatpantioch th sume of the drought-struken areas in ihe lusi few yrurs.



 muke hum an abitract, or teo throuph rount to case "thit

 who now uwn farins to hitd them thin thas inll wit dit

 strive to purcthase hunists




 The farmer is the vieflim of the mallinhletwin in . under it our nonetary supply can be eximanded or centhatha
 aicturrt tre repand or coutrast the curency to meet ine
 same prure they suld it dur ius the Tatr aditulustratilon when

 ${ }^{11}$ "uric What
Whit it the c.ass of thas? 11 is the manipulution of our


 the result that what. culton, cora, anid other agrtcullura
 raiscd the reasscount rate. called his leans. conitracted the
curriticy. und druve conimodity prices down to where they sucpl away the honies of thowends of larmers whe were

 | kvels |
| :---: |
| The | They are nuw renuluce to pay the taxcs and other oblisa-

 Muld 82 wiliat with 11 -cent colwn and 21 wheal
If wid would hitit the carmer to holat his home and help
 enoush to mote home ownias sate and pronembee Mmat wouth do more goon
congress courd pass
Another minge our rranssoritition system penalizes ine Tarimer to an unconscronat ble degree the average former,

 conce on record for the so- called Peilengull bill Lhat would
pile inosis burdens higher No wonder tenants are peling
 nutre fripuly than this propossed measure would make wod-
Uwners out of ten mans uniers out leanis
is Agali. We find the carmer is bled white by monooiles. "1

 to ouy and then turn pround and dax the prices of the thing the turmer has to sell below the cast of production.
prucilcally ait the procecesors of dantry products are in theme

 luan of the croperallive creimentics and cooperalve chese

LWik at Lhe coltonseed Indusiry and see how it is con-
 wheas crup of thy entir Uututed Siates. A bushel of cot torn-
 mi. novolies thut fix tie price of coltoinsed far below their ut dullats criry scirr and matatiuk cenants uut of landouners hy lic hiousaths. wille we: pass a bul here to mate oue Louk el your whint and coni tarners end see how thet

 entas shreducd whical prepared in Chicago A tometo siower Caisup former in Nebraska or lowe cals cosntakes processed th 2ud oftrin lio times. or boo tumese as wuch for the processed
 monoponiles over which sprawi atsentic holding compenicte alt of thich reach down in the tarmer pockel wih one Cor the rau material. while with ine other they reach inito Lhe bemes of tic ulimute conswuern and exact their enor-
mous fributes in overcharsen for the nished producta in mous citbutes in overcharyer for the notshed producte in the innuurneses that coultrol them.







 Hould do the Carmers more gove than
These are bie harm probicms muth win We cannol cure che toubie by inducing A lew cenants 1

 | $\substack{\text { taniles. } \\ \text { we can }}$ |
| :---: |


 This is the richest couniry in all the worid. We have the
 ibe world. Yet we nad that in this twenteth century. Dibs
age of educallon and proses. when mantund has kaned the greatesil ascondency ores whe forens of hature ever thown in aill he agee- with all these advantiazcs. we se ouf

 cerest rates all out of proporituon. nadirect lezees on cecry trmite control.
 trouble and take from the beck of thy farmer thase burdens The berinish numerests nave pastaced upon him anad bive pro-

 man who touts. but we will make it posilluc for the prextil Lendownera to retatin thelr hamess and for the enter prisilut mo very uasurringly hoout alving economic sceurity to tuw farm
 We larniers in debl under existult conallions todiy.
 Lut there is and can be no sunh nacp



Twore wain a trmer tn my diatictit with only a debt on when Hove and innomecte He dusappeared one dark nugh
 sald he wat airalat mat he would be made to teep his tarm
 Source of the evil and principicts. We must so back to the cause enich drove the tarmet rom hat turni
 nd either bccamee cranute on their vemi Land or were com-
 In ther forms to becume wenderins ferm tonanise hundreded the army of tenancy had become a threatensing menacc to the peace and order of the country.
conins inndilords that the loanning insurance complanies, beAstrcullure Deantment to create a barm-natanager burrau to educute men as tornm manaecrs to monage 20.000-2ccre

Then. followiny this and betwen 1924 und 1929 , farm con agea werac reatea non reneved and many existine moriold debl. And followina ligas mortrages weie eamain foreclosed and other milluons of larmers were dispoasessed as These tarmers became tenumst now hand
nicnit did nut loant them munity, nur because tiley could nout pay, but beeculsc of the oft of nut inage chey promised to

 The Iarm owners became to
 new lins thun hie morlgase any one-hall of tis vulue was
 Untul Larin vallucs are made st:ble aud muchunging it
 owners and refain so-celled economic scicurity nand beccome ${ }^{1}$ rospencenen honie
with normal state and farm the price !evel to their tormi:


1 am supporting thas ollt, not in the hope of giving tarmert econonutic seeurity put to supporit chot yrictiple of Congreses can recover the control of the public currency of


 tion the menace of tenancy.
 rreastixy now ycar by year and creatile a srater mes inHaill ever beetore.
trrtility if ite soll by erosion and water is last lasing the Thrthity id the soll by erosion and water curry whe he lev-










 Tiom thertr tane evid cauyes sullil oper uting to do dive liumers
 o pay will not solve the problem of farm tetianicy. And there are other cawies conitributitin to turian
 debt obligations equal to the wiole velue of chlir
 equantly of the prices he recelics with the prices the is com ierials for reparrs and upkiep. He must have pardy
pres

and be folly ho loan to a firnaier the wimile value ur a tuin





 Withant teseorines norinall Ituin





 | amendicint. |
| :--- |
| The $\mathbf{C H}$ |




Mr. Charnana a purfiumintary in-
The CHARMAN. Tin b.antriun will state it


Hisulicr


 reserves 1 to ernd
met her hr problem.

banker, more than ony other thdividual. to usually tamiliar
with the atilty to pay and the clamacter of the average with the aidity to pay and the character of he average of iutie linds in this country it would help the dituation very much 14 secms to we.
Mr. JoNtes.
Mr. JONES There ure, of course. various ways in which
tht Dankug Act nulkht be antiended. but I would ruther not pass fulktincnt on that as it is within hie furistiction of
 the gentlenian froni Tcxast
Therc was no objection.
Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman. 1 ask unaninous consent, thasinueh as so much debate has intervened slnce the autendmient was reported. that the Clerk many agadn read The amendment for the information of the House
The CILAIRMAN. Withoul objcction it is 50 ordered. There was no objectlon
The Clerk asuln read the Burmann amendinent.


Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairm
Tic Clerk read as follows:

Mr bolleau. Mr Chairman, the amendment is sels 3 percent down to $1^{1 / 2}$ percent Many menibers, espectally those from agricultural sections have in reccnt years made speci $h$ after specech upon the stump in which they said that tarnury was being ubliged to pay too much in the form of interest; and a guod many members huve sald that the of Hie inpportant provisions of the frazier-keinke bill was that interest rates should be 1 ' 2 percent. I appeal to you Manbis who tave made such slatements in the campuikn ordcd you during this session of conkress, to reduce the mnterest rutrs. At least give this help to thuse who will be
beniented under the provisions of this bull. Then tou in a reent missage delivered to the Congress. hic Pressident of the Unuted States sisid that oute-third of urr
 werc undirprivileged. Here today we are atconipting, in a very teeble way. it is true. to give some relief to a large part of that underprivilegce class. If you subseribe to the
Pressidcut's views in that respect, if you subseribe to the heory that a large perccoltage of our peoplt need this assistnee and for that reason are guing to vote for this bill, $1 t$
senas to me you should be consistent and should support seems to me you should be consistent and should support
and amendiunt thit would reduce the titerest rates down to $!_{2}$ Pricent.
Oure and a
Oue and a hall percent is enough interest to be paid to
ue Guvernnicnt to insure inat the operations conducted
 thit Thu: Federal Ticasury ran get this moncy for less
 the cost ul adininisisation should be proportionately unduly
meh beriuse of our effirt to do a bis job with a litte bit of humery: if, perchance, the ndmanistralive cost is excesslve. do not the hus. adiluional cost around the necks of the

 Min. Cizawfortid. Mr. Charnian. wul the geutleman
Mr. bolleau. I yleld

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thult it is very tnterest ing to obscree
hat the nan who has a farst mortease on his tarm pays

 cent and I percent per annuma. This is supposed to be soilal insurance, soctal lendine. social rates. What do we balt of 1 percent. and 1 pircent?
 should be I! 2 percent. This carried out so there will not be any loss to the Treausury the that trete. I do not belleve there
ta my Is any justuficatlon for sadding arouma he necks of these
people, who are practically destitute, an interest rate of 3 peopleni.
per
Oh, It wil be sald that these are lower than he can grt farmers cail get. but it is not an low os niany of the privi-
 that if we see going to give any help to uxes: people th must
be by way of reducing the titerist rate that tias been callons be by way of reducing the interist raw that has been catins
up ail of the pronts of agriculure for momay years. Mr. PETERSON of Ocoreli. Mr, Chalirman, I rise in Mr. Chumirman I was delligitcd to licar the slatement of the gentleman frami Mississippl a few mulutes aso that this
bill does not touch the vital questlon that now affects the bill does not touch the vital auestion that now aftects the
Amcrican farm population. In reply to quesitons asted mee by olher Members while I was speakine a few minutes ago. mas I say that in reality frome an economic alandpoint.
what this pice of tegislation does to those who corie under
 Hs innuence
Hicir cash net drocone.
Mr. LuCAB Will the gentleman yield?
 House to a table that has been pripared Irom the census ol
1930. which ts the laut completc farm con:us avnilante, and
 lacked about 4 perecnt of being upoul a werity with the in-
dusirial income of this Nation. This celsus shows that durdustrial income of this Nation. This cclisus shows hat dur-
Ink hal ycar the avelage farni laborer who labored as a tenant had a moritity net casil income of $\$ 28$ per monith.
thile the average farm operator who owned his own fartn white the avcrage farm ouperator whio owned hise net cash
 In the State of Nortli Cirrolina, trum whe whe comes the
gentlemail who asked me questions speviousty. we nudd that gentlemaut who asked me questions previousty. we nud that
Gie average net cash income of the tenaults In 9930 wus $\$ 11$ per month, white the avcrage net cash liconie of the owner-
uperator. whose land was morticaged, was 57 per munhth, or \$4 less than the tcnant.
\$4 less than the tenant. thon of economic urdependetice. We are siuply pankerizitio
und pulting them decper into serflomi if this pruposal is und putling them
put the operatlon.
There has been mocntioned during the debate on this pro-
posal the great work that has becn done in the nation of posal the grezt worr that has becn done in the Maticn ol
Dennark under w sinullar proposeal. I may say to the ment Dership that for over 30 ycars Dennurk has been following a very stmillar, yca, an almost idenitect, prosiam. I quote
irom a periodical that was ptepmed and tisued by the Irom a periodical inat was prepared ald
United states Departnient of Agriculture:


What did they fad after an exhaustive survey?

What did they find in thetr summary
What did hey ind in
iHere tivel

Mr. JONES. Mr. Charman, ask unanimous consent that
all dillute on mus amendmint crose in 6 minutes. gentleinan trom Texas?

## There wus no obsectio

 Mr. Chatman. I find from the discustion of this bill that wc must all be kinssik in America Down in Olishama this cussion of this bill.
Why is It. Mr. Chairmun. that all of a sudden there is a Congress has been in extatence for about 150 years and we have kept the tarmer outaide the pale during that tume Now the not due to the fect that we have Just recenus discovered that we are living in a land of sleeplne gleats who mefore the Corieress of che Unitcd recotestition of their rishia Intue to a tarming disi inct. Inhabited by tho very pick of the men and women of America. Thase folks have been
demandine recognition and we have not given it to them. Mr. Chairman, I am golng to support this blll, not becaune cis. or glves them any real scrivice, but decause $1 t$ makca
creck in the these 150 ycurs, In the hope that crack will grow larger and to the farne class tn Acierica. and the uell you somethine further, You go up to Detrolf that th torn a sunder. You do not thow whellier that nat You go to the la rmers of this Dnion. sive them a new woe loold. give them a prace they may coil hoone, and then pro feccint farm prosram and you have ati ablidina falth for the nag of this Union and America will stways be sulf. IAD Flause. 1
IHere in
e ravel tell. 1
The Chairman. The question ts on the amendment The amcridment was rejected. Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman,
mendmcti, which I send to the Clerrs's dcsk.
The Clert read as follows:

Mr. Coffee of Nebraska Mr Chairman. Lhis amendof th: House. The amendment lost by a smail yote in com-
$\qquad$ ere embartung on a new progrum that will thvolvc
Government in ule cixpenditure of milions. if not bul this Government in the cipenancure of milions, If not binprosram, are wee golne on a reanonable basis. or on one that
no one can delend as belin sound 1 rom a lending standpolnt?
Under the provistons of thas bill it is proposed to loan 100 approximately 3 voou counter the $u$. at $\$ 5.000$ per farm It would require $\$ 15.000,000$ io Anance Just one tennant in each countly. It would require about
 revure approximately $\$ 140,000,000$. Do you want to commit the United Slates Covernment to
a program where it wil lend 100 percent of te purchase price or would you prefor a mare sound progrem which wull

paymentp Bear in mind sou ure not doting a tenamataro


 do you
gage?
By




Mr. OCONNUR or Multana. Mr. Chainnall will the grat
Jeman ylecld?
Mer COPFEE of Nebraskn. I shall be plitwed to ywit,
when 1 frish my statement.
The farmi tenants and stiatir
soon realke that, even with 850.000 .000 an star cuintry winn in


 experiments by the rederal Governmicnt hat niay ity the
future lead to such vasi aphrupriations is to ampair the
credit of the Ftderal Covernnuell redit of the Ftideral Governnicil.

 There are in Nebraska toduy miany tenants. who if they
wented to could buy on reasunable temus uri laruis they are operating. Most of them are wise in nut purithashig untll they are financially able to assume tue risk arid in

 be encouraged to assume the respunsibilitites of ownet witio who will not be able to puy their taxes and tutrest ind they remalned as ternants untu they mad iccemanuluted nitidclent funds, stock, aide equ|pnient, thy prithaps womad hai.. made a success of the venture Sinie wolidu undibitilly the owner shared in the luss frime diongith, hall, grasshinpfers, and other hazaids it are There is no one more imurrestro in aswidue the 1. rimer





 und bank lends money un thir b:inti, of 75 pithmit of the

 nost of the tirnis they hat to hake over. Thy w ill hum trit.
 agency to toan to pricent of the puichase urite if a $1,1, \mathrm{~m}$

 I aubmt that If you winh this tenunt prograin to sutcetil yeara to come. you wul vote for my antleridnent. Yuil camat

Usitity authorizing a Federal ugency to loan 100 perceot of
he purcitiase pricc, but you can jusitfy your position in he Duncithase price, but you can jusitify your posititun in
aithurizing fuas not to caceed 90 percent of the purchase

Mr. MAHON of Tcxas
Mr Chairmun. I onfer an amendNebriaska Imr Corrisi)
The Clirk read as follows:


 25 of the berit farm counties in Texas. I cannol expreas too
stronuly niy titerest in helpful farm legishation and a wise
 awuership prograin to conbat the growth of farm tenancy. 1 peirct to report liat al percent of the farmers of my dis-

 to the Earmers of my yistrict. Soch an woultude would be unfilir to the people I represent and politicalily unwise.
My' allenduncnt pruvidrs that no applicant for a
My allienduncont pruwidrs that no applicant for a lonn
mider ilus act shanll recrive a loan on land in excess of os purce'llt of the value of the land. In oinher words, the flirncer would nut up 5 percrnt of the value of the farm
which he prouposed io purchase. Thus would be $\$ 250$ on a $\$ 5.000$ ferm. I canilot see any ining woong wih inis principle of a down payment on the farn to be bought. Our
tarmurs know the dimimultes involved in buying land. They waint to start out on a sound basta. They are not lookling
for a semirellet contract. They want a falr chance to


Mr. MAIION of Teras. Yes. Mr COOLEY. DDeas thut the
Mins is an etperiment?.
Mr. MAHON of Texas. I do.
Mr. COOLEY. Does ite gentieman think, if it is an ex periaurnt, that we should undertake to put it on a Mr. MAhion of Texas. I think we cuift to start out on the soundest bisfs we possibly can. If we wast to invic
disisaster and pull the nountain down upon the telanat farmers of Amprica, we are at liberty to do so, but it we wan io start right in the deginning and will we tre interested today. we will try to proceed cauitoily and wisely in the begminung of the admunistra. tiun of this rneassure. It the tenant cannot pay 8250 as a of 3 percent, willith will be giso the neat year, and the taxes of 3 percent
on the land?

Ido not want to see the trnant farmers in my distitict ko fato in there are many farm familics in tivs country who ar lons.ng for a chance to buy a home with a small down pay-
nirnil atid a guaranty of proper credit facilitics. The alms In'nl atid a euaranty of proper credit facilitics. The alms
of the coovernment could not be directed in more worthWhile channels. Will ine centicman yledd for a britt ques-
Mr.
cooley. Mr COOLEY. Will ithe renil
D lint
Mr . Malion of Texas. Yes.

Mir COOLEY Dexes ine EPDileman realize that under
 vi., on is very swatith.

Mf. MAlion of 'rixis. There is nu mandiatory provision




## Mr. Mahon of Teias. Ceriainly: and we provide that

 Mr. THOMASSON of Texas. Mr. Chatranan, will the Een Mr MallonMr MAIION of Teras. Yes.
Mr. THOMASON of t Jeas. Does not the genileman thunk that is hus amiendinent is adoptid a down paymen would represent some evidence of sood falith on the part or
the tenant and some evidence of a serious intention and purhe tenant and some evidence of
pose to make he farm a suecess
 THere the gavel tell. 1
Mr., HOPE. Mr. Chairman. I rise in opposition to the
mendment ofrered by the gentleman from Nebraske imr. Mry. Cin
Mr. Chairman, this bill, of course, does not require that oans. be made to the fulli vilue of the tuld. It $p: r o d t s$ loans
up to that mmount, but it specitically provides that pretcrence ap to that amount, but it specitically provides that preticrence
shall be elven to the farmer who sole to make a down payment. Now, as has been said a number of tumes in the course of
this discusion, this bill is sit experinumi, and is it is an experiment. I feel the Departunent of Agr rcullure ourht to have an opportunity. under the provisions of the bill, to make
it somewhit flexible. There may be some parts of the couniry in which it would be better and sounder to require a down payment of maybe mure than 10 percent, and In other section menght ie disaratibe Departurent oudht to hive the opportunity Lo try out dificrent methods and mate hoans on a diflerent basts willimn the limits of the bill. in order to dectermine what is successlul.
Thie erreatest succesa that has been made in tuls type of
project anywhere In the worid has been In Ireland. They bregan back to 1870 in Ireland to solve their tenant problcm by making loans to Lenante to purchase land. and they batan
by makine the toana on the beste of es. 7 percent. or two.
 cver since 1 EBE they heve unade them houne on the basis of
100 percent. Duting this ture they have boased approxinately $8725.000,000$ and have pande owners or pput on the roed
0 ownershitp 517,000 tenants. so that whereas beck in 1970 , 7 percent of the farmers of Ireland were tenants and 3 pet07 percent are owitiers and 3 percent are lenants. Practically al of this was dolie on the bassis of loans at 100 percent of the Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentieman yleld for a Mr, HOPE. Yes
Marr. JONES. The gentleman mrntioned the fact that
 and machinery, and ta it not rrequentiy a sounder ban to to operate a farm than 95 percent to a man who does not have such equipmint: and the adapplan of elther of thase
amendmente would mate it so that the man whit ind plenty of machinery and plenty of equiliment to farm protabily would be eurned duwn for the nuan who bad a s-percent
panient. even thought he had no equilument whatever. Mr. HOPE 1 agree with the genliliana entirely.
Mir Ho the gavel fell.1
Mre HOOK.
Mr. HOOK. Mr. Cliadrian, I move to strile out the hist mor. Cr
of lise fect that Inat sot intend to thilk on this bill because
 of tenancy, but viee of the provious sprakers nere tuxlity
nurationed the fact that the fink of our countiy was weili desecrated in the ctity of Detiolt.
 were out in the wheat fitids and went throwh the farmilus
country and burned uie barns and burncd the wbeat selde.
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Did we consldcr that the furners wcre desecrating the nate to hay innited states of America? Not That same element worked its way tato the tebor movement in America and dt is the cilty of Detrolt and the good peolute of Detrolt ure no desscratinu the nag of Amentica. It to the comnunistice ele ment that has crept into inbor that to desecraling the fage It is bent on desiroying not only the lebor movement bui I have alwaye beecn a friend of labor, and II well remember
when the United Mine Workere of Americs was a real or-antzalion-and I am weighing well my wordo-when Joht Lo Lewls was st the head of that organtzation, and when he in no uncertatata terms, condecmed certiann communistic lcadhe sald they were there for diuruptlve worts from تnthin, and now where are chose very Communisk he condemned. They are the nrat leutenants of Moan Li Lewis in use, 1, O, to others. He cannot deny tit. Why ino change of hearit
Let me say to you that whle I was back in my district Let me zay to you that whlle I was back in my dustrict and Degred me to use my induence to have the $C$. I. O, and its leaders take these communtutes as arganisers out of uist organization. I am not opposed to the c. I. O, or to indus-
irrai organizations. but i am opposed to the communitile.
 hatt is coing to disrupt inbor if it is allowed to co on. Yes: cans acerpt the challenge and will never bow to communisicic. Irciltsious clavery. $\qquad$
As it has been mentloned here that the crack is open fur Hito uhia House of Representatives and be recounized, Let us pass iaws oularetige the rischt of any emploger or employee. naned thl may pass kerislation that will malte it a crime to transport nen from one place to another or from one state to another. cuptinst roops suthorized by lewful suthority. Lawful pickellise is the ringt of lebor, The rizitt to atrike is their only interest of labor at heart., direct that stritc. The Amertican Ederation of Labor reflusea to allow known Communists ithin therir rants. and 1 congratulate hicm tor it. When he C. I. O. enforces sueh a rule they Fill galn the respect of in the eyes of public oplnion, and public opinion rules in mertica.
Ar, Jones. Mr. Chairman. I did not make the point of order to the remarks of the sentieman from michiaan imit. cookio but 1 whe pore of order. belause te hers many who want to discuas thia particular measure, I want oce now if we cannot agtre upor the comil for cussion of inds section. If ast unanimous consent turnat in pimited to 3 minutes.
The CHARRMAN. It there objection?
Mr. JONES. Then, Mr. Chairman. I obk unamimous con-
Lrint that each of the emendmente that are to be offered
to this section be read arat for the information of the
The CHAIRMAN. Is there wbjection?
There was no ubjectinn. Clert with read the
"1t the order in whilch they reach the dicsk.


## Mr. WARREN Mr Chalman, I rise mirrily to state th.   I shauli offer a vcry imporiant clarifying arimendinent to sorithin 3 later 1 understand there is no of jection to the vei, duite Mr. JONES. maendment, and I Chathnan, I have no objectitu to th. The CHAltanN. The question is on agre, the to thi mendinent offered by Mr. Wainen The amendment way agreed to <br> The Chairman. The Clerk will reputt the next ammadment. The Cl <br> The Clert read as fullows: <br>  <br> Mr. JONES. Mr, Chatiman. I reserve the point of urder The CHARPMAN. The Clerk rill repult hie neat aullui- <br> The Clert rcad as follows <br>  Mr. JONES. That is to the ncat section. The CHAIRMAN. We have not remehed that part of tho The Clerk will report the neat aniendiment The Clert read as follows <br>  

The Chandman. The clett will riport uie next uir.itid.
The clerk read as follows


The Clerk read as tollows






 Mr. кlebero. Mr. Chamian. 1 duove to strike out the mat liree words.
The discusslut
 in us .nitrcly, but will conntity my remarks to the recerda as

I waill 10 call the atientlon of the liowe to the fact that r.spule every cturr having been made to show that ine farm

 Hicw farm owners. About be 0.000 or those tarms 10 which
 lind wiuk The parts wulsr 10.000 en which 1 refer were

 II Hut rase of the othcr 10.000 Iurns, money was advanced



 auilitustration, weith ith rifluatcing and in bringing peovile bere ulten owncd by the Government moct hild by he Furm


Eisilit huidred aild Mity thousand forms refnancid by the It by atandoutment proceccings on the part of the owners. nud in the case of the 10.000 oher tarms credit ous not-
 merits und to incect the cridit requirements of the Parm Creds Admitisiration.


 reaisunale down pasinent, showimg R Rrst good falthe and.

 nimsistration
intec very
 IMt. CCriftil frity because I think 10 percent is not too unurli down payment to require during the administration of
the cariy operattons of this act and, Inthug in that amendmetit. 1 will vote fur the amenumicnt oiftred by the gentienun froun Texas IMr. Mation
In sumniation, uhe bill und


 10 tinis. that nutiber tn I year, and will conilnue so to do
in a wadd outcry way
Nuru of the farnts heid by the Farm Credit Admintitration nurmg the warcaientioned operations were accuured \&iter 1933.
 tew or these acquired by foreclosure
The Cuiairian. The lime of the kintiemuitiram texas
 pendittg amendments. My Stace of New Hampsitire has
about tue lowest propartion of tenancy of any Slate in about the lowest propariton of tenancy of any Siate in the
Union. Nevertheless. I weil understand this is a national probleru and as such il coinmands my sympaitcuic interes and attention.
1 want to
Ind went to say at the beginning of my remarks that
Ind iot in accord with ithe genilicrian front Nortin Curolina. who by his interrosation of one of the member a few moments ago sugsested that matcers of an experi-
mental nature in government werc justined in being based upon a basis which is not sound.

 days any more than setlink up
that is not sound in lus provisions.
Some ycars ago I weat to the Secretary of Asricutiure
and dematded the rcport made by Mary Connor Mars and dematided the report made by Mary Connor Myers,
Govemment invcsugator. on the subject of farm tenancy Government investigator. on the subject of farm tenancy
This report was mude by her for the Dellartment of Agri
 prcised by the Drpartment. I was arinted in opportunity
however. of reading that report in tis entirety and i be came well aware of the cerrible conditions of the tenan
faritura and sharecroupers through the mealum of fartuera and aharecropyers through the medum of that
report 1 want to support this icgistaction. as a national expert-
inemit to try and do somechitg wo nutet a serious situationt.

 placins oniy a 90 -percent burden on the Government.
 rcpudiated the bull because it would put the coovernment into the busine sis of beying and sellung tand. The commintee
took this action desplte the fact that tis members weir puit took this actlon desplte the fact that tis members were put
under sreat pressure from the administraulon and were subunder sreat pressure from ts
ject 10 cafolery and threats.
It was to the everlasing credit of those who resisted such nictiods. That idressing myself now to the of record. on Agriculture I need not have the gift of of the Comnilitee ize that when this bull goeat to the Setate. in all probabililiy
thai booy will put in the bill the originai that body will put in the bill the orikinai provislon for the
buylite ond sellitio of land by the Governinent if the corncs back to the House contidning this provis If the buld

 to stand against thal provislon for buying and selling tand and to elliminate it from the bill. Witat do you say. Mr. Chairman?
 I can. Mr. TOBEY. Coming eveus cast their shaduws bcfore
them. however. sur. Them. however. sir.
Mr. JONES. Id thitk the getuemart will expect tuc to make a commitument thus fur in advance.

 feels that I will do the best can in working outd how tilat I on behais of this House. Lo sustian the posilton of the
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to strike out such a provision if inserted in the bul by the
Mr. COPrEE of Nebraska. I am for the gentieman Mr. TOBEY. One thing more. Mr. Chairman. We hcar of Covernment departmens. This bill would add to our alrcady topheay burcaucracy. The bureaucrats are often antenvents are at cross purposiss one with the other. Here atmal wirch alms to put thousands more peopte on the have that tmport behind them: through graniting more credil and lowcr rates of interest-tryine to gel more people on read anma. Llstic. Mr. Chairman Jowze. of Trias. While Dr. O. E. Baker, Dopulation authortyy for the United Biatea in the Wastinglon Posit today he is Associated prear artlicia an address at Purdue Univeralty Inatilute on Aomerican Polici and Tectuology on June 28

Is that true in the gentleman's judgment?
Mr. JoNEES, I do not Lhink 20 .
Mr. ToEs. Then 1 submit to the chairman of the
Cumnultee ort Agriculture that
inconarutity on Asriculture that this is enuther burejucratic
Mr. JONes. Yuu cannot prove a thing by newspaper
stateluents. stakements.
Mr. HLLL of Alabaina, Mr. Cliairman. I want to ex bers my aturectalloir of the ing this bill to the foor of the House. I am sure that but for the devoted eflorts of the chairman and the memberi of the comnutite we would no today
of considerring and pussing thls bill.
 day. I was miluressed in tho Arst place becane yesterrecontuze his oustanding abllity. Insi place because we all reailize Uliat lic spraks with authority, ha sung spent ail of
his life in the busitess of farming. In ute third place ib is turhaps to nian in Congress who is a thare deyoled advocate of what we nitish term indilildualsin, the individual mant form Nuw York. Yet on ycsisirday fic warned us that It Uic Covernment were to make a succuss out of this thand least some directuon by the Govenumicul of the to $w$ be at I am feurfut that the henguage in ut House bil hooking
to that qucstoon is too indennite and uitcertain. The gento that question is 100 indecnnite and uticcratain. The gen-
tueman froin New 1 lampshire has spoken of the coiterence contuittee. I believe that the language in the senterence tul
lakes care of this question in a much better way. and I hope that when this bul ts in coutterence that some languase
 re to be the benenciaries of this act
Mr. Clualman. I am
menis, one permiluing a luan of 80 twercelt of anding andof the. Tarm, and the other a loan of ps percent of the value
of the tarm. We mush
he oniy expenditurc that the purchase of the faren is no is to he put on a thrm and then operato it ticce sestuly tyant As quasslion propounded to Che gentieman from Sansas. there is There is seed to the bourht. There is work expenalks io is iselt. and 14 seed to he bought. There ts work stock. cowns. hogs.
and tertulzer to be acquired. There are all kinde of thinge hal rast money that are esecnitial to the operation of a farm

Many of the farm tenants have today mutle mones ar
property of any kitad und mowt of what hut ue tury have will






 approximulety about 8460 . it this estintutce truste; to be
 of the galn in income whith oceurred betwect 1ysb atil whe
 ment in the thands of the funner.
In ig3s the habilitation clients was only wor. 3 . In outer words. thi" turt

 The total net worth of all uise clicnts in Aluburnut tu tisi



 conditions today. It is at teast a beegriting towara ute sultulon of tue fatm-turiant problem. alld we have wallicd ull tot
 During the past so










 nim a 9 -year lease of a garden und the will culluriala tobe
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 Tharavor.
Tine some tenant farmers throughoul the United
Siates tin the yeurs since 1829 who tive mel winh more







Mr. TARVER. Yes.
Mr. HitI of Otiahoma. Does not every Btate in the Union
provide homestead exeraplon for


 Immidiately fullowhing the remarks of the grnultemelit itat

 minutes. Is there objectiont? this sectlon be bimited to 3





 tw has expred.
Me PETE
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 will be oifered. I purvascy have been tiberal because there



Mr. HoPE. As the geitleteran knows, upre are some im.
 have no objection to such a Jinitation with respect to tilla

 rone CHAIRMAN. S Lhere objection, to lic request of the




 Tie CliAlliman Tic ernatyian's sant of orat.r conics











 a hase and ask the Cularess of the Unitced Stetes to do so.

 Dutcd siutes inw busimiss and furntist every fanner with
 roun tellany us exactiy what luls plan lis this ufternoon. ruti a just want to coll attention to the fect that thas aircady been proven in this country that that is not the
 liurriase in nuinber of tenants and in the wercentage of



 resue of the farmis is $\$ 9.000$.

 faria far 83.000 we saw the tenincy problem there tise. then
1 say that the indiscriminaie givina a way fannis is no the

 and we may be The but it unly an experimint. We do
know that in oincr countrics, notubly in Deninark \&nd in ireliand. a plan simular to this nas succecded. Success in thase countries aives us some ground to hove that through
wxperiment we may be able to work uit a plan which will experiment we may
be successiti in uis country and which would justuy this bul.
The Chairman. The question ts
fered by the sentlenam from Ceorala
The amendment was relected
Mr. LUTHER A. JOFNSSON. Mr. Chairnan. this bill is
mis cuntiained in the national Democratice plationm of 1938 One relates to the tarm cenancy problem and the other to the
purchase and retircment of submarginal lands of suct a eharucier as to be unproductive in agricullural pursults. As to the nirst. I guote Irom the platifurin



 The number of farm letiants in the Unitan sate that the proulcm ra
Impuilance.
Thie number of firm fenan's has gratly increased in the
 were tenanis, white lodis.
the lamers aie tenatis.
 Llon to this there were 716.000 fat in titiunts smerilly known
in tue Soulhern Siates as stiareciopurss. making a totel of

Thiess Curm tenauts nre in nill srections of the Natlon. but Now Enerland inna the Nurth Allantice States have fewer than
the e est. The harkest nutraber of farm tenanus resile in the




Incluce MLsissyppl. North and Syulth Carolina Oeorgla, Ala



 of tenanit farmers 19 ureuter than Texam One reason tor this hivh percentace of farm trnancy in
the south is due to in infletent ceplital und consequent hikii inderest rates. The Eist tind the North, end eapecially the Noithenst, has had an ample supply of cuptole and resultai
low finterest rates. whule jn the soult) funds evaileble for in interest rates when of hescr volume. and consequently Lasiss brought migher titercst, inaking it more dimeult for
 IIf. $R$. 3590 io promute the purcliase of farma by fatin tell-

 lurace sum lor Ure aid of fern turnants than the bill under
consldeyalit the Till we ere now considering authorizes onsideretht nut to exaced $\$ 10.000 .000$ tor the Arst year. an emount
$\$ 25.000 .000$ tor the sccond yrar. and $\$ 50.000 .00$ for the third
 nave availible an amount bliwut 12 pimest, white this bull stipulates a 3 perceent rate.
The chice disappolintnicnt about the bill now bein con-
sidered is that $I t$ will furnish aud to only e very mall number of tenent firmers. It the averase band to each individual
ismer showd be $\$ 8.000$. this would give ald to onis one-hald isrmer showld be 38.000 , this would give ald 10 onis one-hand
of 1 percent of the venant tarmers. Some member of the coinmiltiee. In disceussine the bill. hes stated that the present
 Hue bill does inaururate a palicy which I hope may be developed and eniarged so thatl the coverninent mame owner-
 this laudsble purpose.
 Is workebit end ariorde rellef, that the Gover nament will then
launch io janch uprogram of greater magnitude, and which nilt of
benefial to substantial number of the farm tenante of benencial
Anertica.
Home ouniriship by the farmars of America is of vilal in-
mortance not oniy to the cenant furiners. who wul be perportance not oniy to the tenant furiners, who will be per
mitied to borrow money from the $\mathbf{C o v e r}$. mitted io borrow mones fram the buene bencincent uricet in the redulton of the number of farm tenants wal fevarably
affect the social and economte wellare of the Nation as a
 whoie. Worthy
nomes. and evcry encourngement should be ofered them to
do so. do so.
There is no cliss in greater need thun tus tenant farmers
of America, aund 1 atn glad to vote for a Dill which will give recognition to the neesd of this worthy clas. 1 reill gilize that the bill wilh be a disappointme it in the number of
 aIn hopine that a larger amount muy be made avallable. an hoping that a larger amount muy be made avalabie.
Mr. JONES. Mr. Chaliman, I ask unamimus consent that ail debate on Inis section chose in 6 ninsules.
The CliAlrman is
sentlenan from Texas?
There was no objcction.
The CliAIRMAN. The clert will revort the next ameold
ment. Clerk read as follows:
amenuoletho oferra by Mr. Thava-
 then maceadknent.

The chairman is there objection to the request of the

Thr CIIAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amend ment in ardir.
cleralar riad as folluws:


The CIIAIRMAN. The gentlicunan frem Oeorgla is recog-
ized $\operatorname{lor} 2$ nunules.
mr. PACE. Mr.
Mr. PACE. Mr. Clatrman. I am certainly concerried In
dotne someding ito the tenants of this Netlon. The fact hat there are 24,000 cenant formere in the 24 countien wortant It is co my prople. Tives youls hame been descritived as an expertmeut. In Lhe hope of maktupg tit more than a nobite expertunent mercly. but rether st successitul experiment. I
inilit wo anould make the bill as practical as posible. You hiact voted to lend 100 percent of the value of the livend. Mou
amendment proposes that 11 you lend 100 percent of the amendment proposes that 11 you lend 100 percent of the
value of the hand, 100 percent of the value of the improve.
 stock and equipment, that ceralnaly the becreitiry of the

 amendment that before a perrion can take adyantege of the
Trazier-Leanke iav and stay the proceedings for 3 years he must at teast have an suvestment equal to 25 percent of the urchase price of the land.
This bill. of course to desigped to help the cenant. The enant. but there will te a few beeanis not in eympentith the the secrelary of Auticullure. and ceratinly ve phoujd not
 Act and keep the place for an additionalis y yemm without nne dollar tivestied. My amendment providee sumply that he
must have an equity to protect, which he would poo have ta
 Pralzer-Lemke Act and stay the proceedinges for 8 years.
Mr. JONEs. Mr. Chalruan, miy I be recogaimed for i minute at thas tume?
The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recornted The CHALRaAN. The sentleman from Teras is recosmeed
fur 1 nulnute. Mr. JONES.
of niernbers of the commiltee about thle amendment. They gre not sure stout il. I woader it the gentlerman mould be
 Inclined to belleve there is some furce in what the genteramo
angs. segs.

Mr. Pace. 1 think it is proper. It the genilicman does not The Chairman. The question is on the armendment Chaik genicman irrim Ceorela imr. Pacel.
The CHALRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amend nent. The clerk read as follows:





The CIIARMan. The Clict will report the umendment io
thee amendment odirca by the aentleman from Alabanam

The Clerk reud es tullow


 tul ememintistraton of thas bill.



 and Lo the texpn yers of the cunitry.


 itet that it is an experinemt doc's not Justify us in fulum

 our allempt to thiure a provicr berinning.
 of our prerogatives, he gets a cheer. Here is an upportunity to ovet or mene contron over public suuds by Conbires und
isscre our proper authority. The easiest mey to
The eastest wey to get a man into troubie it to lend hism
 under the approprintion pruvided tur til this niwasure. We
ooght to mopp this amendment providus tial sw luan under this ctite shall excred 86.500 .
I have been in mast of he Stites of the Unlon noud 1
mon that aftrutural condillons and Latra prices vaily diferent focalleses, but 1 am cumpelled ha so say that vily
Covernment is Government is eving to pay 100 percent oo the purchiss
price of a form and turn it over to an occupane wuhtit
 the Governmen,
 we have a much lower lumitation than sugkistett by tha




 we have provided the lumit will be much luwer and 1 nay
say to ure genueman I nupe the aviruatic furm will trin turli

 heg vary in value so nuch in dilicrint counmumities that




operate in the northern section of tuls coulily
Mr. JoNes. 1 may say I had the sam: tur
 ous areass
Mere lle gavel delll I
Mr. LUCAG rose.
The CHARRMAN.
Irom 1 linais rise?
Mr. LucAS. Mr


 consent so to do. at thas porm. and ajk mor Tenticinan Irom Himass?
There was uo ubecpliun.
Mr. Lucas. Mr. Charmun. dariug the hearings upon
the furin temancy bill there were frequenty tujected into
 caltud uiat in rerian sectlons of the country only a small
anuunt of calitial was necessary to transforn hopecess and subnurred tenants inio happy, Hadustrious, and contented
 Mhat inany letuatus in his section of the state with an opcratinu bave of $\$ 2.500$ could conguer and huride the farm hazalus of localy und unasperty.
The genteman from Texas iMr Manow, following in the
wake of such urusual aptunistin ofiers an amendinent to this vaike of suth urusual aptunnsisin offers on aimendinent to this bill hiniting ihe loan thal any one persolt should recelve $w$
$\$ 6.500$ Mr Chuirunal. 1 do nut question the good faith of

 gency crop luais uluph which there is a loan limitation. You
atid 1 know those were imertency measures, designed to ald atid 1 know how indictinumediate and dire distriss. The pollcy we sursue voriay is bering tolluwed under the incory that it
 1 confess that 1 atn not entrely fanultar with all the conditurns whin h exist in the varusus fartang communilues of
 know ng that you owin ucres of ground or that you own a


 sunur time this is a cold. hard, prnctical worid, and uthess
there is swnithing more than the title log huse in the woods the mati, whin is given the opportuluty to tuitd that huuse with the caypyers
lluc Guvertimetut will tose.
 Hes that the everise slze famiyy farm me reminat 158 acres. If the 38.000 is the umil that any individual may be compelled to luok for farn lands selling al approxitnately 335 per acre. That would muan the selectlon of a farm in
my scellon of the siate which would materisly paymint in full by the prospective purchaser, and it would alse elinunutc a eertinin type of hisht-class tenant who would
hot care to till that kind of soit. Our rich productive land scll irem 875 to $\$$ iso per acre cven in thesc days of economl
The records of the hrarings disclose that 11 will take from
$\$ 12.000$ to $\$ 16.000$ to flamee adenuately the pureliase of th $\$ 12.000$ to $\$ 16.000$ to flatnee adenuan:ly the purclase of the
averife farn 1 miny part of hutiols, as contemplated under averipe
this bill.
11 the peaple ar miy section are to be forcelosed trotn par-
 Wrouth the muminuistration agency. Let "t not be sald here
widay that ty tdopling this amendrumt practically huls of
 Wiurnis of this bill
Mr Honbs. Mr Charman. 1 ark unuminuous consent to
 There was no oblection


This bial aulliorizes to be apiruphete

 could mean in uppropriatuns would be $\$ 85.000$.000, or less

There are 3.059 agriculturgi countics in the Uniled Statcs.
 on the ruad to farns ownersh1p for at least one tenant furmer
in every agriculural county of the Nation. lis blessinus will
 lewant tarmers benefiled out of three nululion would be very $\underset{\text { Natura }}{\text { Lew. }}$
Naturally. those stctions of the country where the pre-
valling prices of lund are hugli, will contend that so low a celling as 83.500 per farm would not enable a lenatit farmer
Lo purchase many acres of their tuikh-priced land Thus
 justined upon the ground of real value. Llern a smadier number of such acres would be equal in productivity to a larger
nunber of chapaper acres. The purposc of tuis bill is not to
 and splendidiy inproved farras. As 1 etsvision it. it is to
bring lo ootr lenant farmers the opportunity wo work out thetr own salvation on good land, according to a falr plar, shot hrough wifh hope of independence and constanuly 1 improving
sur roundings and financtui condition. Applause. of this 1 am in heariy accord, and wish to spread the bencfis
 he Individuml project. The smallice
as inexurably true as malliemathes.
While 1 am cordially in favor of the pendilug bill. 1 am nut unnuldiful of he cven inals Nalion, owners and cenants alike, for a sure and reuty
 curves of the conmmodites they must buy-prices which
with assure them rcasoable profit upon thetr of mouey. lime, brawn. and brains inpplause. 1
This transcendent need of fatr markcts for farm products
is to be caken care of til the getheral farm.rellef vill which is to be caken care of inouhe geleral farm.redect bill which
i hope will soon be brought befure the House and passed.

 hus caused the present plyht of agrtculture.
Would you reany help the farmer? Then insure farr
 Lected market, discriminated anatrst as lie is in the matter
of freishi rates, and paying tribute on every hand to thase of treight rates, and paying tribute on every hand to thase
Who demand and get hyigh prices for the thinss and services
the fermers must have. IApplause. the farmers must have. IApplause.
Give the American fermer (alr prices
Give the American tormer fair prices for all the things he
can produce, and you have solved the farm problem. IApcal
plause 1
in pass.
In pascing thas till, today. let ins each and everyone re-
solve to hasten as much as pussible the passage of the cen-
 as bencifinent as its purp
plishment. Applause.
The chin
The CHAIRMAN. The quistion is on the amendnurnt


The amendment to the anurnim. int wiss refected
The CHALPMAN. The questlon is on the ofered by the gentlinian from Tixas IMr. Mhe wno The amene gical wan rclioceled
The Clerk read us toilo
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Mr. PETERSON of Ocorgla. Mr. Chulunan i muve Mrike out the last word.
acorgla. Mr. Chuluman, I mave to making the sugbecsuon that 1 have not prescated Ro then Howse today the provisions of the propustil whith 1 am
edvocalling for the rellet of the farnu population of America. 1 may say to the conthemin that inslead of creating anne'nt cmiployecs my proposal provides thut the Cencrul Land Omice. Which is one of the oldest drepartnients of the
Oovernment, shall procited vided in this bill to be given to especiully favored farmers.
but to buy heiss on farni morkeges. il turther provides that the buy hoversunetarnh mortikages, 11 further provides in each instunce procced to
 the morisagor. Mr. Chatrmun. 1 capalatentilon of the men.
bershtp of the House to the fact that the average farn bershlp of the House 20 the f fct that the average farn
mortiage today ts approximate $\$ 3.500$ the age size of the farmp under mortsuge os approximately 150 acres. Under my bill in every instance where the morkgagor
oo desires he may liouidate the farm inortage and shat

THure the ghvel fell
Mr. JONES. Mr.
Mr. JONES. Mr. Chalrman, I ask unanimous consent
that aH debate oo this section and all amendments therito
close in 3 milnutes. The CHAIRMAN, Is thare objection to the request of There was no objectuon.
imo words. Mr. Chulrman. 1 move to strike out the lasi two worrds.


${ }^{11}$ in the Itrst place, as hat becen stated so many times today,
 The only coitributiont 1 wand to make to this thought is

 ctils or is cernis a dozeng during lice neary layine scason
 clunb to 28 evins or 30 ents 2 quzen whulesule when the
cummission men und cold-storaze houses have already bought in mosi of the cegss cold -sonage houses have atready bought
this condillon peralsts owr In the second place, I doubt if

 stroy bunk credit as the ugricultural population. I belleve
tonut luing must be done about huis questlon bectorc the probleme of the marrucer will be solved.
lin the third place
In the third place, I shall vote for this bul and do in
with some conthusinsm in spite of the fact it is literally onily a muru drop In the buckel. 1 shall vote for it because it Whs forth a prinetille of American aovirnnient. namely,
 population forcest out of the chess of substantual owners of and into subjict class of tenants and kept thare. We
gre. I trust, going to pursite this counsic unill we have re-


 Host important mat we do 11 right. The arcat problcon it ts most impartant that we do 1 l rght. The danger of specula--
ton and specuative rise in land palues and the danger that the new farm owners will have a dimeud the danger charue uteir indebledneess a od make a success of thadr new
veature mulut be faced. We cannot forget elther the danger



 and result to wor wrime turnarse on the filste: 1
tame terms with



 Letlon.
Therr
 Hisce the gavel fill.
The Clerk read us follows:






 we are golny to blave oniy slo. 000.00 far this flist






 sunfilent.
Mr HEA
Mr. COI

 coxced 5 percent"?
 all debatco on
in 5 nulnules
nin
Mr. CAsE of Sollth Dakora. Mr Chatam, I resmrie the








 Whirht is at the Clirk's disk
The Clerk read as fullows

 sudyung the hearings. the seport of the Presudent's comp.
 his opminis :isthini. and fien so much that this is the hand problural, that it do nut desate to have s85.000.000 spent in the building of a labiratury, 1 thank the bill willkh will xpeatur intation has been carried oul should carry the bug



 nests io to alone with this bial to create" the taboratory tithuyf crisapprove "ar certain provisons wn the but it
 hereatict. to Ret tuc iden tuat this bul is being enacted to
 cesearch
Mr. Micilener. Mr. Cualriman. will the gentiemian Mr. CRAWFORD. I yitd to the f .nikeman from Mich-
 pri the money somexhere. Will th be the pur pose ulin to
 Mr. CRAWFORIS. I have no didea what a fulure Consress Mild din in passink, kpislation dealting with this problem whing

 line whe that ninest jobs in cocinerection with creiting a



 Suplluse yillt wice a byiurd of dirtclurs. Would you spxind

 thinl be hic labiration? Thise ure the thangy that have uill I halfe we will no. go ahead and squander $\$ 25.000 .000$
 n priper ine lie lirublem thist is unravelled by reason of tie d minstration of the latoratory. IApplituse. 1


Thr ant madurent was rujected
 Ti: CIIALRMAN Is there uljection to the request of





Mr. Martin of Colorado. Mr. Chiarman. Thls will be posilively miy itrst and last apporarance today, but I nust ge on recora on thas important lesisialiun. 1 shail support the ain afrill it wall be be viry stivit step til $\mu$ very bong dirctuan.
Pun
Puin tenancy is not the cause-and 1 shath nut atlonpt in the United Slates. Mor teases are not the cause of the truuble with the fariuers is that they uric overmiortagaged but i brileve that we could give every fation tciant in tha
 oultativin the chussts whilh have baikriphed agriculture and
 mine conditions with which we are cuntronted today. 1 thulk otie trauble willo lie talmer is that he tis now. in vidualisti. He is not oresuiized and appurenuly he does ind belicive in urgunizan ion. 1 liuve dounbtounded farmers by
 ther witrest has, and agrimullure in thas country would begin to set somed lere. Thie farmers bullt Clicago but
they do not uwn it. They built a lot of New Yoik but hey they do not uwn st. They built a lot of New York but they
do nut uwn aly of it. They toird and produced tlat olluers mikith own cillirs. it is a sligulur mitumaty that the people
 One hundred ycaria ago it is salu lliat it took al
cint of the people of the countity to priduce food for the aten that 30 percent apparentiy cannot nakic a living dut of 4 Agriculture was Iminkrupt before the depresilo
 other country tis the world. It is Inconiprebensible. Thirre
 We have to go derper on than this, knd outscde oo this. 以e-
the tucounpreherssble thine presented in this country. that
agtreulur, the basse Industry that producca all of the
 must be fed out of thousands of the farners themselves nust be fed out of the Federal Treasury trouble or name the remedg. I could $u$ my naser on the Jor enuugh, do some good by ahowing what the trouble not.
locuses too much that thin and other tarm tegigatation
tarm trnancy and farm debte alves too much vethi tarm tenancy and farm debta as casues mo the deccline of Industry.
Take tor example the great tarming state of Otiahome
and it is a rich tarming state. That Biale wa viritin certiory only 45 yearming state. That state wis virath celtiement and the people were given free larms. They rot a start rom traw, soo to speak, whit clean state. It the farm cenaus of 1935 showa that mare than on percel of the farmers of outahoma sre tenantse and probebercent the mujorlty of the rest of them are mortgaged. 1 it is not much kanses is a comparatively new stale. It has practicully at been seltied in my lifetime. but tut perceat of the farmers shuse. the percentaze of tenancy is 39. In Jowa thi a grew orn blate, it is 49. These states apd many others did hot bealn. With lenants and mortsages. They began with the.ll has beconie a malor giathonal qucstlin.
Another purzling feature of the unfavorable situation of Another pluzzina teature of the unfavorable situalton of
agreculture is that the erow of tenancy and debt amung the farmers has deen contempuraneous with a pertod of the reatest industrial expansion and increase in material wealth ould seem incvitable that aericullure would benchi by the gruwth of sich a maiket for its products. I have already cent of the people co prodice the food supply of the country. If now that percentage hase diwn foded to to 30 and the other 70 percent are in the cansumers' class, what is coeminger perlly of africulture.
 hing, period of thme. Por example in 1830 , 25 percent of
the fermery were tenants. in 1000 the percentage had grown to 35. Were Lenants. In 11000 the percentage hued durlog that tume 300,000.000 acres of new free band ef setlled. Even the siving away by the Oovernment of vamong the pullicticin promer

to 42 and the olat number of tenants in the United states cotal of 0.812 .000 farmera
So It appears that for neariy to years, and under what
vould appear to be the nost favurable cundiltons in aill
 states has steudily lost ground. It has been progressive and cuntunuous undcr all changes and condituons and apparcenty it has aftected astriculture athne. Putling out
585.000 .000 over a period of 1 yeurs wilt not make much of dont In thas stluation.
The growth in tarm ladebtedness has bren no less alarm-
lug in March la33 farm mortsuyes amounted to aruuna


 or the ccunaunlc condulion of arilculture. iot am nesponstile On the conirary. I havic supporkid evary farme -ald mencurure
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 arie hadividuat but an entire farm famly. I contend that the
bill nuw betore this inembership will require ati expend ture
 in a clundition of cumplete cronomir independence after it trits becn "xpended, but will be $\$ 7.500$, or 100 perrient deeper
 farm-nart rage sndrbtcdness, and will ulso give alarm to an adiln unaia tianily.
mitied to frami comblete econonac mincpendince to a complite furn lamily untit of this Natloth, In doing so we will be going in complete harmony with the tradilional Jetter-
soutuan pultitrs which wic all claim to hold in such hugh



 of edmumec indeprawnicr our trec instltutiois rannot sur-

 the hit rmuny with the divine laws of God and the eternal
binws of Niturc. This bul $H$. 6 . 68 natit the conimitee



















Mr. LORD. Mr. Chatrman, 1 ofirr an auendurat which is at the Cierk's drisk
The Clirk read as tolvows:







 The submarginal land as purchased will not pay any tncome
whatcver. but will take out of the tax rolls and foin the

on the assessmicnt ruit und puying tixirs.
it will add to the taxes of all olier farm tands and all
 burder of taxation that was formeity assessed on these parIn the Siat
Hon. The state buys the lind and $1 t$ is assessed for what the
Hen Suate pays for it, and the Statc pays liaxes sor hlighways and
sclicolt
 district. I do not propose to assess the land but I have
taken this lankuage froin a bill which the Seiretaiy prif
 The fair and equituble Cux for the Governinent to pay to will reccive payment, and the exisa burden wilh not fall upan
 time wri are addulug ou to the cux rate of ull ouhci' farmers In the tax district in order to do th.
In addultion. ia mere the land is parchased there is bondid indibledness and tue bulancr of thy tax payirs will have to bear the extra buiden that has becn
assessed aguinst the land purchused by the Govirninctit

This is 10 my mind very unfar to the farmers and tax
payeris of nur Nathith.
 Yuk (Mr) Lanbi has "xulted Mritume on this Chit iman. a ask mianimous cranselth that
 num how stikining recuigution.
the krnueman from Trixas?
There was no oblretion.
The CHALMMAN. The guestuon is on the amendment of
The amendment was rejectied. York IMr, Lonol.
Mr. WEARIN. Mr. Chairman,
The Clerte rcad as

Mr. Wearin. Mr. Chatmernit or mis ect:"
Mre to tus particular tlitr with the thought tn mind that submarginal lands should be aveiluble for rcs sale to terant
whenever the Secritary of Agriculture thinks that it is advis abie that such action proceed. I do not cxpect to press the amendmcnt: In fact, in intend to withdraw it because by vire tue of having discusscd the siluantion with the distinguished
cliarman of the Cummiller on Agriculture ims. Jonssi at charman of thr Cummituer on Agriculture 1 Mr. Jonss it
is my und rstand Ing with the dispositiost of submarginal lund will be torth-
conilug. I dit, howiver, expect, as I originalit Intended. to coniling. I di, howrver, expect, at 1 orisinaly intended. io
offer namendinent to itile IV with reference to the ranster

 lo. -ull thic matler to the attention of the monibirs of the complans by which we can solve ur problat of of two major Plans by whath we can solve hur probilly of tenancy the the With somr drgrce of success in ohther sections of the world.
and this is cspecially true of tie Ptce State of Irriand. belive that whin we arc experimentirig with a proposition
 ect. If such it cna be cajtrd, the various provisions that mikht
prove satisfa tory withe a vicw to advancing each of them to Proct a politit inat we cun deridc for oursiles after that
supher uninnal meriod which is thr most sallstuctory exper antrinal beriod which is the mast sallstisctory.
 the wading of tue bill, 1 asik unanumnous cousent at uus time. Mr. Chainmant to withdraw my amendinent.
Tic Clilimman. Is therc objuction to uie riquest of thic frilctran from lowa?
 unutidutitit.
The Clerk ad as fallowe


 ment is to page 10 o
 My amcndtent adds to that the authorty for this noney bouds and warrants legaliy lssued and outstanding at the lime llis nct becomes law.
A good dcal of the debate on this bill has been conflied
to thit subject of the farm-tenancy program in tule 1 . As io the subsect of the riam-tenancy plogram in tive I. As







 solng to throw the entiry buiden of prisent bunds thad wat
rants onto tic renumulng landiouding taxpayers
 marsinal arcas in tily distird We have a corannuilinal
 Ical to throw onto r.mailung taxpayers thr cirimat dent the lunds this purriliuitir nrosrann will reniove
 It will relleve the roud and schoul futds, but whrre the unit
has been rcar hed on suluk ing fund levi. s, y.un cannul slift
 hie areus ar Irom this subniarbinal area ran be alplited to ribute much to thr workibility of the bill.
 Hilere chr kavel fith:
the CHAIRMAN.
Fnncusonf is recognized fur 3 munute fran okiatuma imr
 ophy of this bill, il is a "hope bul" In that we lupe it will
be auminisered, il a main ner that will work out bron driaily To the farni-twnant class in this rountry, the rominty.

 20 yeurs as teuants ind faltrd to initke good. It netrons ingange to me that thi Congress wiwht puthuriz. the than-
ing of this yast scratch the surface of the tenimt firbobirmi with uit nrst is still operating


 credit to those farniers who arr uble til pat un mer ckil tuith on the purchiase of land und operatuon if their fierth

 pay the full purchawe price of larul nati thens liwinn the full
amount necessary to start and niperate the tarm amount necesssary to start and nperate the thrm
However. If the cointy romnllus virk out

 ufe on the tarm will make a success.
Thice ycars ago is stat the talking furoul my tiking the fluir Thrce ycars ago 1 startrd talking about the Dust Bowl urid
wind erosion in thic pantanitie of Okidhoina and in



 area In Kansas, Oknahoma, Colorudo. New Atexicti. inut













In conclusan may 1 say that the Americen people hive



 The charman. te there objectuon to the revuect of
 Che mid
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 ur. Boilrent. Mr. cmaimman thut amendment would
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reason for so donng or a hope it mateht turn out rood at his
excusc for doing so. You know ihis country has been in the habil of subsiduzing sone interest that gets yht distress for ${ }^{2}$ good many
yerars. I remeinter over 20 years ago when I was a Member
 pele with the were not sell-sustaining and could not com
Then in recent years when evpring countries of the world Then in recent years when everyhody and all business con-
cerns went down olt their knees and were begging for help and uivetr very luves and were ready and willing to sive up half of anl they had if the President would save the other
hali. subsdilzed all the banks in order that the poor. proatrate things mighl rise on both of their feet and open their doora In salety. We also subadised the ralliroads of the country from one end to the other. We subsiditized bulding end loan essocinhey could have the assurance thcy could tasure yout that they could have the assurance thcy could tasure you
We subsidided nitnes and factories. In fact we unbaldzeed enterpises and bustuesses that came bearing. cying. and
tneeling at our tect Eneeling at our fect.
Theretore. sny time
come distressed any hancially. tor a good many yeara we have Just subssidized ithm. These induustries are the compara-
uvely small ones. The larees industry whe in the country is harming. There are momething like 10.000 .000 farmera In ithis country engaged in that bunsines. which is a lot of tenant tarmers.
Now we come in with some Lllie peewee prostam and
hope we may pry in and tend somie moner worntion the broten-down farmers who went broke for the sempe reawn
the banks. the railrouds. and the insurance companes, and to forth. went broke. and for no other reason.
if we will just be as charitabie and as libe telluws who really want to farm. Who really want to engese
 alisolutely indispensable to the welfare of this counirr.
matbe tins bill will be an intervening wedge wich aill give us the rigltt to do so.
Mr. Chainnan notionthstanding the apparent good purpose
and intent of this but. yet I am imbued with wo very serious
 first place. the aniount of the appropriation in chis biu is not
sumpiemt for the farmiug industry to feel the entrance of thas
 bebinining of an expendlture that we do not here fanthom, and
one unt at a future date we shull be colled upon to check. one thint at a future date we shall be called upon to check.
At that t ime it may be dimcult for us to legislate the chect. In the second place. I am not fully continced but that this
bill will call for the creation of an additional commision or Lill will coll for the creation of an addutional commission or
burcuall to admuister the expenditure of the appropration.
 and capabie chairman. Mr Jomise, of Texes. huat there would
be no such expense. and I am trusting to the correctioes and be no such expense. and I am
truthfurness of that advice.
We have hicarda a sreat deal Loday from the gentleman from
Gcorgia iMr Periasomi about a land bull in ested and that he soon hopes to have before us for consldera-thon-a bill which he saya will provide for the arready eatabIthed Land Office of the Covernment to buy and sell the lande bureau. That bill may do more and so farther than this ose. and if su1. when it comes on for consideration th may be the
we shail be couvinced it should subplatit this one it it does, We shail be couvtnced It should supplant this one. If It
tet us hot hestate to adopt it in hieu of the present bill. These are my missivines. and may I now say I am unalter
aliy opposcd $w$ thc creation of sny other commissions o aly oppossd $w$ the creallan of any other cummissions or
bureaus. 1 should like to see this Conkress abolish about 75 percent ot all prissint existing conimissions and bureaus and try to operate all the andiars of the Coveranment af etrenien-
dously great saving to the taxpayers. If we should now begin to conduct the bustuess of the Govermment dlong the line and
with sume economy that antvele indindual or corporalon
perates his or its bustness. you would be surprised how
aulckiy an out-of-bulance Budret would besto to belance quickiy an out-of-bulance Budset would besto to belance [Here the gavei fell.1
 Unis of the decilioy the civil service and merit system
 complete chanue of front strice the last election. I that to mey about the mertit system last yeur.


 Thla ta pretty explucit and a dennite pledse to the people. policy. It meems to tme ellither jou are for civil service or Jou are agalinst civil service. If this had been the frat time
and was merely the exception to the rute 11 and was merely the exceplion to the rute 11 would be at
dinterent mater. buut bill alter bill ta coming from the Democratic majority hat undermines and deatroys the civil servto do in estabolithinge. your perty clatima you hed so much I mubmit the the has come tor a record vole on the ouet-
Hon of aivi nervice. There are plenty of aood men lett even in the Democratic Perty to nill these posallons under civll scrice. There are plenty of honest men left in tho
Democralic Party under civil service to nil all dhese jobs. Why not have a record vote wilh respett to where we somad
 record vole of the Members of Congress. That is the
hasue before you. This provision tis merely another one of the enlorta of Democratic spounmen to srab the jobs and to selze upon an possible polltucal plunder and patronage
for deserving Democrata reasidiess of the merit aystem. Let us be honest with ourselves. Let us late astand President repeatedily gives tip service to the merrt system
and and Just as often Jolns with the Democratic apollsmen in
 IHere the gavel fell. 1
The CHARMMAN. The question is on the amendment The question was taken: And on a division cdemanded by Mr. Bousan) there were ayes 32. noes 11 .
Bo the amendment was rejected
Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman. I ofter an amendment.
The Clert read as followa:

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chalrnan. thls amendment amply
makes the eatablishment of the act discretionary 1 tit not committee amerdment. I think it is wise. if thicre is
any objection to the amendment, ithall not insit on it. The CHAIRMAN. The qucstion is on the amendment ofered Dy the genticman froms Texas ima. Jonisi.
The amendment was agreed to.
Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairmen.
The Clerk read as follows:


Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman. this amendment 15 ymply wo correct the oversight to which the
MU. Sownmal called our altention.

The cinairnan. The questlon is on the amendmen
oiferid by the gentueman trom Teias (MAr. Jomis).
Mr. JONES. Mr. Chayruan, I ofier a further amendment. Mr. Jones. Mr. Chalman,
The Clerk read as followa:




Mr. JONEs. Mr. Chatrman. thin amendment. offered at
 Department of Juallce.
The CHADRMAN. The question so on the amendment
offered by the genteman trom Teras iMr. Jomas. The amendment was agreed to.
Mr. JONES. Mr. Cbalrman. $I$ offer a further amendment The Clert read as roilowi


Mr. JONES. Mr. Chalrman. I have shown this amendment to a number of memberg of the commilive. This simply ressdential requirementa
The CHAIRMAN. Tre question so on the amendment
offered by he gentleman from Texes imp. Josma). The smendment was agreed to.
Mr. WARriment wr. Chaliman. I ofter an amendment.
Mhe Clerk read at ollows:
The Clerk read at follows:

Mrid tite. ToNes. Mr. Chairmen. I have consulted with the
Mr. Jones. Mr. Chatranan. I have consulted with the Niting minority member of the cation
The amendment was asteed to. 1 oder an amendment.
Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman.
Mr. BIERMANA. Mr. CLA
which 14 at the Clerky deak
The Clerk read as follows


 provides that when the Unlod
land. that $1 t$ shall rethin all the the out. all the ges,
 is wold for ferming purposea and not for apeculative purposes. It seeme to me there can be onty one side to thin eral righis.
man that if he makes it three © Ourths augast to the gentleatle: othcrwise. you could go on this lind under A leate from to be a part of auch righta left to the owner of the land 10 some instancea.
Mr. DIERMANN. No: thata ta the case of the Oovernment The CHARRMAN. fered by the genileman from Lowa tiar. Braminiri.


Bo the amendment was refected.
Mr. FULIER Mr Mrairman.
Mr. MULLER Mr. Chairman. I ofer an amendment
 coct month
 Hon. 1 have no ublection to the amendment.
Mr WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman. Will the gentleman Mreld JONES. I yeld to the gentleman trom New York Mr. WADBWORTH. It ta Illte dmewt for nis to under tand Just what this amendment doea. May I auk this
guantion. and perhape it will be answered by the amend quantion. and perhape It will be answered by the amend-
ment. In vise of the fact that under the bill for the arst year. no more than one cosee can be decided upun in each
aricultural county of the United gialea. Is $1 t$ nece,sary anficultural county of the Unted Blatea, Is it nece,sary
under thoue circuantatancea that the comantier in every county meet once every month?
Mr. JONES. The amendmen
Mr. JONES. The amendment does away with hut pe

Mr. WADSWORTH Congratulutha mont
The CHALRMAN. The question to on agreeing to the amendment onfered by the seritcm
The amendment was agreed to.
Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chamman. I ofer the followith
mendment. Which I mend to the desk. amcndment. which I eend to
The Ciert read at follows:
 Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman. ins amendnent inecto the suggestion of the chairman of the Commitive on Agri-
culture made at the unie the genueman from Iowa ( $M$ ar Butrennal orfered tha amendment. If the tramers of the coal. oul. gan and seen the wisdom of providing that all
gincrats in or under all lands belongine to the Oovernment at the time of the adoption
of the Constutulion would remaln the property of the United Btate When the land was disposed of we would never have
been bothered with taxes. The revenue derived tron the been bothered with taxes. The revenue derived tron the
sale of oul. coal. and wo iorth would have supported the
Covernment for all ume. I hope uhe andendment will be Mr. JONEs. Mr. Chairman I have no personal ubjec. Mr. JONES. Mr. Chatrnana I have no personaw wbjec-
Hon thet. I would ilke to have the Howe know what thon to that. I would ilke th have the House know what
the The conmiltee repported a reservallon of onetive of
the mineral righta. and this amendment would change that the mineral righto. and this amendment would change that
to three-lourths. The CHARIMAN. The question $1 s$ on the amendment
ofered by the genlieman trom Missourl. odered by he genwe laken; and on a divistiou (dimauded The question Wie laken; and on
Bo the amendment was agreed to.
Mr. WEARNN. Mr. Chalrman, 1 olter the tollowing
amendment. which I end the the dcak. amendment. which I gend
The Clerit read as follows:






Mr. JONes. Mr
Oil that amendment.
Mis. WERIN. Ms Chirinan, a parilamentary inquiry The genilkinan from rexas reserves all polnts of oftider. apmendment. then I Dreewime I aharil have have an opportunty to be heerd on the polmt of order.
would have that privilege.
Mr. WEARIN. Mr. Chairman, in briet this amendment
does this: It takes approximateiy 8.000 .000 acrea of land


 Which the land the operated by the tenamt purchaser. At the
present trree that hand is carried oo the books of the Ped. eral land bank at a price of approximately 8123.000 .000
That trcucudes the land owned by the Pederal land bant
 amountuns 10 a 11 He over 8.000 .000 acres
 that would. In effect. oftrsel the carryitrg value of the tand.
that 8.000 .000 acres: so that an exchange could be mede very niceis.
I realize the fact thast there might be same oppoaltlon to the procedure. end naturally so. because, an I underation now parth of slock. I believe this transfer could be made and once the 8.000 .000 ecrea were so transferred to the Becretary
of Agriculture. he would have an opportunity
o of Agricuiture. he would have an opportunty wo bestun
lend-purchase and resule program operated Ede by aide

 wortung out the most satisfactorlly at far os the temant
purchaser was concerned. purchaser was concerned.
|Here the savel fell)
Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman. I desire to make e point of
order agalist the amendment. It is cleurls eublect to a
 These are not involved to this all ill of toct in the banka.
 oryenization. There are a number of diferent points on
v, hich it is sublect to a point of order. It ateo makes the provistons of section 3s5 of the statite tapppucchbe. It
provides that for the purpose of exchanges the value of such provides that for the purpose of exchanaes the value of such
real proverty shall be that carried on the booke of the land

 Le sustained
 Wrannin desire to be heard on the potath of order ? etcention of the Chair io the cnactinas clauiee of this bilu. which specifics that it it an act to eneourage and promote ownership
of furm honus. It can be seen that the enacting clawe itself. of firm hontes. no can bet seen that the proposed act providea exclusively for loans. It asy it is a provition io encournae
and pronute ule ownershitp of farm lands. Which is prectisely



separate and dustunct feotures is the tute that deals Fith
rehubilitution toans, which have been ducused entensively
 third is an allocaton of funds or rather permisalon granted
to the Becrectary yo Ayriculture to use funde appropatated in
ing
 ton in the resettlement Admintitration. which I remind the
Chair tnvolves the purchase and resale of land, exactly at

I have in my hand a leture from the Revectuement Admin-
Isiration of the United Biate Department of Ammeulture, setistration of the United Bitites Department of Agricultire, set-
ting out speclicalis that they have peen proceding in exacily Ing out specticacalis that they have been procezding in exactis
that wayt that they have been buling hand and reselling that
 this amendment, and therefore it it serciane to a section of
the mewure under consideration.
Mr. Chan imana, in view of the fact that this perticular Mr. Chantrmane, In riew of the fact that this partucular bull
involves unree separate and distinct subject matiera
 thould be withip the order of thin coniminitee to include a
tourth. if titwere fourth separate and dusunct matcer. Dut in wuild remind the Chatir of the fact that reseltement
 for as cootimuntuon of the hand purchase and resele program
on the part of the Pederal
Oovernmeat. which is prectely

 Bermane.
The chairman (acr. Dirvic. The sencleman from
Iowe Iown offern
haneuase:

 unastrar. Toceral
And so torth.
The measure
The

 It is true that this amendinent seems to direct the thought
to the amme purpoce. the aquintion of land for the pur-




 of Agriculture for the purpone of enmbung him to acquire
the tupe. In that amendment however. new machinery to Wet up for the purpose of operating with properts that with
 In connection with the uve of properties ownoed by a sepe-
rate and durtinet sency of the Covernment. sate and dirutinct seency of the Coverniment.
The Chalr. therefore. is of the optrian that
 consaderaltian.
The polint of
The point of order is sultalined.
Mr. PADDIB. Mr. Cualiman 1
Mr. PADDIS. Mr. Clainan
The Clert read as followe:
 Hon rollow wos:
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Mr. JONRS. Mr. Chatrman. I regret erceedingly to make a point of order aginst tho ameadmant onfered by my
friend. with much of which 1 am in sympethy, bui I thiak It ought to so wo another commantiteo. Mr. Churman. I maker come potiat of order that the amendment lis not germane to the paragraph or to the bull. The ecpara lions from the Pederal service troush furlougha and othervise, it denls with employment in tho Dustrict of $\mathrm{Co}^{-}$ mbile, and so for 1 h
The CHALRMAN. Doen the gentleman from PenusylMr. PADDIS. Mr. Chalrman the polth of order?
Ment
is gerinane to the bill. Chalme poriton of the thin endendment separato by reters to to separationam Traman the pedeanal mervice of thase cosning under the provialons of this bill.
Tise bill under consideration seeks to veat in the secrelary of Agriculture, by the language beginning in tue a on with the operatlon of the businese. the dutbea and resporan-
 lande available to the clacees of percons embraced in the
The amendment under consideratlon is nothing more nor
less than a merc lunitatlun on the authoruy gramited by the less than a merc lunitatlun on the suthorlly gramted by the The Chatr the
mane to the till

The point of order is overruled
The genticmian fram Pennayivanta is recognized for g
Mr. PaDDIS. Mr. Chatrman. I merely wish to atate to the uneabbers of the commiltec that this is an amendment which provides apportioned emong the several sitates of collumbla shan istlon. The amendment is fair in all reapectis and should not be controversial at wh. I hope $1 t$ is adopted
The Chalighan. The question is on the amendment
The mandment was asreed to.
Mr. MARTIN of Calarado. Mr. Chairman. I ofier an
amendment. which I send to the clerta deat. The Clerk read an follows:

Mr. Jonves. Mr. Chairmen. I make the potnt of order
that the amendment has been acted upon. Mr. Martin of Colorado. Wha wa gentleman withhold
his polnt of order for a haff a minuie? Mr. JONEB. Mr. Chalrman. I reserve a point of order againat the amendment.
Mr. MARTIN of Mr. MARTIN of Colorsdo. Mr. Chairman. the Federai
Oovernment. at the gentleman Prom Texas weil knows. re. serves all mineral rishto and has reserved all mineral righis an the pubilc domain for more than 30 years, 20 that an
enirman geta nothung by his patent but surface righta do not see any reason on carth why a tenant farmer. for Whan the bull originaliy proposed or one-quatter of the minerai
 other purpase than to prevent tuise point passing umnoticed and to preserve the matter in the record for posable con-
sideration to the other body. The absolute owner of the
minoral nibis getis only a one-tenth royith and the Guv
ermment ahould
 that thin undertakes to amend an amendment alreudy adopted by whe commultee.
The CHNRMAN.
The callramaN. Does the genticman from Colorado Mr. MARTIN of Colurado. Mr. Chalrman. I rcuret very nuch Idd not have the opportunity to ofter the amind.
ment when the watier was up for constderallon before bectuse It ought to be to whe taw.
The CHABMAN. The point of order ts suslatined.
Mr. DDMOND. Nr. Chatrman. I ofler an amendaicont
The Clerk read as


Mr. Jones. Mr. Chairman, the genticman frum, Alaska
has expalined thata ameadment to several members of the han explained thals ameadment to several members of the
Committee on Agricullure. We think it is desiruble Committee on Agricullure. We th
amendment and have no objection.

## The CHAIRMAN. The question

offered by the Denegate from Alacka is im. Dimunul.
The amendment was agreed to.
Mr. IOLegias. Mr. Chairman. I ofter an amulidment
which I aend to the Clicre's desk. The Clerk read as follows
 Me. JONris. Mr. Chairman, that amendment is all rigti
and ase in with the other amendment. The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amenumeat
ofered by Lhe Delegate from Puerto Rico. The amendment was agreed to.
Mr. JONEs. Mr. Chalrman. I
Mr. JONEs. Mr. Chairman. I promised the charman on
Uhe steering committee. the genuleman from oklahonia
 overslagh I negiected to reserve sumplent time for him. He
ha been very helpful in thls maller, and I ask unant consent that the gentleman may proceed for 3 uninutes The chairman. Is there objection to the request of the senteman trom Texas ${ }^{\text {There was no objection }}$
Mr. Johnson of outiahome mince
appreciate the request of the chairman of the Agricultural Commitue that I be peruitted to clase this debace on the
Iam-tenant bill. I have not had ind all of the discussion this afternoon. but I did hear some of the afternoon. However. I did heer the discussion on the pending measure yesterday. I heard some of the distrin-
sulashed Members of this body make speche, sulshed the rule to hring up the bul and then adnat thry
lon of the were going to vote for it. I heard uny diatinguished frienid.
 that address by stuting he was solug to support the bill. The distinguished chammen of the Conimittere oll Axrivery interesting and detaited explunamon of the prowewnins of the Farm security Act of 1037 on yestirdity wnd 1 shall sol take up the ume of the House in going bactiv oure the It is my feeling that in the


 anally ensected the 3.000 .000 landess futiatrs of Amellicu
will have a new hope.


 burt At Bhat ume it was my havpy privileace io repori io you that the commintea found the geniteman trom Toxa


 of our ferm pooulation.

 to bring the Perm secorty Act up at this time
This bul ts by no means sallsfactory to me. 1 mm guro




 saieam, wenncy yrobiem. eftive. and whour attect upan the 1 weas espertally tot

 approppration of as on exper ments on a very slort rout.

 gram. but if that is impassible. 1 an willing suble what we Applause 1

thairman: жith pleasure.

 ceptionaly
stering cood
commitce.

Toonicu qumo niclictio
 May 1 suy that Congress neds more men of the caliver.
vision and courage of the enticman from Texae




 terant furmers in in is35. Lle tha soring of 1035. 34.2 percent of the farmers had occupled their farms sess chan 1 year

 Hees. and veroun farmers organizations. cated that ait lest halt of othe moving io of no economic of



This constant anfung from mand wis farm is not only

 Bot how can thit be prevented when the tenant nas yumie or no permanent interaht to mit trim? Once a ton of soll h
 I want io warn Members trom be induatral ceatecri hat




 ${ }^{\text {it }}$ Wheurning may arty.
The fasures are elarming. The proportion of tenant tarm-

 rrembenal District of othanome are tenants.
The Iolooine teblo Indicates 1 he Lmportance of tenancy in thave the honor w represent in Conarree. 1t thows the num-
 by counites for la35



The CHAITMAN. Under the rule the Committee riscs.
 resumed Lhe chair. Mr. Duyzr. Chatrman of the Cammultea
of the Whoce House on the state of the Union. reported

 Untited states. to provide addlltonal creatit fecilltes tor
 House with sundry amendment serred w in coumblet of The BPEAKER. Under the rule. the previou question is Is seep

The anu dien were arieed t . and wa read the chird ume Thi BPEAKER. The question ta on the paceare of the
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The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot recognize the genilenagn to offer motint to reconimit. Mr. Apeaker. I quality,
Mr MARTN of Massachusetts. and offer a motion Lo recommut.
The SPEAKER. Is the gentlem Mr. Bpeaker. 1 quality Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetis. 1 sm . Mr. Bpeaker. The PPEAKER. The Eenteman quallates. And tho Clert will report the motion to recommall
The BPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.
Mr. BOILEAU. In the event a member of the minority or any, other Member of the House desires to oifer a motion
recommit and reeko recognitlon. in the absence of any tetement that he th opposed to the blul. 1s not the Miember who tel
The gPEAKER. The rule to that a member of the mbnortiy ta entilied to recounititon to offer a motion to recompoon inquiry by the chair he must atate that he ta opposed upon inquiry by the chair he must atate that he happosed opposed to the bll and the zentleman stated he could not
qualify in that respect. The gentleman trom Massachusetts
 Mer of the minorthy.
Mr. BOILEAU, I submit the gentleman Irom Massachu-
sets wa not on his feet. Mr. Bpeaker. Tie genteman rom Massachuset Lsemael preporing to ofrer a motion to commit in the cvent 1 was not granted recognition.
The sPEAKER. The Chatr will again quaity members
In there any member of the minurity who destres to offer motion to recommat
Mr. BOLLEAU. Mr.

Speaker. 1 destre wosubmt a mo-
tion to recommit.
The BPEAKER.
is the gentleman opposed to the blu?
mi boileau. I cannot qualiry in that reapect. Mr.
Mr. MARTIN of Massachusets. mr. Speaker. 1 ofter a
notion to recominit.
The SPEAKER. is the gentleman opposed to the bill?
Mr. MPREAKER. The Clert will report Mhe motion to reommitt onfered by the gentle
The Clcrk read as tollows


Mr. MAPES
The BPEAEER
For what purpose does the sentieman

| rom Michigen rise? |
| :--- |
| Mr. MAPER. Mr. Bpeaker. 1 ahould 1 ke to pursue e htile | urther the parliamentery thqury of the geniteman from Wisconsin (AMr. Boile Ti, inasmuch as the question has been

The apeaker. The gentleman will state has partasmentery inquily.
had to do with a situatiton where no one asked for recory nition who was opposed to the hegisletion. Would the gentiteman from Wisconsin not have been entliled to make
the motion to recommit $t$ no one opposed to the bul had asked for recoennition to make the opotion?

 Mr JONES. Mr Bpeaker to make a motion to reconimit Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question Mr. MAPEs. A turher parliamentary loquiry. Mr.
The BPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

 reciltion, a person should be recognized amake andithough he docs not qualify as being opposed to
to the entre legislation. I know the impression has got a round
the House that this culinot be done. Ithuk this is an wiug he house that this calnnot be done. 1 think this is a wrung
impression. 1 think now is a good time. Inasmuch as the impression. 1 think now is a good time. inasmuch as the
questlon has ben ralsed. when the Bpeaker nilshit will clurify the atmosphere in that rcspect.
The SPEAKER. The gentleman wind kidy state mis
 The apeniker. The chalr has anawcred the gentienian's
 has been anawered defnitely.
The BPEAKER. The gentienan will kludly restute tha pariainentary inquiry
ar. MAPES. Following up the inquiry of the benlleman cared to ask for recegnition who was prepared to say he was opposed to the bill. my inquiry is. Was not the gentleton to recommir
tion to recommitr
The SPEAKER
The EPEAKER The Chatr has undcriuken clearly to motion to recommut. The Chirir is of the optalon, the record wade in this inatier clearly states the proper Dosition will
reference to this parilamentary situation. The Chatr asked the gentlenian trom WIsconsln. who hist opposed to the bill. The gentleman stated tie could not qualify to that he qas not opposed to the bult The chatir then tnquired is there was uny Member of the nulhority who to the bill. Thereupon the eentleman tron Massachusetts Mr. Mnstiml qualined and the chatr -reogilacd the senthe purpose of submituing a motion to recoumit The gentieman from Texas moves the previous questiod the motion to recommint.
The SPEAKER. The question $t 4$ on the me.tion to ricoun-
The question was taken: and on a division (demanded $L$ Mr. Mantix of Mussachusetis and Mr. Tobiry, merr wiri

nays. yeas and nays were ordired.
The question was tuken;
The
The questlon was tuken; and thire wert-yeas 102. nuys
231. not voting gas as follow:
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The speaker. The clerk will call my name.
cailed the name of Mr Banxizan. And he voted
So the blll was passed.
The clictk ailinaunced the following additlonal para:
Oeneral paits:





Mr. Luecke of Michigan with Mr. Secrest.
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Gray of Pennsylvanta.
Mr. Mourton with Mr. Wene.
Mr. Phillips With Mr. Jacobsen.
Mr. Allen of Dalaware with Mr. Ryan.
Mr. Edmiston wheh Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. Hennings with Mr. DeMuth.
Mr. Murdock of Utah with Mr. Casfy.
Mr. Smith of West Virgitia witripMr. Flanners.
Mr. Gingery with Mr. Whiténil Ldaho.
Mr. McSweeney with Mr, Greal:
Mr. Sedowski with Mr.e Crosby.
Mr. Fulmer with Mr, Stack.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Fart.
Mr. Cannon of, Wisconsin with Mr. Ellenbogen.

## CBEDEN GATE HNTHINATIONAL EXPOGITIOD

The SrFakEFR. Pursuant to provistons of Eublic Resolution 52. Seventy-fifth Congress. the Chair appoinfsas members of the United States Golden Gate International Exposition the following Members of the House of Representativer;


## BANIRHEAD-JONES PARM TEHANT ACI

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report upon the bill (H. R. 7562) to encourage and promote the ownership of farm homes and to make the possession of such homes more secure. to provide for the general welfare of the United States. to provide additional credit facilities for agricultural development. and for other purposes. and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas calls up the conference report upon the bill H. R. 7562 and asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. -Is there objection?

There was no objection.
The Clerk read the statement of the conferees.
The conference report and statement are as follows:

## CONPRRENGS REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7562) to encourage and promote the ownership of farm homes and to make the possession of such homes more secure, to provide for the general welfare of the United States. to provide additional credit factilities for agricultural development. and for other purposes, having met. after full and free conference, have agreed to recom mend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

In lleu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:
"That this Act may be cited as "The Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act'.

## "Tithe I-Farm-Tenant Provisions <br> 'POWER OF SECRETART

"Section 1. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized to make loans in the United States and in the Territories of Alaska and Fiawali and in Puerto Rico to persons eligible to receive the benefits of this title to enable such persons to acquire farms.
"(b) Oniy farm tenants. farm laborers, sharecroppers, and other indifiduals who obtain or who recently obtained, the major portion of their income from farming operations shall be eligible to recelve the benefits of this title. In making available the benefits of this title, the Secretary shall give preference to persons who are married. or who have dependent famules. or, wherever practicable. to persons who are able to make an initial down payment. or who are owners of livestock and farm implements neceasary successiully to carry on larming operations. No person shall be eligible who is not a citizen of the United States,
(c) No loan shall be made for the acquisition of any farm unless it is of such size as the Secretary determines to be sumicient to constitute an efficient larm-management unit and to enabie a dillgent farm family to carry on successiuil farming of a type which the Secretary deems can be successfully carried on in the locality in which the farm is situated.

COUNTY COMMITIES AND LOANS
"Src. 2. (a) The County Committee estabilshed under section 42 shall-
(1) Examine applications (aled with the caunty agent in the county, or with such other person as the Secretary rosy designate) of persons desiring to anance the acquisition of farms in the county by means of a loan from the Secretary under this title.
"(2) Examine and appraise farms in the county with respect to which an application for a ioan is made.
"(b) If the committee finds that an applicant is eligible to receive the benefits of this title, that by reason of his character. abulty. and expertence he is likely succeasfully to carry out undertakings required of hlm under a loan which may be made under thls tille. and that the farm with respect to which the applica-
tion is made is of such character that there is a reasonable ince* hood that the making of a loan with respect thereto will cariy $c$ the purposes of this title. it shall so certify to the secretary. The committee shall also certify to the Becretary the amount which the committee finds is the reasonable value of the farm.
(c) No certiflcation under this section ahall be made with respect to any farm in which any member of the commulttee or any person related to such member within the third degree of conperson related to such member within the third degree of con or in which they or either of them have had such interest within one year prior to the date of certincation.
"(d) No loan shall be made to any person or with respect to any farm unless certification as required under this eection has been made with respect to such person and such farm by the committee.

## 'Tames or congs

"Sxc. 3. (a) Loans made under this titie ahall be in such amount (not in excess of the amount certited by the Connty Committiee to be the value of the farm) as may be necessary to ennole the borrower to sacquire the farm and for necessary repairs and tuprownments thereon, and shall be secured by a tirst mortgage or deed of trust on the farm
(b) The instruments under which'the loan is made and socurity given therefor ghall-
(1) Provide for the repayment of tho loan within an agreed period of not more than forty years from the making of the loan
(2) Provide for the payment of interest on the unpaid balance of the loan at the rate of 3 per centum per annum.
(3) Provide for the repayment of the unpald balance of the loan. together with interest thereon. In installments in accordance with amortization schedules prescribed by the Becretary.
(4) Be in such form and contain such covenants as the secretary shall prescribe to secure the payment of the unpaid balance of the loan, together with interest thereon to protect the security. and to assure that the farm will be maintained in repair. and waste and exhaustion of the farm prevented. and that such proper farming practices as the secretary shall preacribe will be carried out.
(5) Provide that the borrower shall pay taxes and assesaments on the farm to the proper taxing authortites. and insure and pay for insurance on farm buildings.
(6) Provide that upon the borrower's asatgntng, selling, or otherwise transfersing the farm, or any interest therein. without the consent of the secretary. or upon default in the performance of. or upon any failure to ccmply with. any corenant or condition contalned in such instruments. or upon involuntary transfer sale, the Secretary may declare the amount umpaid immedtate due and payabe. and that. Without the consent of the Secretary, no final payment shall be accepted. or release of the Secretary's interest be made. less than five jears after the maring of the loan.
"(c) Ercept as provided in paragraph (6) oi subsection (b), no instrument provided for in this section shall prohibit the prepayment of any sum due under it.
(d) No provision of section 75. as amended. of the Act entitled An Act to establish a untform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States', approved July 1. 1898 ( U. S. C.. 1934 ed., title 11. sec. 203: Supp. II. title 11. sec. 203), otherwise applicable in respect. of any indebtedness incurred under this title by any beneficiary thereof. shall be adolicable in respect of such indebtedness until such beneficiary has repaid at least 15 per centum thereof.
equitable aistribution or loans
SEx. 4. In making loans under this title, the amount which is devoted to such purpose during any fiscal year shall be distributed cquitably among the several 8 tates and Territortes on the basis of cquitably among the several states and Territortes on the bais of
farm population and the prevalence of tenancy. as determined by the Secretary.

## "AVOTDANCE of pRODUCTION ERPANEION

"Sac. 5. In carrying out this title. the Secretary shall give due consideration to the destrability of avoiding the expansion of production for market of basic commodities where such expansion would defeat the policy of Congress as set forth in section 7 (a) (5) of the Soll Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. as amended. and shall. so far as practicable, assist beneficiaries of the program under this title to become established upon lands now in cultivation.

## "APPROPRLATION

"Sme. 6. To carry out the provisions of this title, there ts authorlzed to be appropriated not to exceed $\$ 10.000 .000$ for the fiscal year ending June 30. 1938, not to exceed $\$ 25,000.000$ for the fliscal year ending June 30. 1939, and not to exceed $850,000,000$ for each fiscal year thereafter. Not more than 5 per centum of the sums appropriated for any fiscal year in pursuance of this section shail bo avallable for administrative expenses in carrying out this title during such fiscal year.

## "Tithe II-Refrabinitation Loans

'bornowers and texms
"Sxction 21. (a) Out of the funds made avallable under section 23. the Secretary shall have power to make loans to eligible individu for the purchase of livestock. farm equipment. supplles. and i
other farm needs (including minor improvements and minor repairs to real property). and for the reflinancting of indebtedness. and for family subsistence.
(b) Loans made under this section shall bear interest at a rate not in excess of $\$$ per centum per annum, and shall have maturitiea not in excess of ave years, and may be renewed. Such loans shall
be payable In such installments as the Secretary may provide in the loan agreement. All loans made under this ticle shall be secured by a chattel mortgage, a lien on crops, and an assignment oi procecds from the sale of agricultural products, or by any one or more of the foregoung.
(c) Oniy farm owners, farm tenants. farm iaborers, sharecroppers, and other individuals who obtain. or who recently ciatained the major portion of their income from farming oparations. and nho cannot obtain credit on reasonable terms from any federally iccorporared lending institution, shall be eligible for loans under tlas section.

## DEET ADJUSTMENT

"SEC. 22. The Secretary shall have power to assist in the voluntary adjustment of indebtedness between farm debtors and their creditors and may cooperate with and pay the whole or part of the expenses of State. Territorial, and local agencies and committees engaged in such gebt adjustment. He is also authorized to continue and carry out undertakings with respect to farm debt adjustment uncompleted at the time when appropriatlons for the purpose of this section are first avallable. Services furaished by the Secretary under this section shall be without charge to the debtor or creditor.

## APPROPRIATION

-Scc. 23. (a) For the fiscal fear ending June 30. 1938. the balancea of funds available to the Secretary for loans and rellef to farmers pursuant to Executlve Order Numbered 7530 of December 31. 1936. as amended by Executive Order Numbered 7557 of February 19. 1937. which are unexpended on June 30. 1937, are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provistons of this tutle.
(b) The President is authorized to allot to the Secretary. out of appropriations made for relief or work relief for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1939, such sums as be determines to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title and to ensable the secretary to carry out such other forms of rehabilitation of individuals eligible under this title to receive loans as may be authorized by law and designated in the Brecutive order directing the allotment.
'"TTTLE III-RETLREMENT OF SUBMARGINAL LAND procray
"Section 31. The Secretary is authorized and directed to develop a program of land conservation and land utillastion. Inciuding the retirement of lands which are submarginal or not primarily surcable for cultivation, in order thereby to correct maladjustments in iand use, and thus assist in controlling soil erosion, reforestation, preserving natural resources, mitigating floods, preventing impadrment of dams and reservoirs, conserving suriace and subsurface molsture. protecting the watersheds of navigable streams. and procecting the public lands, health, safety, and welfare.

POWERS UNDER LAND PROGMMI
Sec. 32. To effectuate the program provided for in section 31, the Secretary is authorized-
"(a) To acquire by purchase, gift, or devise, or by transter from any agency of the Un!ted States or from any State. Territory. or political subdivision. submarginal land and land not primarily suitable for cultivation. and interests in and options on such land. Such property may be acouired subject to any reservations, outstanding estates. interests, easements, or other encumbrances which the Secretary determines wull not interfere with the uturation of such property for the purposes of this title.
(b) To protect. improve, develop. and admintster any property so acquired and to construct such structures thereon as may be necessary to adapt it to its most beneficial use.
(c) To sell, exchange. lease. or otherwise dispose of, with or without a consideration, any property so acquired, under such terms and conditions as he deems will best accomplish the purposes of this title. but any sale, exchange, or grant shall be made only to public authorities and agencies and only on condition that the property is ised for public purposes. The Secretary may recommend to the President other Federal. State, or Territorial agenclas to adontnister such property, together with the conditions of use and administration which will best serve the purposes of a land-conservation and land-utilization program. and the President is authorized to transier such property to such agencies.
"(d) Wlth respect to any land, or any interest therein, acquired by, or transferred to, the Secretary for the purposes of this title. to make dedications or grants, in his discretion, for any publle purpose, and to grant licenses and easements upon such terms as be deems reasonable,
(e) To cooperate with Federal. State. Territorial, and other public agencies in developing plans for a program of land conervation and land utilization, to conduct surveys and investigations relating to conditions and factors affecting, and the methods of accomplishing most effectively, the purposes of this title. and to disseminate information concerning these activities.
"(f) To make such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to prevent trespasses and otherwise regulate the use and occupancy of property acquired by, or transferred to, the Secretary for the purposes of this title, in order to conserve and utilize it or advance the purposes of this title. Any violation of such rules and regulations shall be punished as prescribed in section 5388 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C.. 1934 ed., title 18. sec. 104)

## "PAYMENTS TO COUNTIES

'Sec. 33. As soon as practicable after the end of each calendar year. che Secretary shall pay to the county in which any land is held by the Secretary under this title. 25 per centum of the net revenues received by the secretary from the use of the land during such year. In case the land is situated in more than one county.
t: $:$ amount to be paid shall be divided equitably among the respective counties. Payments to counties under this section shaly be made on the condition that they are used for school or road purposes, ol both. This section shall not be construed to apply to amounts recelved from the sale of land,

APPROPRIATION
'SEC. 34. To carry out the provisions of this title. there is aus. thorized to be appropriated not to exceed $\$ 10.000 .000$ for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938. and not to exceed $\$ 20.000 .000$ for esich of the two flscal years thereafter.

## "TITLE IV-GENERAL PROVISIONS 'FARMERS' HOME CORPOMATION

"Section 40. (a) There is hereby created as an agency. of and within the Department of Agriculture, a body corporate with the name 'Farmers' Home Corporation' (ln this Act called the Corporation). The priaclpal ofmce of the Corporstion shall be located In the District of Columbia. but there may be established agencies or branch offices elsewhere in the United States under rules and regulations prescribed by the Board of Directors.
(b) The Secretary shall hsve power to delegate to the Corporation such powers and duties conferred upon him under title 1 or title II, or both. and such powers under title IV as relate to the exercise of the powers and duties so delegated, as he deema may be necessary to the eflicient carrying out of the purposes of such titles and may be executed by the Corporation. and to transfer to the Corporation such funds avallable for such purposes as he deerns necessary. In connection with and in the exercise of such powers and duties so delegated, all provistons of this Act relating to the powers and duties of, and limitations upon. the Secretary shall apply to the Corporation in the same manner as Secrecary shal apply to the Corporation in the same manner as to the Secretary, and
include 'Corporation'.
"(c) The Corporation shall have a nominal capital stock in an amount determined and subscribed for by the Secretary. Receipts for parments for or on account of auch stoct shall be tasued by the Corporation to the Secretary and shall be evidence of the stock ownerzhip of the United States.
"(d) The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a board of directors (in thats Act called the Board) subject to the general superviston of the Secretary. The Board lhall consist of general supervision of the Secretary. The Board shan consist of three persons employed in the Department of Agriculture who shall
be designated by the secretary. Vacancies in the Board, so long as there are two members in oflice, shall not impair the powers of the Board to ezecute Its functions and two of the members 1 cance shall constitute a quorum for the transection of busine? The dtrectors. appotated as hereinbefore provided, shall receive in additional compensation for their services as auch directors bu may be allowed travel and subsistence expenses when engaged in bustaess of the Corporation outside of the District of Columbia.
(e) The Board may select. subject to the approval of the Secretary. an administrator. who shall be the ezecutive onicer of the Corporation. With such power and authority as may be conferred upon him by the Board.
"(1) The Corporatlon-
(1) Shall have succession in its corporate name:
(2) May adopt, alter, and use a corporate seai, which thall be judlcially noticed:
"(3) May sue and be sued in its corporate name in any court of competent jurisdiction. State or Federal: Provided, That the prosecution and defense of all litlgation to which the Corporaticn may be a party shall be conducted under the supervision of the Attorney General. and the Corporation shall be represented by the Undted States Attornegs for the districts. respectively. in which such litigation may arise, or by such other attorney or attorneys as may, under the law. be destgnated by the Attorney General: And provided further. That no attachment. injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or flnal. shall be tsautd against the Corporation or its property;
"(4) May adopt. amend. and repeal bylaws, rules. and regulations governing the manner in which its business may be conducted and the powers vested in it may be exercised and enjoyed:
"(5) Shall be entitled to the free use of the United States mails In the same manner as other ezecutive agencies of the Government:
(6) Shall have such powers as may be necessary or appropriate for the exercise of the powers vested in the Corporation (including, tut subject to the limitations oi this Act, the power to make contracts, and to purchase. or lease. and to hold or dispose of such real and personal property as it deems necessary) and all such incidental powers as are customary in corporations generally The Board shall defne the authority and duties of the oficers and employees of the Corporation. delegate to them such of the powers vested in the Corporation as it may determine, and require bonds of such of them as it may designate and itz the penalties and pay the premiums of such bonds.
( $g$ ) Insolar as spplicable. the benefits of the Act entitied An Act to provide compensation for employees of the United States ourlering injuries while in the periormancs of their duties. and for other purposes; approved September 7.
to emplogees of the Corporation.

- employees of the Corporation.
"(h) All money of the Corporation not otherwise employed d be deposited with the. Treasurer of the Dnited Statea or in a bank approyed by the Secretary of the Treasury, subject to withdrawal by the Corporation at auy time. or With the approval of the Becretary of the Treasury may be invested in obligations of the Secretary of the Treasury may be infal States. Subject to the approval of the Becretary of the United States. Subject to the approval of the secretary of ane
Treasury. the Federal Reserve bants are bereby authorired and
directed to act as depositortes, custodians, and fiscal agents for the Corporation in the periormance of its powers.
"(i) The Corporation, including its franchises. Its capital, reserves, and surplus and its income and property shall. except as otherwise provided in section 50 (a), be exempt irom all taration now or hereaiter imposed by the United States or any State. Territory, District. dependency, or political subdivision.
(J) The Corporation shall at all times maintatn complete and accurate books or account and shall fle annually with the Secretary a complete report as to the business of the Corporation.


## ADMINTSTRATIVE POWERS OF SECRETART AND CORPORATION

"Sec. 41. For the purposes of this Act, the Secretery shall have power to-
"(a) Appoint (without regard to the civil-service laws and regulations) and fix the compensation of such omcers and employees as may be necessary, No person (except as to positions requirtag technical training and experience for which no one possessing the requisite technical training and experience is avallable within the area) shall be appointed or transferred undar this Act to any position in an ofince in a State or Territory the operstions of which are confined to such state or Territory or a portion thereof. or in a regional offce outside the District of Columbis the operations of which extend to more than one. or portions of more than one. State or Territory, unless such person has been an actual and bonafide resident of the State or Territory, or region, as the case may be. in which such oflce is locsted. for a period of not lest than one year next preceding the appolntment or transfer to such position (disregarding periods of residence outside such State or Territory, or region, as the case may be. while in the Federal Govermment service). If the operations of the ofice are confined to a portion of a single State or Territory, the Secretary in making appointments or transfers to auch office shall. except in the classes of cases exempted from the preceding sentence, appoint or transfer only persons who are residents of such portion of the state or Territory: Provided, That herearter, wherever practicable, all appointments of persons to the Federal service for employment within the District of Columbia, under the provisions of thts Act, whether such appointments be within the classified civil service or otherwise. shall be apportioned among the several States and the District of Coiumbe apportioned among the several states and the District of Coivming census.
(b) Accept and utilize voluntary and uncompenseted services. and. with the consent of the agency concerned. utilize the ofncers. employees, equipment, and information of any agency of the Federal Government. or of any State. Territory, or poiltical subdivision,
(c) Within the limits of appropriations made therefor, make necessary expenditures for personal services and rent at the seat of government and elsewhere; contract stenographic reporting servlces: purchase and ezchange of supplies and equpment. law boolss. books of reference. directories, periodicals, newspapers, and press clippings; travel and subsistence experases, including the expense of attendance at meetings and conferences; purchase. operation, and manntenance, at the seat of government and elsewhere, of motor-propelled passenger-carrying and other vehicles: priming and binding: and for such other facilities and services as he may from time to time find necessary for the proper administration of this Act.
"(d) Make contracts for services and purchases of supplies with. out regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Btatutes (U, S. C.. 1934 ed., citle 41. sec. 5) when the aggregate amount involved is less than $\$ 300$.
"(e) Make payment prior to audit and settlement by the General Accounting Ofnce.
"(f) Acquire land and interests therein without regard to section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended. This subsection shall not apply with respect to the acquisition of land or interesta in land under title III.
"(g) Compromise claims and obligations arising under, and adJust and modify the terms of mortgages, leases. contracts, and ugreements entered into pursuant to, this Act. as circumstances may require.
(h) Collect all claims and obligations arising under this Act, or under any mortgage, lease, contract, or agreement entered into pursuant to this Act. sind. If in his judgment necessary and advisable, to pursue the same to final collection in any court having jurisdiction: Provided. That the prosecution and defense of all litigation under this Act shall be conducted under the supervision of the Attorney General, and the legal representation shall be by the United States Attorneys for the districts. respectively, In which such litigation may arise, or by such other atorney or attorneys as may. under the law, be designated by the Attorney General.
(1) Mske such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out this Act.

## "COUNTE COMMITILE

Sec. 42, (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed to appoint in each county in which activities arc carried on under title I county committee composed of three farmers residing in the county
"(b) Each member of the committee shall be allowed compensation at the rate of 83 per day while engaged in the performance of duties under this Act but such compensation shall not be allowed with respect to more than five days in a month. In addition. they shall be allowed such amounts as the Secretary may prescribe for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses.
" (c) The commattee shall meet on the call of the county agent
in the county, or on the call of such other person as the Secretary may designate, Two members of the committee shall constitute
a quorum. The Secretary shall prescribe rules governing the $F$ cedure of the committees. furnish forms and equipment necesid for the performance of their duties, and authorize and provide for the compensation of such clerical assistants as he deems may be required by any committee.
(d) Committees established under this Act shall, In addition to the duties specifically imposed under thls Act, perform such other duties under this Act as the Secretary msy require af them.

## "REsLITLEMENT PROJECIS

"Sec. 43. The Secretary is authorized to continue to periorai such of the functions vested in him pursuant to Erecutive Order Numbered 7530 of December 31, 1936, as amended by Executive Order Numbered 7557 of Pebruary 19, 1937. and purauant to Public Act Numbered 845, approved June 29. 1936 (49 Stat. 2035), as shall be necessary only for the completion sind admintstration of those resettlement projects. cural rehabuitation projects for resettlement purposes. and land development and land utilization projects. for which funds have been allotted by the Preaident, and the balances of funds available to the Secretary for said purposes which are unexpended on June 30 , 1937 , are authortaed to be appropriated to carry out aaid purposes: Provided, That any land held by the United States under the supervision of the gecretary pursusint to said Executive orders may where sultable be utilized for the purposes of title I of this Act, and the secretary may sell said land and make loang for the necessary improvenent thereof to such indiFiduals and upon such terms as shall be in accordance with the provisions of said title.

GEMERAL FROVISIONS APPLCABLT: TO BanE
"Ste. 44. The sale or other disposition of any real property acquired by the Secretary pursuant to the provisions of this Act. or any interest therein, shall be subject to the reservation by the secretary on behalf of the Inited States of not leas than an undivided three-fourths of the Interest of the United States in all coal, oll. gas, and other minerals in or under such property.

## "TRANSTLE OF AVATHABLE LANDS

"SEc. 45. The President may at any time in bis discretion trangfer to the Secretary or the Corporation siny right, interest. or title held by the United States; and under the supervision of the secretary, in any land which the President shall find suitable for the purposes of this Act. and the Becretary or the Corporation, as the case may be. may use and dispose of such land in such manner, and subject to such terms and conditions, as the Preaident determines will best carry out the objectives of this Act.

## "TRANSACTIONS WITH CORPORATIONS

"SEC. 46. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize the making of any loan, or the sale or other dispoaition of real property or any interest therein, to any private corporation, for farming purposes.

## "sUEVETA AND EDSEARCE

"Ssec. 47. The Secretary is authorized to conduct surveys. investigations. and research reiating to the conditions and factors affecting. and the methods of accomplishing most efectively, the purposes of this Act, and may publish and disseminste information pertinent to the various aspects of his activities.
"vaciable Paymentrs
"Sec. 48. The Secretary may provide for the payment of any obligation or indebtedness to him under this Act under a system of variable payments under which a surplus sbove the required payment whil be collected in pertods of above-normal production or prices and employed to reduce payments below the required payment tn periods of subnormal production or prices.

## '3ET-0FT

"Sbc. 49. No set-ofl shall be made againgt any payment to be made by the secretary to any person under the provisions of this Act. by reason of any indebtedness of such person to the United States. and no debt due to the Secretary under the provisions of this Act shall be set off againgt any payments owing by the Untted States, unless the Secretary shall find that such set-oir will not States, unless the Secretary shall find th
adversely affect the objectives of this Act.

## "TAEATION

"Sxc. 50: (a) All property which is being utuized to carry out the purposes of title I or title II of this Act (other than property used solely for administrative purposes) shall, notwithstanding that legal title to such property rematns in the Becretary or the Corporation, be subject to taxation by the State. Territory, Dis trict. dependency, and political subdivision concerned. in the same manner and to the same extent as other similar property is taxed
(b) All property to which subsection (a) of this section is inapplicable which is held by the Secretary or the Corporation pursuant to this Act shall be exempt from all taration now or hereafter Imposed by the United States or any State, Territory. District. dependency. or political subdivision, but nothing in this subsection shall be construed as affecting the authority or duty of the Secretary under any other law to mare payments in respect of any such property in lieu of taxes.

BLD AT FOtBCLOBUET
"Sec. 51. The secretary is authorized and empowered to bid for and purchase at any foreclosure or other sale, or otherwise to acquire property pledged or mortgaged to secure sany loan or other irdebtedness owing under this Act: to accept titie to any proparty so purchased or acquired: to operate or lease such property for such period as may be deemed necessary or advisable to protect the investment therein: and to sell or otherwise dispose of such
property so purchased or acquired upon such terms and for such considerations as the Secretary shall determine to be reasonable. m.it subject to the reservation of the rights provided for in sec44.

## penalties

sicc. 52. (a) Whoever makes any material representation knowIng it to be false, for the purpase of influencing in any way the action of the corporation upon any application advance. discount. purchase, or repurchase agreement. contract of sale, lease. or loan. or any change or extension of any of the same by renewal. deferment of action or otherwise. or the acceptance. release. or substitution of security therefor. shali be punished by a fine of not more than $\$ 5.000$ or by imprisonment for not more than two years. or both.
(b) Whoever, beligg connected in any capacity with the Corporation, (1) embezales. abstracts. purioins, or williully misapplies any moneys. funds. securties. or other things of value. plies any moneys, funds. securities, or other things of value. whether belonging to the Corporation or pledged or otherwise or any other body politic or corporste. or any indivitual. or to deceive, any ofncer. auditor, or examiner of the Corporation. makes any false entry in any book, report. or statement of, or to, the Corporation or draws any order, or issues. puts forth. or assigns any note or other obligation or draft. mortgage. Judgment. or decree thereof: or (3) with Intent to defraud the Corperation, participatee or shares in or receivea directly or indirectly any money. proft or shares in or receivea directiy or indirectily any money. profit, property. or benents through any transaction. loan, commission
contract. or any other act of the corporation. shali be purnished by 3 fine of not more than 810.000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.
(c) Whoever willfully shall conceal. remove. dtrpose of. or convert to his own use or to that of another, any property mortgaged or pledged to, or heid by, the Corporation, as securty for any obiligation. shall be punished by a fine of not more than $\$ 5.000$ or by imprisonment for not more than two years. or both.
(d) The provisions of sections 112, 113. 114, 115. 116. and 117 of the Criminal Code of the United States (U. S. C., titie 18. secs. 202-207. inclusive). insofar as applicabie. are axtended to appiy to contracts or agreements of the Corporation. which for the purposes bereof shall be heid to inciude advances, loans, discounts. purchase and repurchase agreements, contracta of sale, and leases: ex tensicns and renewals thereof: and acceptances. reieases. and substitutions of security therefor.
"(e) Whoever conspires with another to accomplish any of the acts made unlawiul by the preceding provisions of this section
ll. on conviction thereof. be subject to the same fine or im-
onment. or both, as is applicable in the case of conviction for ig such undswful act.
'rELS AND COMMISSIONS PROFDPITHO
SEc. 53. No Federal officer. attorney, or employee shall. directly or indirectly. be the benefictary of or recelve any fee. commisaion. gift. or other consideration for or in connection with any transac-
tion or busincss under this Act other than such salary. fee. or cther compensation as he may receive as such offcer. attorney. or ernployee. No member of a county committee established under section 42 shall knowingiy make or join in making any certifica. tion prohibited by section 2 (c). Any person vioiating any provision of this section shall. upon conviction thereof. be punished by a fine of not more than $\$ 1,000$ or imprisonment for not more than onc year. or both.

## EXTENSION OF TERRETORTES

"Sec. 54. The provisions of this Act shall extend to the Terrtwories of Alaska and Hawali and to Puerto Rico. In the case of Alaska and Puerto Rico the term 'county' as used in this Act shali be deemed synonymous with the Tersitory. or any subdivision thereot as may be designated by the Secretary. and payments under section 33 of this Act shall be made to the Governor of the Tertitory or to the fiscal agent of such subdivision.

## "SEPARABTLTTY

Sec. 55. If any provision of this Act, or the appilestion thereot to any person or circumstances. is heid invalid. the remainder of the Act. and the application of such provisions to other persons or circumstances. shall nct be affected therrby."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment to the titie of the bill.

Marvin Jones.
Clefrozd R. Hope.
Managers on the part of the House.
J. H. Bankhzad.
J. P. Popt,

LYNN J. FRantige.
Managers on the part of the Senate.

## statestent

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on he disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of Sencie to the bill ( $\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{R}, 7562$ ) to encourage and promote the lership of farm homes and to make the possession of such mes more secure, to provide for the general weifare of the Jnited States, to provide additional credit facilities for agricultural development. and for other purposes, submit the following tural development, and for other purposes, submit the following by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

## Farm-tenant provisions

The Senate amendment authorized the Corporation created in the amendment to acquire land and sell or lease tt to persons ellgible to the benefts of the act. The conference agreement with yespect to the farm-tenant titie follows the substance of tha House bill with the following differences:
(1) Onder the conference agreement. loans may be made for a period not in excess of 40 years. The Eluse bill term was 30 years.
(2) Onder the conference agreement, applications for loans. which are to be passed on by the county committee. are to be flled with the county agent in the county or with such person as the Secretary designates.
(3) The conference agreernent contains a provision, adapted from the Senste amendment. under which the loan instruments are to contain a term that the borrower carry out such proper farming practices as the Secretary prescribes.
(4) The conference agreement concains a provision. adapted from the Senate amendment. Under which the ioan instruments are to contain $a$ term to the effect that. without the consent of the Secretary. final payment may not be accepted or the Governthe secretary. Anal pagment may not interest released prior to 5 years from the mating of the loan.
( 5 ) The conference agreement contains a provision. which was implicit in both the Eouse bll and the Senate amendment, which expresaly gives the Secretary the power to declare the entire amount due under the ioan agreement immediately payabie on default in the performance of. or upon any failure to comply with. any term or condition of the mortgage or deed of trust.
(6) The conference agreement rewords the provision of the House bill maling the provistons of the Franter-Lemake Act unavallabie to the borrower until he has pald at least 15 percent of bis indebtedness.
(7) The conference agreement contains a provision, adapted from the Senate amendment, under which the Secretary is. so far as practicabie. to exercise his powers to avoid production expansiom where expansion would defeat the parity policy of section 7 of the Soll Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and to assist beneficiaries of the title to become eatablished on lands now under cultivation.
(8) Onder the House bill. $\$ 50.000 .000$ was authorized to be appropriated for the Ascal year ending June 30. 1940. and no sutborization was made for later years. The Senate amendment authorized that sum to be appropriated for the ascal year 1940 and for each fiscal year thereafter. The conference agreement adopts the senate provision.
(8) The conference agreement contains a provision under which administrative expenses for carrying out the farm-tenant titie (personnel. overhead. etc.) are not to exceed in any iscal year 5 percent of the amount appropriated for the fiscal year. The Benate amendment fixed a fiat $\$ 400.000$ as the upper ilmit.

## Rehabilitation loans

There are no express provisions in the Senate amendment authoriving the making of rebabilitation loans as such. but the Senate amendment does authorize loans of the kind which may be made under title II of the House bll. These loans under the House bui and the Senate amendment may be made to the benefictarles of the tenant provisions. The conference agreement contains the iom and debt adjustment provisions of title II of the tains the loan and deminor ciarifylag changes. Under the House Hill the purposes for mhich loans could be made included "other farm needs." The Arst change made by the conference agreement is for the purpose of making clear that the phase "other farm needs' inciudes minor repairs and minor improvements to real property. The second makes it ctear that loans made under the title are renewable.

Submarginal land
The Senste amendment contains no expresa provision relating to retirement of submarginal land. The conference agreement containg the profistons of the House bill without change.

## General provisions

Under the Senate amendment. a corporation is established to carry out its provisions. The House blll conferred the powers on the Secretary of Agriculture and did not provide for a corporation. The conference agreement establishes a corporation in the Department of Agriculture, the directors of which are to be Department oflicials, who serve without additional compensation. The Secretary of Agriculture can empower the corporation to exercise the functions conferred upon him under the farm tenant and rehabiltation toan titles and in the parts of the general title which relate to such subjects. When so authortred the act appiles to the corporation Just as it does to the Secretary. The cofporation can exercise no powers under the submarginal land title. The corporation in order effectively to exercise the powers conferred upon it must have the power conferred in the Senste conferred upon it must have the power conferred in the senaso amendment to acquire. hold, and dispose of real and personal property. In the conference agreement. that power has been strictly limited. so that it is not a general one. but is confned only to the necessities of exercising the powers given it and must be exercised subject to the limitations of the act. Thus a granted corporate power with respect to real and personal property mas not be construed to authorize a general property purchage and sales program contrary to the terms of tities I or II.
The remainder of the general title in the conference agreement is the same as the same titie in the House bull with the following ditierences:
(1) The conference agreement omits the profision of the House bill under which reductions in personnel were to be determined in accordance with a geographical rale. The provision for requiring apportionments of appointments of personnel in accordance with the census has been mado to apply only where it is practicable to do so.
(2) Under the House bill. land could be acquired without regard to section 355 of the Revised Statutes under which various restraints are put upon land acquisition. The conference agreement limits that exception so that acquisition of submanginal land must be in accordance with section 355 whenever that section by its terms applies.
(3) An express provision in the conference agreement which was adspted from the Senate amendment requires that litigation be conducted under the supervision of the Attorney General by the varlous district attorneys.
(4) Onder the House bill. property held by the Secretary was tax exempt. but property which was in the hands of the beneficiaries of the tenant and rehablitation provisions was subject to taration. By reason of the inclusion of a corporation in the conference agreement it is necessary to carty over some of the provisions of the senate amendment relating to taxation and tax exemption of the corporate property. The conference agreament provides that even though title is in the Secretary or the Corporation. real and personal property in the hands of benefciarles of titles I and II is subject to taration. Property of the Corporation or the secretary (used for administrative purposes) and poration or the secretary (used for administrative purposes) and property owned by them and not. in the hands of such is tar exempt. The Corporation's franchises. Income. notes. etc.. are tar exempt. An express provision of the conference agreement preserves the power and duty of the Secretary to make such payments in lieu of taxes on property held by bim as are now authorized by law.
(5) The conference agreement provides that the county committee shall meet on the call of the county agent or such person as the secretary may dealgnate.
(6) The conference agreement contains a provision taken from the Senate amendment under which the President is authorized to transfer to the Secretary or the Corporation any land under the supervision of the secretary which is suitable for use under the act and authorizes them to use and dispese of such land in such manner. and subject to such terms and conditions as the President determines will best carry out the objectives of the act.
(7) The conference agreement contains a prohibition on making of loans, and transferring real property to corporations for farming purposes. A comparable provision is found in the senate amendment.
(8) Inasmuch as the House bill did not contain any provision for a corporation. the usual penalty provisions in relation to transactions by and property of Federal corporations were not included. The conference agreement provides for a corporation and hence includes the penalty provisions of the Senate amendment.
(9) Section 49 of the House bill contalned certaln provisions prohlbiting offcers. attorneys. and eraployees of the United States to be the beneficiaries of any fees. commissions. or gifts in connection with any transaction or business of the Onited States under the bill. The conference agreement makes it clear that this provision is to apply to oflcers, attorneys, and employees of the Corporation.

The House recedes on the title and short title to the bill
Manvis Jones.
Whin Doxey.
Cutrosd R. Hope.
Managers on the part of the House.
Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker. those who are interested have read the statement or have followed the changes in the measure. The measure as reported follows the general outlines of the House bill. The questions involved in title I which caused a discussion here are identical with the House profistons. with these exceptions: We retain the loan provisions; the Government does not take title to the land at all. In the House bill there was a provision that the loan period should not exceed 30 years. and that the man could not sell the property until he patd for the entire loan. except with the consent of the Secretary. Under the bill as reported the time is changed from not exceeding 30 years to not exceeding 40 years. The rate of interest remains the same: and we have this added provision: That if the man pays off the loan at any time he may have the deed. except that if he pays it off within the period of 5 years the Government will not issue a full release until the end of the 5 -year period. There is a further provision broadening the statement in the House bill which stipulated that the purchaser should not waste the land cr damage the buildings or injure the soil. That is clarifled and added to by stipulating that he shail during this 5-year period. or during the period which he takes to pay, comply with such farm practices as the Secretary may find essential to the preservation and conservation of the soil.

There is this further provision put into the bill: The senate bill provided for administration by a corporation instead of by the Secretary of Agriculture.

In the conference report we authorized the searetary to use a corporation if he finds it advisable to do so. In other words. it is in his discretion: but that corporation must ezercise only the functions that are conferred upon the secretary under the terms of the bill.

That, I believe. covers the main changes in the measure.
Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker. will the gentleman gield?
Mr. JONES. I yield.
Mr. WARRJEN. The gentleman will recall that I offered a. very important amendment which was agreed to by the House. which assigned over to this new agency certain farm lands in various States that had been acquired by the Resettlement Administration. Can the gentleman tell me what became of that amendment?

Mr. JONES. That amendment is retained in the bill.
Mr. MITCHELC of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker. will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.
Mr. MITCHEFLL of Tennessee. The appraisement of the lands remains in the hands of the local committee?

Mr. JONES. In the hands of the local committee.
Mr. MITCEIFLI of Tennessee. The same as it was orighnally passed?

Mr. JONES. Just as it passed the House.
Mr. MITCHIML of Tennessee. That is true as to the applicant for the loan?

Mr. JONES. Yes.
Mr. MITCHELL of Tennessee. And also the appraisal of the land?

Mr. JONES. Yes.
Mr. NELSON. This local committee is made up of three farmers?

Mr. JONES. The local committee is made up of three farmers: yes.

Mr. JOFNNSON of Oklahoms. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I Field.
Mr. JOEINSON of Olclahoms. As I understand. the same amounts remain available. $810.000,000$ the first year, \$25,000,000 the second. and $\$ 50,000.000$ thereafter?

Mr. JONES. That is correct: $\$ 50,000,000$ the third gear and succeeding years. That change was made. The House bill only ran for 3 years. This change says 'not to exceed $\$ 50.000 .000$ for each year after the second year." It is a continuing authorization rather than a limited one. I am glad the gentleman called my attention to that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Is there any provtsion with reference to submarginal lands?

Mr. JONES. Yes. That remains as in the House bill.
Mr. CASE of South Datcota. Mr. Speaker. will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.
Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What profision is made for title to the land? Are the lands subject to taration?

Mr. JONms. The land is subject to taxes right alows. The Government never owns the land, and therefore it never would be exempt from tazstion.

Mr. Speaker, I gield 5 minutes to the gentleman from nlinots [Mr. LUCAs].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaiker. having spent more time on the problem of farm tenancy than any other major issue before Congress today. I am compeiled at this Juncture of farmtenancy legislation to speak briefly again upon this vital issue.

I think the distinct difference between the House bill. which received overwhelming approval here. and the bill which was passed by the Senate is generally understood by the Members of the House. I think it is understood by all that the conferees faced a formidiable task in reconciling the conflicting provisions of these two measures. There was a fondamental difference involved. There were two entirely different philosophies in the bills.

From the beginning of the hearings on farm-tenancy legis lation last January I never altered my position in my antagonism toward the Government going into the purchasin; r acquiring of lands for the purpose of resale to a tenant.
appreciate the fact that in days of economic stress and trouble, such as this Nation has been passing through during the last few years, it has become necessary in many instances to transfer a certain amount of local government to the Nation's Capital; but the great difficulty in this trend toward centralized government is to know when and where to stop. Certainly this is not an emergency piece of legislation, and the more local autonomy you can keep in legislation of this kind the better it will be for the future government of this country
I know the type of tenants both bills seek to reach-industrious, thrifty. and independent tenants. I undertake to say at this point that had the Senate bill become the law of the land, and had any independent, honest. thrifty tenant thoroughly understood the provisions of the Senate bill, he never would have entered into partnership with Uncle Sam. Under the philosophy of the senate bill, those independent Americans, many of whom in my community are leaders in public thought and social activities. would be placed under the direct control. supervision, and guidance of Oncle Sam as their landlord. This is bureaucratic control from Washington. which, in my opinion. is wholly unnecessary, and I make the prediction that if the time ever comes in America when Uncle Sam becomes landlord for a million tenants. which was the bright prospect under the Senate bill, within a short space of time, from 30 to 40 years, the next step will be for the Government to control all of the lands of the country. and land socialism will be the policy of the Government. When that last veatige of independent initiative is stripped from the farmers, then another different and strange so-called Utopia in government will replace the Government of our fathers.

In conclusion. I want to pay a tribute to the Eouse conerees for standing by their guns, upon what seems to me wo be one of the most important problems which any group of conferees was compelled to face.

Especially do I want to commend the distinguished chair man of the Committee on Agriculture for his rigidity, firmness, and fairness in acceding to the wishes of Members of the House. I think it is generally agreed that there are certain manifestations of farm tenancy dealing with the sucial fabric of the Nation which must be seriousiy considered in the future, and as an experiment in a problem where the fleld is broad and fertile I hope that we are in the beginning assuming the one and only justifiable course. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker. will the gentleman gleld?
Mr. LUCAS. I yield.
Mr. SABATH. I fuly appreciate that the gentleman has devoted a great deal of time and study to this problem and that probably few Members are better posted or better informed upon this subject than the gentleman from Illinois. Do I understand that the gentleman is willing for this conference report to be adopted because he considers the legislation to be merely an experment and not a permanent fixed policy of the Government?

Mr. LUCAS. No: I think that in the beginning it will be an experiment, but that if it is handled properly it will become a permanent policy of the Govermment to benefit the farm tenants of this country.

## [Here the gavel fell]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I gield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Pace].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker. I hesitate to take issue with the distinguished gentleman who heads the Committee on Agriculture, but I say quite irankly that if this conference re-
he farmers of this Nation into irons.

Did you know that there has been added to this bill a provision that every man who secures a dollar to get him a home must contract and asree "to carry out such farming practices as the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe"?

For 40 long years the man who borrows a dollar under thi bill is under the absolute domination of the Secretary Agriculture. whosoever he may be. It is not a question to Mr. Wallace, the present Secretary. in whom we all hat confidence: but I warn you gentlemen that you are now taking a step along a road that runs down through the years. You do not know. and I do not know who the next Secretary of Agriculture will be. I for one will never consent that he shall tell the farmers in my State how. what; when, and where they may plant and harvest their crops.

Mr. MICHENERR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. PACE. I do.
Mr. MICEIENER. Right along the line the gentleman has suggested, the Bureau of the Census advises us that 42 percent of the farmers of the country are tenant farmers. As suggested by the gentleman from Georgia, we will by this action be giving the Secretary of Agriculture absolute control to regiment over 42 percent of the farmers in the country if this bill does what it is presumed to do.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the Members to read the provisions that have been added to the bill.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker. I think that my good friend from Georgis is unduly ezcited over this provision. This will not apply to any 42 percent of the farmers. It will apply only to those who want to avail themselves of the benefts of the bill and who are given special concessions of a low interest rate not exceeding 3 percent, and a period of loan not exceeding 40 -years.

It is my feeling that if we are to have a farm programand those who went through the agonies of the period when we did not have a farm program know that the only sensible thing is to have one-if we are to have a farm program somebody must administer it. Our present farm program is based on the soundest principles, those of soil conservation. Certainly it is my thought that if we are going to have that as the basis. and if we are going to charge a low interest r and encourage these people, those who avail themsel of the beneft of this legislation should submit to the sai farming practices that are required of the others who carry out the farm program already adopted.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman gield?
Mr. JONES. I yield.
Mr. PACE. There should not be any diference between us. The gentleman must agree that under this bill every single person who gets a dollar must agree to carry out such practices as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, and that that has nothing in the world to do with general conservation but is in addition thereto.

Mr. JONES. I may state to the gentleman that certainly the administrative authority on the one will probably have the same requirements in the other. for it will be the same administrative authority in both instances. Certainly somebody has to name the conditions and we cannot do that in the bill. I would rather have the Secretary of Agriculture, who is administering the program for the other farmers, stipulate the conditions than to bave it done by anyone else; and, certainly. I would not want just to permit them to have special rates with no obligation.

## Mr. DOXET. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman gield

Mr. JONES. I yield.
Mr. DOXEY. I appreciate the action of the chairinan in ylelding to me to make an observation for the beneft of the gentleman from Georgia. I do not know whether the gentleman from Geargis ever served on a conference committee or not. but if he las be will appreciate the diffculties that face the conferees.
This provision with reference to administration is taken from the Senate bill and not the House bill. Substantially the same provision was offered in the House as an amendment to the House bill but was defeated. This and one or two minor propositions is about all we brought back fr the conference. I do not believe the gentleman Georgia means to be critical. I am sure that he is in ested in the program. He must know that we had to yieru somewhat to the Senate. If the bill is not entirely satisfactory, the gentleman should feel charitably toward it,
because the Senate and the House tried to work for the benefit of agriculture.

We are certain of one thing: When the Government lends money it should try to see that the man who gets the benefit will farm in the right sort of way.

Mr. HOPE. Will the gentleman gield?
Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.
Mr. HOPE. In view of the statement of the gentleman from Georgia. may I ask the chairman of the Agricultural Committee if he knows of any individual. corporation. or organization of any kind which would sell land to a man with nothing down and simply an option? Some supervision has to be exercised over the man while he is pay. ing for it.

Mr. JONES. I do not know of any who would do that and I never heard of anyone like that. As a rule there are in some of the mortgages issued by private companies stipulations that would almost astonish you if you read them carefully, but they are safeguarding provisions. All the Secretary can do if any of these covenants is violated is to declare the balance due and leave the man where he started. All he can do is take away the privileges which the Government extended in the first place.

Mr. HOPE. Of course. we assume that the purchaser goes into this with his eyes open.

Mr. JONES. He does not have to take advantage of this opportunity if he does not want to.
Mr. HOPE. He does not have to accept the provision.
Mr. JONES. The Senate conferees. of course. want the Government to purchase these lands and go through a lease period and not give title to the purchaser until the end of 20 years. I hope the gentleman feels this is a much less drastic provision than that.

Mr. Speaker, I gield the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Pacel 3 additional minutes.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker. I do not want to be misunderstood. This provision has nothing to do with preventing waste. That was in the bill as we passed it. and I favor it. It has nothing to do with keeping the property insured. That is all right. It is provided by section 4. page 3. of the conference report that the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe rules and regulations for operating the farm. what he shall plant. how he shall plant. when he shall gather. kow he shall gather. what warehouse the products shall be taken to. and provides, if you please. if you do not do every single thing that the Secretary of Agriculture tells you to do he has the right to declare your loan in default, foreclose and take your home.

I say that is important. Mr. Speaker. because today we are just beginning. If we start off with such a provision and put the tenants of this Nation in irons. we will certainly see the day when there will be millions of tenants in this Nation under such domination.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the gentleman gield?
Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.
Mr. LUCAS. Admitting what the gentleman says is correct
Mr. PACE. There cannot be any doubt about that.
Mr. LUCAS. Does the gentleman believe any independent. thrifty, honest. frugal tenant. which this bill seeks to reach. will enter into a partnership with Uncle Sam under such circumstances?

Mr. PACE. If he will not. then the bill means nothing.
Mr. LUCAS. That ought to satisfy the gentleman from Georgia.
Mr. PACE. I want a tenant bill. I have 24.000 tenants in ${ }^{\circ}$ my district. and I want to help those poor fellows. but as this matter stands today you compel me to vote against a conference report to help the men in my district.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.
Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Since the Government is putting up all the money and taking all the risk. does not the gentleman think if the tenant wants to avail himself of assistance
from the Goverament he should subscribe to these requiremeats?
Mr. PACE. I am sorry, but I cannot vote under any circumstances to make the temants of my district subject to the whim of any man in the city of Washington.
[Here the gavel fell.]
Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman from Texas Field?
Mr. JONES. I gield to the gentleman from Michtgan.
Mr. MICHENER. Is it not true that there has been but one bill affecting agriculture passed by the Congress within the last few years containing the regimentation that this bill does in this particular section, and I refer to the potatocontrol bill? This is the ach bill that has been before the Congress that has contained the potato-control regulation which the country so condemned?

Mr. JONES. I do not think the gentleman would even suggest that comparison if he had taken the time to read the entire bill and compare it. This is a purely voluntary transaction. The potato bill levied a tax on all potato growers regardless of whether they entered into the program or not. As a starter in the present program the Government is going to lend 100 percent. It is going to lend that money to tenants who are selected by local committees. Several concessions are made. It is not amiss, in my opinion. for the authorities who have this matter in charge and those who will administer it to have the right to see that the land is not abused and that the security which the Government has under this program is not dissipated. The whole conference group is of the opinion this is a reasonable proviston.

Mr. ZIMMESRMAN. WIll the gentleman yield?
Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Missourt.
Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Is it not a fact in addition to putting up all the money to buy this land, the Government even agrees to make subsistence loans to the tenant farmer?

Mr. JONES. Yes.
Mr. ZIMMERMAN. And it is no more than fair or reasonable to require him to follow certain directions of the Department?

Mr. JONES. This is not regimentation. and I do not favor regmentation.

Mr. BURDICK. Will the gentleman gield?
Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.
Mr. BURDICK. I was interested in what the gentleman from Georgia said a while ago. He stated he has 24.000 tenants in his district. May I ask him. under the terms of this bill. how many of the tenants can be aided?

Mr. JONES. It depends upon the appropriations to be made by the Congress. If the thing is worked properly. I think this program will be more beneficial as time goes on. Mr. BURDICK. I mean the ilst year.
Mr. JONES. There will be comparatively few. There is only $\$ 10.000 .000$ made available the first year. However. practically all the great programs of this country started modestly. Usually when they started too ambitiously they were bogged down.

Mr. HOFFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.
Mr. HOFFMAN. The House bill is so much better than the proposal advanced in the Senate that there is no comparison. I agree with the chairman. If the Government is to lend this money, it should be protected against waste and the other things that naturally follow improper farming. However. I recall that on the last page of the application for a rehabilitation loan-and I have cited this fact here before (Record. p. 4199)-there was a requirement that the borrower should not do anything that was in opposition to the A. A. A. program until the money borrowed and interest thereon was paid. Under this act can the Secretary go tha* far?

Mr. JONES. I do not think so. There is no authorization for that. and I would very much oppose any such provision.

Mr. HOFFMMAN. I should hope so.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.
The previous question was ordered.
The conference report was agreed to.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
 (H. DOC. NO. 293)

The SPEAKipr laid before the House the following veto message of the president of the Onited States. which was read by the Clert

## To the House of Repmesentatives:

I return, without minapproval; the bill H. R. 2757. entitled "An act to carry out th findings of the Court of Claims in the claim of Morse Drydock \& Repair Co."

This claim is based upon an alleged unpaid belance of the charge of the Morse Drydock Repair Co. against the Onited States Mail Steamship Co.. Inct for labor and materials furnished in reconditioning the stedraships George Washington. America. Princess Matoika. Pocompntas. Susqueharna. and Potomac, delivered to the steamshincompany pursuant to a contract entered into by it with the voited States Shipping Board on May 28. 1920, by the terms onwhich the steamship company agreed to recondition said vestels, at its own cost and expense. promptly upon the delivery or the vessels to it. and to charter them for a period of 5 yeala at the rate of $\$ 3.50$ per net register ton per month.

The United States Mail Steamship Co.. Ind contracted with the claimant. the Morse Drydock \& Repatr fo., for the work of reconditioning these six vessels. The nerotiations leading up to the contracts were with the steamship company, and the claimant at all times during the work of reconditioning understood that the steamship company inpuld pay for the work and did not look to the Shipping Board Yor payment.

A receiver was appointed to take over the assets of the -nited States Mail Steamship Co., Inc., on August 16. 1921. nd said company was adjudged a bankrupt on November 14. 1921. by the United States District Court for the Southery District of New York. At the time of the appointment offa receiver the steamship company was indebted to the SIIDping Board on account of accrued charter hire in the syin of $\$ 501.552 .93$. A settlement agreement was entered into between the United States and the trustees in bankruptcy. by which the trustees assigned and transferred to the United States all interest in any money or accounts due the steamship company or the trustees, in consideration fof which the United States withdrew its proof of claim forthe amount of the accrued charter hire and paid to the tristees the sum of $\$ 175.000$. The trustees thereupon released the United States from liability for all claims against theponkrupt estate.

The approval of this bill would give fíe claim of the Morse Drydock \& Repair Co. a preferred stztus. to the exclusion of other creditors.

Had it been established that the Onited States is morally liable for the balance due on acount of the repairs to these vessels, under the charter pary-agreement payment should be made to the bankrupt estye.

For this reason and thefeasons set forth in the attached letter. I do not feel justig-d in approving this bill.

Franking D. Roosevelt.
The White Hoose fuly 12. 1937.
The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be entered at large ypon the Journal.

Mr. KENNED $Y$ of Maryland. Mr. Speaker. I move that the message and the bill be referred to the Committee on Claims and be printed under the rule.

The motion was agreed to.

## PERBHSSION TO ADDRESS THE FOUSE

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next. after the disposition of the business on the Sppaker's table and the completion of the legislative business of the day, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Knorson] ,may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of th entleman from New York?
There was no objection.
CONTROL OF OUTBREAFS OP TNSECT PESTS
Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker. I ask un himous consent for the present consideration of the joint fesolution (H. J. Res. 431) making an appropriation for th contral of outbreaks of insect pests.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resoluy 10 .
Mr. SUMANBRS of Texas. Mr. Speakey, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the gen (eman from Missouri if he can indicate how long it wily take to dispose of the matter which he has just presentel.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speprer, this blll has been reported out by the unanimous vot of the committee. So far as I know there is no opposition to the measure. It is a matter of national energencyf

Mr. SUMNERES of Texas. Mr. Speaker. I withdraw my objection.

The SPBAKEAR. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Missourl upon his as, Urance that there was no opposition to the foint resolutifin and that it was a matter of great emergency.

Is there objection the request of the gentieman from Missouri?

There was no gfection.
The Clerk reg, the joint resolution. as follows:
Reaclved. etc. That for carrying out the purposes of and for expenaltures sthorized under the public resolution entitied "Jolnt rebolution m, ing punds avaliable for the control of tnetpient or emergency utbreatis of insect pests or plant diseases. including grasahoppyr, Mormon crickets, and chinch buge". approved April 6. 1937. fere is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasur not otherwise appropriated. the sum of $1,000,000$, to remal) avallable until June 30. 1938: Provided, That in the discretifo of the Secretary of Agriculturs. no part of this appropitatiof shall be expended for control of gragatappers, Mormor cparets, or chinch bugs in say State until such Stato has provide Ne organizstion or matertais and suppliea neceacary lor coopar Hon: Provided /urther. That transportation of control mitarial prychased uncter this appropristion shall be under conditions and mans determined by the Seeretary of Agriculturre as mot adventagerus to the Federal Government: Provided fwrther. That procuren pats under this appropristion may be made by open-market curonints under this appiopriation may be made by open-market purchase notwithetanding the provisions of section 3709 of
Revised tatutes of the Dinited States ( $\mathrm{J} . \mathrm{S}$. C. titio 41. sec. 5).

With the following committee amendment:
Page 2. 11, 5, after the colon. Insert the following: "Prootded further. That this approprtation shall be expended under the personal supervisila and direction of the Secretary of Agriculture. sonal supervisien and direction of the Secretary of the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the several items of expenditurt made hereunder."

Mr. CANNON of Missount. Mr. Speaker. the Budiget estimate for this purposi submitted last April provided for an expenditure of $\$ 2.000 .0 \mathrm{no}$. The Committee on Appropristions. in pursuance of its holicy of holding down expenditures to a minimum, reported apill for half the amount, which was passed by the House an became a law.

But the infestations this yerr have been unusually heavy. In fact. reports received througr the Department of Agriculture and from Members of the Einise indicate that it is perhaps the heaviest for many yeart As a result. the first appropriation has been exhausted. and uniess further funds are available the loss of crops in manistates will be serious. The loss in corn alone will amount to a hational catastrophe. All corn reserves are being exhausted and importations from abroad have been required to supply barest fomestic requirements. It is believed that prompt action $W$ II save corn and ether crops not yet matured.

This bill appropriates the remaining million dilars recommended by the Budget. The funds are being econd aically administered, and practically the entire amount is bepg spent for materials. The States and local subdivisions are plpviding transportation and distribution. and Federal approprt tio are applied directly without material overhead expendit!

The time is short. Every 24 hours count. and the bill shd be messaged over this afternoon. For that reason I ask for vote on the bill and amendment without extended debate. The committee amendment was agreed to.

## SENATE

## Thursday, JuLy 15, 1937

The Chaplain. Rev. Z:Barney T. Phillips, D. D.. offered the skowing prayer:
O herciful God and Heavenly Father. who has taught us in Thy Holy Word that Thou doest not willingly affict or grieve the children of men: We come unto Thee at this sorrow-laden hour like ships storm-driven into port. like wanderers seeking refuge from the whelming night. asking Thee to receive us. to shelter us under Thy wing. to hide us in Thy heart.

Thou hast taken unto Thyself the soul of our beloved friend and gallank leader, for whose life we thank Thee. who knew no fear seve that of wounding Thee. who never stooped to an unchivalrous deed. but always bowed in reverence before the innocence of little children because his heart was pure. Help us to imitate his virtues and at this altar of our sorrow to rededicate pur lives to Thee and to the service of our beloved country. Through these halting hours of anguish deal tenderly. O compassionate Father. with the dear one. the heart companion of his life: enfold her in Thine arms of everlasting love, add by the very hush of Thy presence soothe her aching heart.
Bide with us all. dear Lord. for day is fast dying and the shadows of the night shall fall. and solan we shall no longer see each other's faces here. but be ouk light in darkness till Thy day shall break above us as we wait. We ask it in the name and for the sake of Hlm who hath brought life and immortality to light. Jesus Christ. Thy 'Son, our Lord. Amen.
tere journal
On request of Mr. Barkiry. and by unanimous consent the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of thy calendar days Tuesday. July 13. 1937. and Wednesday. Juy 14. ${ }^{\prime} 937$. was dispensed with. and the Journal was approved

## messagr from the housr

A message from the House of Representatives. by Mr. Chaf fee. one of its reading clerks. communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to pe memory of Hon. Joseph T. Robinson, late a Senator from the State of Arkansas.
The message announced that the House had plssed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 431) making an appopriation for the control of outbreaks of insect pests, i which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

## enrolled bilis signed

The message also announced that the Sppaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bish, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:
H. R. 458. An act for the relief of E/a Markowitz:
H. R. 730. An act for the relief of oseph M. Clagett. Jr.:
H. R. 1377. An act for the relley of Walter T. Karshner. Katherine Karshner. Anna M Kz shner. and Mrs. James E. McShane:
H. R. 1945. An act for the relief of Venice La Prad;
H. R.2332. An act for the elief of Willam Sulem:
H. R.2562. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. David Stoppel:
H. R. 2565. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear. detepmine. and enter judgment upon the claims of contractof for excess costs incurred while constructing navigation dams and locks on the Mississippi River and its triy 1 taries: and
H.R.3634. Af act for the relief of Noah Spooner.
fouss joint resolution referred
The join resolution (H. J. Res. 431) making an approbriation for the control of outbreaks of insect pests was read vice by its title and referred to the Committee on Approations.

## CONTROL OF INSECT PESTS

Mr. LEWWIS. I ask for a roll call. in order to assure the presence of a quorum.
The PRESDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll

Mr. McKetLiAR. Mr. President. before the roll is called. will the Senator from Ilinois yield to me?

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President. I withdraw for the pres at the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from pilnots withdraws the point of no quorum.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President. House Jolnt Fesolutian 431. making an appropriation for the control of gitbreaks of insect pests. has just come over from the Fouse. I am authorized by the Committee on Appropriatio A. and for the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Glass]. to repor the joint resolution favorably without amendment, and/ submit a report (No. 887) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolutin.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, a par amentary inquiry.
The PRESDDENT pro tempore. phe Senator will state it.
Mr. KING. Does that mean th 1 . without discussion and consideration, the House joint y solution shall be approved?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I b pe it may mean that. The proof before the House compattee shows that a great emergency exists in the West on regard to insect pests. The Senator from Colorado is specially interested in the passage of the proposed legislation; it seemed to the committee to be an emergency mater, and it is hoped that the joint resolution may be pased without delay.

Mr. McNARY. ar. President. I do not recall the provsions of the meavare.

Mr. MCKELI_R. Sometime ago the Congress, in connection with wha, is known as the grasshopper control, authorized an appypriation of $\$ 2.000,000$. $\$ 1.000 .000$ of which has been apprypriated and spent. The proof before the House was so vgly strong that. in order to control grasshoppers and other p-sts in various Western States. it is absolutely necessary flat the appropriation provided by the Joint resolution sha) be made.

The PRESDDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the resent consideration of the House joint resolution?
There being no objection. the joint resolution (FI. J. Res, 431) mating an appropriation for the control of outbreaks of insect pests was considered. ordered to a third reading, lead the third time. and passed. as follows:
hesolved, etc.. That for carrying out the purposes of and for expesditures authortzed under the pubic resolution entitled "Joint resollition making funds avallable for the control of inclplent or emergency outbreaks of insect pests or plant diseases, tncluding erasshophers, Mormon crickets. and chinch bugs". approved Apri 6. 1937. there is hereby appropriated. out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. the sum of 81.000.000. to remain avallaple untll June 30. 1938: Provided, That in the discretion of the fecretary of Agriculture. no part of this appropriacretion of the kecretary of Agriculture. no part of this appropita-
tion shall be expended for control of grasshoppers. Mormon crickets, or chinch bags in any State until such State has provided the organization on materials and supplies necessary for cooperation: Provided further, That this approprtation shal be expended under the personal stipervision and direction of the gecretary of Agriculture. who shall make a detalled report to the secretary of the Senate and the Clert of the House of Representatives of the several items of expenditure made hereunder: Provided further. several items of expendirire made hereunder: appropriation shall be under conditions and means determined by the Secretary of Agriculture al most advantageous to the Federal Government: Provided further, That procurements under this approprlation may be made by open market purchases notwithstanding the provisions of section 3709 pf the Revised Statutes of the United States ( U. S. C., titie 41, sech 5).

Mr. McKWLIAR. Mr. Presidend I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be signed by the Presiding Officer while the Senate is in rocess or adjournment following today's session.
"The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FARMERS HONLS CORPORATION-CONTERENCT REPORT
Mr. BANEHEAD. Mr. President. for certain reasons. I am anxious to have final action taken on the conference report on House bill 7562, being the farm tenancy bill. socalled. I submit the conference report. and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. If it leads to any debate. I will withdraw the request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read.

The Chief Cleik read the report. as follows:
The committce of conference on the disagreeing votes of the $t$ wo Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7562) to encourage and promote the ownership of farm homes and to make the possession of such homes more secure. to proFide for the general welfare of the United States. to proride additional credit facilities for agricultural development, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to thetr respective Houses as follows:

In lleu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:
"That this Act may be cited as 'The Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act:

## Tremp I-Farm Tenant Provistons

"Powne of mecimasy
"Siction 1: (a) The Becretary of Agriculture (herelnafter referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized to make loans in the United States and in the Territories of Alaske and Hawril and in Puerto Rico to persons eligible to recelve the benetts of this titio to enable such persons to acquire farms.
"(b) Only farm tenants, farm laborers, sharecroppers. and othar individuals who obtain. or who recently obtained. the mafor portion of their income rrom farming operstions shall be ellgible to receive the beneits of this titio. In maling avallable the bonefits of this title, the Becretary shail give preference to persons who are marrted, or who have dependent lamilies. or. wherever prac are married, or who have dependent lamilies. or. wherever practicable, to persons who are sbie to mare an initial down parment. or who are owners of ivestock and farm implements neces-
sary succesarully to carry on farming operations. No person shall be eligible who is not a citizen of the Onited States.
(c) No loan shall be made for the acquitition of any farm unlest it is of such size as the Becretary determinea to be sumelent to constitute an emctent farm-management unit and to enable a dillgent farm family to carry on succesaful farming of a type which the Secretary deems can be succesirully carried on th the locsulty in which the farm is aiturted.
"countr conciritms Aid Loans
"SEC. 2. (a) The County Committee established under section 42 shall
(1) Eramine applications (Aled with the county agent in the county. or with such other person as the secretary may deatgnata) of persons desiring to flanance the acquintion of farms in the county by means of a loan from the secretary under this title.
(2) Examine and appraise farms in the county with respect to which an application for s loan is made.
"(b) If the committee fands that an applicant is eligible to receive the benests of this title. that by reason of his character. abllity. and expertence he is likely succeasiully to carry out undertatings required of him under a lasn which masy be made under this title. and that the larm with respect to which the applicathon is made is of such character that there is a reasonable likelihood that the maldig of a loan with respect thereto will carry out the purposes of this titic. It shall so cartity to the gecretary. The committee shall also certify to the secretary the amount which the committee finds is the reasomable value of the farm.
"(c) No certincation under this section shall be made with respect to any farm in which any member of the committee or any person relsted to such member within the third degree of consanguinity or annity ha any property interent. direct or indirect. or in which they or either of them have had such interest Within ome year prior to the date of certification.
"(d) No loan shall be made to any person or with respect to any farm unless certification 26 required under thif section has been made with respect to such person and such farm by the committee.

## "rzenes or loans

"SEC. 3. (a) Loans made under this titie shall be in such amount (not in excess of the amount certified by the County Committee to be the value of the farm) as may be neceasary to enable the borrower to acquire the farm and for neceasary repairs and tmprovements thereon, and shall be secured by a first mortgage or deed of trust on the farm.
(b) The instruments under which the loan is made and security given therefor shail-
"(1) Provide for the repayment of the loan within an agreed period of not more than forty years from the malding of the loan.
(i) Provide for the payment of interest on the unpaid balance of the loan at the rate of 3 per centum per annum.
(3) Provide for the repsyment of the unpsid balance of the losn, together with interest thereon. In installments in accordance with amortization schedules prescribed by the Beeretary.
(4) Be in such form sind contain such covenants as the Secretary shall prescribe to secure the payment of the unpaid balance of the loan, together with interest thereon to protect the security. and to assure that the farm will be maintained in repair. and waste and exhsustion of the farm prevented, and that such proper farming practices as the Secretary shall prescribe will be carried out.
"(5) Provide that the borrower shall pay tares and assessmenta on the larm to the proper taring suthorities, sact insure and pay for insurance on farm bulldings.
"(6) Provide that upon the borrower's assigning. selling. or otherwise transferring the farm, or any interest therein. without the consent of the Becretary, or upon default in the performance the consent of the secretary, or upon default in the perrormance
of, or upon any fallure to comply with, any covenant of condi-
thon contatred in such instramenth. or upon infoturntary tramater or sale, the Secretery may deciare the amorunt unpeid mmedist due and payable, and that. without the consent of the bears no final payment shall be sccepted, or release of the Beank interest be made. less than five years arter the making of the
(c) Except as provided in paragraph (6) of subsection (b) instrument provided for in this section shall prohibit the prepayment of ang sum due under it.
(d) No provistion of section 75. as smeaded. of the Act entitied 'An Act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughous the United States', approved July 1. 1898 (J. S. C. Igse ein titio 11. sec. 203: Supp. II, title 11, sec. 208), otherwise applteabie in respect of any indebtedness incurred under this titie by any beopfictary thereof, shall be appitcable to respect of such tadebtednean until such beneliciary has repaid at leat 15 par cemtum therieor.
'meUTrasin Disteriction of Lonis
"Siec. 4. In matiag loans under this titio, the arownt which is devoted to such purpose durtag ans fiscal year ahall bo ditributed equitably among the meveral Btatea and Teiritories on the benf of farm population and the provelence of tenancy. Is detarmined by the Becretary.
"avomancer of rmoducison meparisions
"Siec. 6. In carrying out this tithe the Eecratary ahal give due consideration to the dedratulity of avolding the expanston of production for market of bastc commoditles where much expansian wrould dercet the policy of Congress as eat rarth in section 7 (B) (5) of the Soll Conservation and Domestic Allotament Act. as amended, and shall so far as practicable, amint benahiaries of the program urder this title to become entablished upon lands now in cultivation.
"giec. 8. To carry out the provitione of that titio, thero is anthorized to be appropriated not to exceed 10.000 .000 for the niscal year ending June 50. 1938, not to erceed $835,000,000$ for the fiscy year ending June 30. 1939, and not to erceed $150,000,000$ for each yecal year thereatter. Not more than 5 per ceritun of the eum appropristed for any flecal year in prossuance of thit section shall be available for edministrative expenses in carryms out this titlo during such ascal year.

##  <br> "yomeownes Art menm

"Sicrion 21. (a) Out of the funde made aralabie under rection 28, the secretary ahall have poyw to matice loans to eligible in viduale for the purchaee of liventock tarm equiponent, sup and for other farm neede (maluding monor improvement minor repairs to real property). and for the reanancing of in edness, and for family aubstitance.
"(b) Loans made under this section aball bear tntrereat at a rata not in excese of 3 per centum per annum, and ahnill have maturities not in excess of ave years, and mey be ranewed. Such loave shall be payable in such installmants as the Beuretery may prow vide in the loan agreement. All loans made under thit titie ehall be eacured by a chattel mortgage, a lien on cropa, and an aseignment of proceeds from the sale of agriculturls products, or by exy one or more of the foregoing.
"(c) Only farm ownars, farm teanants, farm laborers, sharecroppers. snd other indiriduals who obtals, or who recentry obtained, the major portion of thetr income from farming operations, and who cannot obtain credit on reemonable terme from any federally incorporsted lemding ingtitution, ahall be difible for loans under this section.

"SEc. 22. The Eecretary shall have potier to andit in the voluntary adjustment of indebtedreas between fem debtors and thoir credttors and mas cooperate with and pas the whole or pert of the expenses of stata, Tertitorish and local agenctat and committees engeged in euch debt adjustment. Eie is also suthortred to continue and carry out undertarings with reapect to farm debt sdjuftrment uncompleted st the time when appropitstion for the pupose of this eection are bret spailable. Services furniahed by the gecretary under this section shall be without charge to the debtor or creditior.

## "Arymothations

"Sye. 2s. (8) For the facal year ending June 30. 198s, the bele ances of funds avalable to the secretary for loams and rellef to farmers, pursuant to bixecutive Order Numbered 7530 of December 31. 1986, 是s amended by Erecutive Order Numbered 7507 of February 18. 1937. which are unexpended on June s0, 1937, are suthorized to be appropitated to carry out the provitions of this titile.
"(b) The President is gnthoryred to allot to the Beoretary. out of appropriations made for rellef or work relief for any fiscal Fear ending prito to July 1. 1989 . such sums an ha determinea to be necesary to carsy out the provtsions of this title sud to enable the secretary to carry out such other forms of rebabilitation of individuals eligible under this thele to receive loana as may be suthorized by lav and destgisted in the sremutive ordar drecting the sllotment.
crive III-Ririoncivi of Busympandal Latre
"Fioctan
"SEcmos 31. Tha Eecretary th avthortred and directed to deteruy s program of land conservation and land utiligation, including the retirement of lands which are submarginal or not primarily surtsble for cultrition, in order thereby to correct maladjustrmenth in land use, and thins ands in controlling soll eroaton, reforentation,
preserving natural resources mitigating floods, preventing impair ment of dams and reservoirs, conserving surface and subsurface moisture, protecting the watersheds of narigable streams, and protecting the pubilc lands, health, safety, and welfare.

## POWES UNDER LAND PROGRAM

"Sbe. 32. To effectuate the program profided for in section 31 this Secrecary is authorized-
(a) To acquire by purchase. gift, or device, or by transfer from any agency of the United States or from any State. Territory. or political subdivision, submarginal land and land not primarily suitable for cultivation, and interests in and options on such land Such property may be acquired subject to any reservations, outh standing estates, interests, easements, or other encumbrances which the Secretary determines will not interfere with the utllization of such property for the purposes of this title.
"(b) To protect. improve, develop, and administer any property so acquired and to construct such structurea thereon as may be necessary to adapt it to its most beneficial use.
(c) To sell. exchange, lease, or otherwise dispose of, with or without a consideration, any property so acqufred, under such terms and conditions as he deems will best accomplish the purterms and conditions as he deems will best accomplish the pur
poses of thts title. but any sale, exchange, or grant shall be made only to public authorities and agenctes and onjy on condition that the property is used for public purposes. The Secretary may recommend to the Preaident other Pederal. State. or Territoria agencles to admintster such property. together with the conditions of use and administration which will best serve the purposes of a land-conservation and land-utilization program, and the President is authortzed to transter such property to such agenctes.
(d) With respect to any land, or any interest therein. acquired by. or transferred to. the secretary for the purposes of this title. to make dedications or grants, in his discretion, for any public purpose, and to grant Hcensea and easements upon such terms an he deem reasonable.
(e) To cooperate with Federal. State. Territorial, and other pubHic agenciea in developing plans for a program of land conservation and land utlligation, to conduct surveys and investigations relating to conditions and factors affecting, and the methods of accomplishing mont elfectively, the purposes of this title. and to disseminate information conceraing these activities.
"(1) To make such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to prevent trespanses and otherwise regulate the use and occupancy of property acquired by. or tranaterred to, the secretary for the purposes of this title. in order to conserve and utture it or advance the purposes of thils titie. Any Folation of such rules and regulations shall be punished as prescribed in section 5388 of the Revised


## "Patmgrivts to countries

SEC. 33. As soon as practicable after the end of each calendar year. the Becretary shall pay to the county in which any land is held by the Secretary under this title, 25 per centum of the net revenues received by the secretary from the use of the land during such year. In case the land is situated in more than one county, the amount to be pald shall be divided equitably among the respective counties. Payments to counties under this section shall be made on the condition that they are used for school or road purposes, or both. Thls section shall not be construed to rosd purposes, or both.

## APPROPRIATION

"Sec. 34. To carry out the prorisions of thin title, there is suthorized to be sppropristed not to exceed $\$ 10.000,000$ for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and not exceed $\$ 20,000,000$ for each of the $t w o$ fiscal years thereaiter.

## Ttite IV-Gmintal Provistons

## "FARMERS" HOME COMPORATHOM

"Siccion 40. (a) There is hereby created as an agency, of and Within the Department of Agriculture, a body corporate with the name 'Farmers' Home Corporation' (tn this Act called the Corporation). The principal oflce of the Carporation ahall be located in the District of Columbia, but there may be eatablished agenctea or branch ofmces elsewhere in the United States under rules and regulations prescribed by the Board of Directors.
"(b) The Secretary shall have power to delegste to the Corporation such powers and duttes conferred upon him under title I or title II, or both, and such powers under titie IV as reiate to the exercise of the powers and duties so delegated, as he deems may exercise of the powers and duties so delegated, as he deems many be necessary to the efficient carrying out of the purposea of such the Corporation such funds avallable for such purposes as he deems necessary. In connection with and in the exerctise of such powers and duties so delegated, all provisions of this Act relating to the powers and duties of. and limitations upon, the secretary shall apply to the Corporation in the same manner as to the Secretary. and the term 'Secretary' shall be construed to tnclude 'Corporation.
(c) The Corporation shall have a nominal capital stock in an amount determined and subscribed for by the Secretary. Receipt for payments for or on account of such stock shall be lesued by the Corporation to the Secretary and shall be evideuce of the stock jwnership of the United States.
(d) The management of the Corporation shail be vested in a board of directors (in this Act called the Board) subject to the general supervision of the Secretary. The Board shall consist of three persons employed in the Department of Agriculture who shall be designated by the Secretary. Vacanctes in the Board. so
long as there are two members to omice. shall not impatr the powers of the Board to execute its functions and two of the mem bers in offlce shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. The directors, sppointed as heretnberore provided, shall receive no additional compensation for thetr services as such directors but may be sllowed travel and subsistence expenses when engaged in business of the Corporation outside of the District of columbia.
(e) The Board may select. subject to the apprival of the Secretary, an administrator. who shall be the executive oficetio the Corporation, with such power and authority as may be coniferred upon him by the Board.
(1) The Corporation-
"(1) Shall have succession in its corporate name:
'(2) May adopt. alter, and use a corporate seal. which shall be Judictally noticed:
(3) May sue and be sued in its corporato name in any court of competent Jurisdiction, State or Federal: Provided, That the prosecution and defense of all IItigation to which the Corporation may be a party shall be conducted under the supervision of the Attorney General, and the Corporation shall be represented by the United States Attorneys for the districts, respectively. in which such utigation may arise, or by such other attorney or attorneys as may. under the law. be destgnated by the torney or attorneys as may. under the law. De destgnated by the Attorney General: And provider further, Thist no attachment, shall be issued against the Corporation or its property:
(4) May sdopt. amend, and repeal bylawi, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its bustness may be conducted and the powers vested in it may be exercised and enjoyed:
(5) Shall be entitled to the free use of the United Statem malls in the same mannar an otber executive agencies of the Government:
(6) Shall have such powers as may be necessary or appropriste for the exerctise of the powers vested in the Corporation (Including. but subject to the limitations of this Act. the power to make contracte, and to purchase or leane, and to hold or dis pose of, which real and permonal property as it deems neceusary) and all such tncidental powtra are customary in corporationa generally. The Board ahnal define the authorits and dutien of the ompers and employees of the corporation, delagate to them such of the powers vested in the Corporation is it may determine. and require bonds of such of them as it may deatgnate and as the penalties and pay the premiums of auch bonds.
(8) Insofar as applicabie. the benents of the Act entitied An Act to provide compencation for employees of the United 8tates suffering infuries while in the performance of thetr dutica, and for other purposes', approved september 7, 1916. as amended, shall extend to employees of the Corporation.
(h) All money of the Corporstion not otherwise employed anay be depoaited with the Treanurer of the United States or in any bank approved by the secretary of the Treasury. subject to withdrawal by the corporation at any time. or with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury masy be invested in obligations of the United States. Subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Federal Reserve banks are hereby authorized and directed to act as depositories, custodians, and fiscal agent for the Corporation in the performance of its powers.
(1) The Corporation. Inctudiag its franchises, its capital. reserves, and surplus and its income and property shall, except as otherwise provided th section 50 (a). be exempt from all tasiation now or hereaiter imposed by the United States or any State. Territory. District. dependency, or political subdivision.
(j) The Corporation shall at all times malntain complete and accurate books of account and shall file annually with the secretary a complete report as to the businest of the Corporation.
"Sec. 41. For the purposes of thil. Act, the Secretary shall have power to-
(a) Appoint (without regard to the civi-service lam and regulations) and fix the compensation of such ofncers and employeen as may be necessary. No person (except as to poaltions requiring technical tratning and experience for which no one posseading the requisite technical training and experience is available within the area) shall be appointed or transferred under this act to any position in an office in a 8tate or Territory the oparations of which are confined to such state or Territory or a portion thereop, which are connaned to such state or Tistrict of Calumbla the opers: or in a regionsl omice outside the District of callambia the operaone. State or Territory. unless such person has been an actual and bons-fide resident of the 8 tate or Territory, or region, as the case may be, in which such omee is located. for a pertod of not less than one year next preceding the appointment or tranafer to such position (disregarding periods of residence outaide such State or Territory. or region, as the case may be. while in the Federal Government service). If the operntions of the omee are conflned to a portion of a single State or Territory. the secretary in maluing appointments or transiers to such oflce shall. ercept in the classes of cases exempted from the preceding sentence, appoint or transfer only persons who are reaidents of such portion of the State or Territory: Provided. That hereafter, wherever practicable, all sppointments of persons to the Federal service Sor employment within the District of Columbla, under the prooistons of this Act. whether such appointments be within the classified civtl service or otherwise. shall be apportioned among classified civit service or otherwise, shal be apportioned among the several States and the District of Columbla upon the
population as ascertalned at the last preceding censum
(b) Accept and uttlize voluntary and uncompensated services, and. with the consent of the agency concerned. utilize the offcers, employees, equipment. and faformation of any agency of the Federal Government, or of any State. Territory, or political subdivision.
(c) Within the limits of approprtations made therefor. make necessary expenditures for personal services and rent at the seat of government and elsewhere: contract stenographic reporting services: purchase and exchange of supplies and equipment. law bocks, books of reference, directortest periodicals, newrpapers, and press clipplngs: travel and subsistence expenses, including the expense of attendance at meetings and conferences; purchase, operation, and maintenance, at the seat of government and elsewhere. of motor-propelled passenger-carying and other vehicles: printing and binding: and for such other facllities and services as he may from time to time find necessary for the proper administration of this Act.
(d) Make contracts for services and purchases of supplles without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C. 1934 ed., title 41, sec. 5) when the aggreguto amount involved is less than $\$ 300$.
"(e) Make paymente priar to audit and cettlement by the General Accounting Once.
"(1) Acquire land and interests therein without regard to section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended. This subsection shall not apply with respect to the acquiation of land or interests in land under titie III.
-(g) Compromise claims and oblugations arising under. and adjust and modify the terms of mortgages. leases, contracts, and agreements entered into pursuant to, this Act, as circumstancea may require.
"(h) Collect all clatms and obligations aristing under thls Act, or under any mortgage. lease, contract, or agreement entered into pursuant to this Act, and. if in his judgment necessary and advisable to pursue the same to flal collection in any court having furisdiction: Provided, That the prosecution and defense of all Litigation under this Act shall be conducted under the superviaion of the Attorney General; and the legal representation shall be by the Onited states Attorney: for the districta, respectively. In which auch Litigation may arise, or by such other attorney or ittorneys as may. under the law, be deaignated by the Attorney General.
(1) Make such rules and regulations as be deams necessary to carry out thls Act.
"coosity comprrysin
"Sirc. 49. (a) The Becretary is authortzed and directed to appoint in each county in which activitiem are carried on under titio I county committee composed of three farmers residing in the coumty.
"(b) Fach member of the committee shall be allowed compensetion at the rate of $\$ 3$ per day while engaged in the performance of duties umder this Act but much compensation shail not be allowed with respect to more than five days in a month. In addition, they shall be allowed such amounts as the secretary may preacribe for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses.
"(c) The committee shall meet on the call of the county agent th the county, or on the call of such other person as the Becretary may designate. Two membert of the committee shall constitute a quorum. The Becretary shall prescribe rules governing the procedure of the committees, furnish forms and equipment necessary for ure of the commitees, iurnish forms and equpment necessary for the performance of their duties, and authorize and provide for the required by any committee.
( a ) Committees estabitshed under thin Act shall, in addition to the duties specifically imposed under this Act, perform such other duties under thla Act as the secretary may require of them.

Sec. 43. The secretary is authorized to continue to perform such of the functions vested in him pursuant to Erecutive Order Numbered 7530 of December 31. 1936. as amended by Erecutive Order Numbered 7557 of February 19, 1937, and pursuant to Puble Act Numbered 945, approved June 29 , 1936 ( 49 Stat. 2095). as shall be Numbered 845, approved June 29 , 1936 (49iniatiation of those resetnecessary ony for the compietion and administration of those resetposes, and land development and land utiliration projects. for which funds have been allotted by the Frestdent, and the bainnces of funds available to the secretary for matd purposea which are unerpended on June 30, 1937, are authorized to be appropriated to carry out sald purposes: provided. That any land held by the United States under the supervision of the Secretary pursuant to and Executive orders may where sultable be utilised for the purposes of Exite I of thls act. and the secretary may sell sald land and mato loans for the necessary improvement thereof to such fadividuals and upon such terms as shall be in accordance with the provitions of said title.

## "GENERAL PROTESTONS APPLTCARLE TO SALE

"Szc. 44. The sale or other disposition of any real property acquired by the secretary pursuant to the provisions of this Act. or any interest therein. shall be subject to the reservation by the Secretary on behalf of the United States of not less than an undivided three-fourths of the interest of the Dilted States in aلl coal, oul. gas, and other minerals in or under such property.

## "TRANSTKE OF AVATLABLE LANDS

"Sgc. 45. The President may at any time in his discretion transfer to the Secretary or the Corporation any right. Interest. or titie neld by the United States. and under the supervistion of the Secretary, in any land which the president shall find sultable for the purposes of this Act, and the secretary or the Corporation, as
the case may be, may use and disposs of such land tn ruch ner, and subject to such terms and conditions, es the Pr cetermines will best carry out the objectives of this Act.

## "TRANSMCHONS wLIE COPporarions

"SBC. 46. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize the making of any loan or the sale or other digpostion of reat property or any interest theretn, to any private corporation, forf freming purposes.

## "sumvers AND Exitiscti

 tigations, and research relsting to the condition and lactore sirecting, and the methods of accomplishing most entectively. the purposes of this Act, and may publish and difneminata informo tion pertinent to the vapious aspects of his sctivitien.

## 

"Stec. 48. The Becretary may provide for the pasment of any obligation or Indebtecinean to him under this Act under $s$ bytam of Variable payments uncer which euplus showe the sequired payment will be collected in periods of abovernormal prodtrition or prices and employed to reduce peymente below the required payment in pertodis of exblonarmal proctuction or prisen
"3nn-CF
agre. 49. No set-or shall be made against any pasment to be made by the Becretary to any person under the provirions of thit Act, by reason of any indebtedness of such perion to the United Etates, and no debt due to the gearetary under the providon af Etates, and no debt due to the secretary under the provisiona as United States, unless the Eecretary shall ind that arioh set-0if mill not adveriely aflect the objectives of this Act.

## craterios

"Sre. 60, (B) All property which is beting urtilited to entry out the purposes of titie I ar titie II of this Act (other thin property used solely for administrettive purposes) shall, notwith etanding that legal titio to such property remains in the Secretary or the Corporation, be abject to territion by the Btate. Teriticir. District, dependency, and political subdiviaion concerned, in the same manner and to the eame extent an other efmiler property is tared.
"(b) All property to which rubsection (s) of this rection is inepplicable whion it beld by the georetary of the Corpcretion pursuant to this Act shall be erempt trom all taretion now or after impoed by the United States or any State. Turritory, trict. dependemes. ar polltical subdivistom, but mothing in suboection shall be construed is afecting the suthortty or of the Becretary under any other lav to mins payments in of the becretary unger any other lsv to

## 2m AF Foveclonury

"Byc. 51. The Becretary is suthorised and empowered to bid for and purchase it any forectomure or other anle, or othernise to acqutre propertry pledged or mortgaged to socur any lown or other Indebtednes owing under this Act; to ecoppt titie to any property 00 purchaned of acqutred; to opernte or lence fuch property lor much pertod as may be deemed necensery or adFisable to protect the investment therein: gind to aill or othernise dirpoae of such property so purchased or acquired upon aueh tern and for such considerstions as the Secretary shall determine to be reasuch consideranoms bs the subject to the resarvation of the rights provided for sonablo. but
in rection 44.

## crasactios

Sac. 52. (a) Whoever matres any matarial repreantation. lanowing it to be false, for the purpoes of thriuenctig in any wry the action of the Corporation upon any applicition, edvence, discount, purchase. or repurchase agreement, contract of ale. lease. or loan. or any change or extenston of any of the ane by fex newal, deferment of sction or otherwise, or the ecceptance, re lease. or substitution of eacuitit therefor, shall be punished by a tine of not more than 85,000 or. by imprisonmant for ing more then two fears, or both.
"(b) Whoever, betag connected in any capacity with the Corpo ration. (1) emberites, abstracts, puriolns, or willinily minapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other thinge of vaiue. whether belonging to the Corporation or plediged ar othervise entrusted to It: or (2) with Intent to defraud the Corporation, or any other body politic or corporate. or any individun. or to docelve, any omcer. suditor. or eraminer of the Corporation, marson any false entry in any book report, or statement of, of to, the Corporation of draws any order, or issues, puts forth. or agaigns any note or other obligation of draft. mortgage, Judgment, or dearee thereof: other obligation of drait. mortgage, dudgment, or douse thereor:
or (3) with intent to defraud the Corporation. participates or of (3) with intent to dairaud the corporation pares in or receives directly or indtrectly any money, protit.
shares property. or benoth through any transaction, loan, commission contract. of any other act of the Corporation. shall be purished by a flne of not more than $\$ 10,000$ of by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.
"(c) Whoever williully shall conceal, remove, disposa convert to his own use or to that of another, any property gaged or pledged to, or held by. the Corporation, as eecur any obligation, shall be punished by a tne of not mare 36,000 or by imprisomment for not more than two yeare, or bobh.
(d) The provistons of sections 112, 113. 114. 115. 118, and 117 of the Criminal Code of the United Btatee (U. B. C. ttive 18. eecs. 202-207. inclusive). Lasofar as applicable. are extended to apply to contracts or agreements of the Corporation. which for the purposes hereof shall be held to inciude sdvances, loang disoontris purchase
and repurchase agreements, contracts of sale, and leases; extensions and renewals thereor: and acceptances, releases, and substi'ations of security therefor.
"(e) Whoever conspires with another to accomplish any of the
ts made unlawful by the preceding provisions of this section hall. on confiction thereor. be subject to the same flne or 1 m prisonment, or both. as is applicable in the case of conviction for doing such unlawful act.
'fres $\operatorname{AND}$ COMMISSIONS PROHTBITED
"Sec. 63. No Federal offcer. attorney. or employee shall. directly or indirectly. be the beneficiary of or recelve any lee. commisaion. gift. or other consideration for or in connection with any transaction or business under thls Act other than such salary, fee, or other compensation as he may receive as such oflcer, attorney. or employee. No member of a county committee estabilished under section 42 shall knowingly make or join in making any certification prohibited by section 2 (c). Any person violating any provision of this section shall. upon conviction thereof. be puaished by a Ane of not more than $\$ 1.000$ or imprisoned for not mare than one year. or both.
'EETEANSLON OF TEBEMORTES
"SEc. 54. The provirions of this Act shall extend to the Territortes of Alaska and Hawail and to Puerto Rico. In the case of Aisska and Puerto Rico the term "county" as used in this Act shall be deemed synongmous with the Territory, or ang subdivision thereof as may be deslgnated by the secretary, and payments under section 33 of this Act shall be made to the Governor of the Territory or to the flscal agent of such subdivision.
"SEPABABILTTT
"Sec. 55. If any provision of this Act. or the appllation thereof to any person or circumstances. is held invalld. the remainder of the Act, and the application of such provisions to other persons or circumstances, shail not be affected thereby.
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment to the title of the bill.

> J. R. Banericad.
> J. P. Pope.
> LiNin J. Frazien.
> Managers on the part of the Senate.
> Masvin Jones.
> Wacl Doxet.
> CuITORD R. Hops.
> Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the ;onsideration of the conference report?
Mr. McNARY. Mr. President. it was rather understood that general legislation would not be considered today. I have no objection to proceeding to the consideration of the conference report if it will not lead to debate.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will say to the Senator that if it leads to debate. I will promptly withdraw it.

Mr. MCNARY. I reserve the right to object later if it should lead to debate.
Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President. if the Senator from Alabama will yield to me. I should like to make a general statement.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yfeld.
Mr. BARKLEY. It was my understanding and the feeling of us all that there would be no legisiative business transacted today or tomorrow or at any time until after the funeral of our late beloved colleague. The Senator from Alabama has illness in his family and desires to go home. With the understanding that the conference report will lead to no discussion. and that there will be no objection to its consideration. I shall not object: but I should like to have it understood that my statement applies to any matter which may be brought before the Senate.

Mr. MCNARY. I made such a reservation. So I think we might go forward.
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.
The report was agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. President. it is with great reluctance that I ask unagimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 908. being Senate Joint Resolution 171. dealing with the Charles Carroll of Carroliton Bicentenary Commission. The joint resolution does not propose new legislation. FAn appropriation has been made and a commission has been created. but. due to the fact that some portraits have to come from Italy to Baltimore for exhibition there. and as the time limit is very short. the Commission is held upfin the most important part of its work. I ask unanimous
pnsent that the joint resolution may be considered at thif th ne.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?
ipere being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J/Res.
171) relating to the employment of personnel and e pendifures made by the Charles Carroll of Carrollton Bic htenary
Comndssion was considered, ordered to be engro sed for: a third rfading. read the thire time, and passed. as fllows:

Resolv d. etc. That for the purpose of carrying of its functions under th joint resolution of June 15, 1936, the Cfarles Carroll of Carrolltor Blcentenary Commission or the chairgan acting for the Commission, is authorized to Ax the compensay on of such offcers and emplosees as may be necessary without tegard to the provisions of ott er laws applicable to tise emplo, ment and compenssfion of omers and employee of the Unite States, and to determine its nedesary expenditures and the manner, in which they fhall be inculed, allowed. and pald. wit out regard to the proristons of any orner lawe governing the eppenditure of public funds; and be it furth:
Resolved. Th, the Commission authorized to borrow the services of empla fees from other $G$ vernment agenctes.
 CONFERHCE REPORT
Mr. COPBLANL Mr. Py-sident. I desire to ask unandmous consent for the in medigle consideration of the conference freport on the bill malrag appropriations for certain non. military activities of he War Department. May I do that now? I may say th there is no disagreement between the House and the Serad that has to do with as to any provision except one. and , a a mendment no. 15. That amendment relates to the pyy of fiv retired omcers of the Regular Army assigned to agave duty the United States Soldiers' Home. The questign was subm ted to the House. and the House disagreed to this amendm nt. I have talked with the chairman of the House commit ee. who says there is no use whatever in making any further attempt to obtain favorable actioy on that side. I th ink that is true. because. as a matker of fact. it was a controversial question in the committee.

Mr. KnNG. Mr. President, fill the Senator Field?
Mr. COPELAND. I gield.
Mr. KING. Is it pertinent th the propased legisiation to have included in it a provision for the salartes or increase of compensation of the officers rei rred to? Is that germane to the main purposes of the bill?

Mr. COPELLAND. Yes: because he bill makes appropriations for certain civil functions ad ministered by the War Department, and among such funct ons is the operation of the United States Soldiers' Home. It seems that flve retired officers of the Army are on duty there. They get thetr retired pay. They have quarters and subsistence. But at the same time personally I feel. and I think it is the feeling of all members of the Senate committee. that these men are on active duty. performing active servich and ought to be paid accordingly. Of course, they have cortain emoluments and certain privileges which they get. Ferhaps, in some degree. because of this service. The matter Fas discussed at some length in the conference committee. पhere was disagreement there. When the matter went to the Elowse. the House Members. with only three exceptions. va ed against it. Mr. WALSE. Mr. President. a parliamentar inquiry.
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator pill state it.
Mr. WAISH. The regular order of business now before the Senate is the presentation of petitions and nemorials. Many of us have bills to introduce and reports to mike. May I suggest that the Senator wait until morning busi ess shall have been disposed of?
mo. Mr. COPELAND. I shall be very glad to do that. I shall wait and take up the matter again after moraing bysness shall have been concluded.

COMOLERCLAL AIRPORT FOR TEE DISTRICT OF COLULDIA
The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Sens a letter from the chairman of the District of Columbia Alroprt Commission (Bon. WIILIAM H Engc. senior Senstor frcm Utah). submitting. pursuant to law. the report of the Cont mission concerning potential sites for commercial sirports is. and the establishment of a commercial airport for the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.
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## TITIE I - FARN TENANT PRNVISICNS

Section 1 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to farm tenants, farm laboreres, sharecroppers, etc., in the United States, Alaska, Yawaii, and Puerto Rico, for the acquisition of farms, each of sufficient size for a family to carry on successful farming.

Section 2 directs the County Committees established under section 42 of this Act to examine applications for loans and certify to the Secretary facts conserning the aplicants and the farms with respect to which applications are made, and prohibits any member of the Comittees from being interested in the farms financially.

Section 3 provides the following terms of loans: must be secured by first mortgage or deed of trust on the farm; interest rate, 3 percent; amortization schedules and form of instrunents to be prescribed by the Secretary; payment of taxes and insurance to be made by borrower. Also provides trat if the borrower disposes of the property without consent of the Secretary or if he fails to comply with the terms of the loan, the unpaid balance shall be immediately due and payable; prohibits acceptance of final payment or release of the Secretary's interest in the farm less than five gears after the making of the loan; and provides that section 75 of the bankruptcy act shall not apply to indebtedness incurred under this title until 15 percent of the loan has been repaid.

Section 4 provides that loans shall be distributed equitably among the States and Territories on the basis of farm population and the prevalence of tenancy.

Section 5 requires the Secretary to assist borrowers under this Act to become established on lards now in cultivation, so far as is practicable, in order to avoid expansion of procuction.

Section 6 authorizes appropriations of $\$ 10,000,000$ for the fiscal year 1938, $\$ 25,000,000$ for the fiscal year 1939, and $\$ 50,000,000$ for each fiscal year thereafter, to carry out the provisions of this title, and limits administrative expenses to 5 percent of the sums appropriated.

## TITLE II - REFABILTTATION LOANS

Section 21 authorizes the Secretary to make loans to farmers who cannot otherwise obtain credit, for periods of 5 years or less, renewable, for purchase of livestock, farm equipment, supplies, etc., and for refinancing indebtedness and for family subsistence, such loans to be secured by chattel mortgages, liens on crops, and assignments of proceeds from sale of agricultural products.

Section 22 authorizes the Secretary to assist in the voluntary adjustment of indebtedness between farm debtors and their creditors, without charge to either party, and also authorizes hill to continue to carry out undertakings with respect to farm debt adjustment uncompleted when appropriations for this section become available.

Section 23 authorizes the appropriation, for the fiscal year 1938, of the balances of funds available to the Resettlement Administration for loans and relief to farmers, unexpended on June 30, 1937, and authorizes the President to allot from relief and work relief funds additional sums for rehabilitation loans.

## TITIE III - RETIPENGNT OF SUBYARGINAL LaND

Section 31 directs the Secretary to develop a program of land conservation and utilization, including retirement of submarginal lands.

Section 32 authorizes the Secretary to acquire, protect, improve, develop, and adrinister submarginal land; to dispose of any property so acquired for public purposes, and authorizes the President to transfer such lands to other governmental agencies; to cooperate with other public agencies in developing plans for a program of land conservation and utilization; to conduct surveys and investigations relative to retirement of submarginal land; and to disseminate information concerning these activities.

Section 33 provides that the Secretary shall pay 25 percent of the revenues received from land acquired under this title to the county or counties in which the land is situated, for school and road purposes.

Section 34 authorizes an appropriation of $\$ 10,000,000$ for the fiscal year 1938 and $\$ 20,000,000$ for each of the fiscal years 1939 and 1940, to carry out the provisions of this title.

## TITLE IV - GETERAL PROVTSIONS

Sections 40 and 41 create the Farmers' Home Corporation as an agency of the Department of Agriculture, to which the Secretary may delegate powers conferred upon him by tris Act, the capital stock of which shall be subscribed by the Secretary. Place the management of the Corporation in a board of directors, composed of three employees of the Department of Agriculture designated by the Secretary, who may select, subject to the Secretary's approval, an administrator to be the executive officer of the Corporation with such power as the Board may confer upon him.

Section 42 dirests the Secretary to appoint in each county in which activities are to be carried on under Title I a county committee composed of three farmers residing in the county, at a salary of $\$ 3$ per day when actually employed, to perform duties imposed by this Act and such other duties as the Secretary may require of them.

Section 43 authorizes the completion and adrinistration of resettlement projects, rural rehabilitation projects, and land development and land utilization projects, for which funds have been allocated to the Resettlement Administration by the President, and authorizec the appropriation of balances of funds unexpended on June 30, 1937, for these purposes.

Section 44 provides that the disposition of any land acquired pursuant to this Act shall be subject to the reservation on behall of the mited States of at least trree-fourths of the interest of the United States in the minerals in or under such land.

Section 45 authorizes the President to transfer any public lands suitable for the purposes of this Act to the Corporation for such use and disposal as will best carry out the objectives of this Act.

Section 46 prohibits the raking of a loan or the sale of land to any private corporation for farming purposes.

Section 47 authorizes the Secretary to conduct surveys, investigations, and research relating to the purposes of this Act, and authorizes dissemination of information pertinent to the varfous aspects of his activities.

Section 48 authorizes the Secretary to provide a syster of variable payments on any loans made under this Act, so as to relieve emergencies in borrowers' finances.

Section 49 provides that no set-off shall be made against any payment to be made by the Secretary, and no debt due the Secretary shall be set off against any paynents owing by the United States, unless such set-off will not hinder the objectives of this Act.

Section 50 provides that all property which is being utilized to carry out title I or II shall be subject to taxation, other than property used for administrative purposes, but all other property held by the United States pursuant to this Act shall be tax-free.

Section 51 authorizes the Secretary to bid in at foreclosures or other sale any real or persional property which secures any loan made under this Act, and to operate, lease, or sell such property.

Section 52 provides penalties for certain acts, including false representation, embezzlement, fraud and theft.

Section 53 prohibits any Federal employee from taking fees or commissions in conrection with any transaction of business under this Act.

Section 54 extends the provisions of thets Act to Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

Narch 5, 1935
January 6, 1937

January 27, 1937
February 16, 1937

June 15, 1937

June 17, 1937

June 18, 1937

June 24, 1937

June 28, 1937

June 29, 1937
July 1, 1937
July 2, 1937
vuly 6, 1937
July 9, 1937

July 12, 1937
July 13, 1937
July 15, 1937
July 22, 1937

Yearings: Senate, S. 1800 - 74th Congress.
S. 106 was introduced by Senator Bankhead and was referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Print of the bill as introduced. (Companion bill).

Hearings: House, H. R. 8.
House Document 149. Report of the Special Committee on Farm Tenancy.

Senate Comittee reported S. 106 with amendments. Senate Report 732. Print of the bill as reported.

Amendments proposed by Senator $0^{\prime}$ Mahoney to S. 106. Prints of the amendments.
H. R. 7562 was introduced by Rep. Jones and was referred to the House Committee on Agriculture. Print of the bill as introduced.

House Committee reported P. R. 7562 without amendment. House Report 1065. Print of the bill as reported.

House Rules Gommittee reported H. Res. 261 for th consideration of H. R. 7562. House Report 1088. (No copy of the report). Print of the resolution as reported.

House debated and agreed to H. Res. 261. Print of H. Pes. 261 as agreed to.

Youse debated and passed H. R. 7562 with amendent.
Senate debated S. 106.
Senate debated and passed S. 106 with amendment. Action on S. 106 indefinitely postponed in lieu of F. R. 7562.

Senate Conferees appointed.
House Conferees appointed.
Print of H. R. 7562 with the amendments of the Senate.

Conference Feport svbmitted. House Rept. 1198.

- House agreed to the Conference Report.

Senate agreed to the Conference Report.
Approved. Public Law 210.
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## APPENDIX J

## CHAPTER 33—FARM TENANCY

1000. Short title

SUBCHAPTER I-TENANT, PURCHASE LOANS AND MORTGAGE INSURANCE

1001 to 1006. Reprealed.
1006a. Loans to homestead or desertland entrymen and purchasera of lands in reclamation projects: security: first repay ment inatallment.
1006b. Cancellation of entry or purchase upun loan default: entry
ur resale: condiliuns: satinfaction of indebtedness.
1006c to loote. Repented.

## SUMCHAPTER H GIFERATING I.OANS

1007. Repealed

1007w. Omitted
1008, 1009. Repealed.
SHBC'IlAITTER III I.AND (ONSERVATION ANI LAND UTIL.IZATION
1010. Land cunservation and land utilization.
1010. Land cunservation and land utilization.
101tia, Suil. water and reluted arsuor'ce data: repurt
1011. Powiers of Sicretais of Axriculture.
1011. Powirs of Secretary o
1032. Paymelits to
1013. Omitted.

1013a Benefita extended to I'urrtu Riro and Virgin Islands: coun dufined: payments to Governor or fiscal agent of county.

SUBCHIAPTER IV-GENERAL PROVISIONS
$8 \mathbf{8 e c}$.
1014 to 1029. Repealed.
1030. Consolidation of agricultural credit and service offices. 1030. Consoneyance uf mineral rights with land
1032. Tiansfer uf rights and duties of Reconstruction Finance Cor 032. Tiansfer uf rights and duties of Recitation and farm tenancy poration arising out of resury.
033. Sale of reserved mineral interesit.
0.34. Persons to whom mineral inturestaration: transfer of unsold 0135. Sile of mineral interests: condior. interest.
10:16. Repealed.
1037. Rexulations: delegatiuns of authority.
1038. Rixula filug purchase applirations.
1139. Time for flime Adnimistration funds account

## 1000. Short titie

 012 and 1013 tu lu29 of this title may be cited as "The Bankhead Junes Farm Tenant Art",
July 22. 1:3:77, c. 517, 50 Stat. 522

## Historical Note







 hurtioage insurance

## IHatorical Note


§§ 1001 to 1006. Repealed. Pub.L. 87-128, Title 111, \& 941(a), Aug. 8, 1961, 75 Slat. 318

IHztorical Note




7 § 1009

 "unler seillum 1021 of thit titie.
Miffective Date of Hepral. Itejo-nl if Sendunn rejrealed effertive Oitt. 15. 1001,




SUBCHAPTER III - LAND CONSERVATION AND LAND UTILIZATION
§ 1010. Land conservation and land utilization
The Secretary is authorized and dirccted to develop a program of land conservation and land utilization. in order thereby to eorrect maladjustments in land use, and thus assist in controlling soil erosion. reforestation. preserving natural resources, protecting fish and wildife, developing and protecting recreational facilities, mitigating floods, preventing impairment of dams and reservoirs, conserving surface and subsurface moisture, protecting the watersheds of navigable streams, and potecting the public lands, health, safety, and welfare but not to builil industrial parks or establish private industrial or commercial enterprises.
July 22. 19inc. c. 617. Title III. § 31. 50 Stat. 625 : Sept. 27. 1962, Pub.L. 87-703, Title I, \$ 102(4). 76 Stat. 607: Nov. 8, 1966. Pub.L. 89-796. \& 1 (a). 80 Stat. 1478.

Repealy
Section repealed by Pub.L. 96-579, Title VII, § 706(a). Oct. 21, 1976. 90 Stat. 2793, effective on and after Oct. 21, 1976, insofar us applicable to the issuance of rights-of-way over. upon, undrr, and through the public lands and lands in the National Forest Sustem.

Hlatoricat Nute
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Ch. 33
 aection 710 et eeq. of Title 15. Connurerce asction 700(a) of Pub.I. O4-579. except na and Trade, ware tranuferred to the Fed. pertalalng to righta-of.way. not to be
eral Inapector fur the Alaska Natural copatrued an affecting the authority of Ga Trapaportation ty alcai effective July the gecretary uf Agriculture under ihita 1. 1679, unilt the firnt annliternary of the mectlon. mee mote under section 1701 of date of Initial uperallun uf the Alanka Title 43. Public Janda. Natural Gaa Tranaturtatlun Hyotem, pur.
 1070 Jteorg.IJan Nu, 1. Jume 12, 1070. it lary and purpome of Jult. I.. 87-703, nen
 Organlaatlun and Employes.

Library Reference:
C.J.N. Axrbultury is

Agrivitury.
(J.J.s. Fublle liandia a pt mey.

Notes of Decislons
Acyuifititua of leade $t$
Cesntitutiomaltty
$\qquad$

1. Conotltutlonallty

Tbla meitlon and moriting iuts are thut uncomatifutlunal an a driegnilow of "teg. conferred la "adiuluintralice authourtiy
 Auree uf laniol ln Willaminnin cuonty, di. C $111.1040,32$ F.Sujp. 55.
(t. Aenuigition of iende

The aryulisition liy the United Staten of renietertea within the Crab tircherd Creek
lie hodlee therefrom, are neceeanry to "rurrect malalfuntiment in land use'
 1041), 32 E. Soupt. 35.

That landa arcemanry ta rurrert mani uljumbinent lin innd une are remeterlisu and are alreasy deviten to a publho une
in no difense to rondetanatlun bruceed.

Ingn l.y the Lullod Statos. Id
§ 1010a. Soll, water and related resource data; report
In recognition of the intreasing need for soil, water, and rulated resource data for land conservation. use. and development. for guidance of community development for a balanced rural-urban growth. for identification of prime agriculture producing artas that should be proterten. and for use in protecting the quality of the environment, the Selretary of Agribulture is directed to rary wit al latil inventory and monitoring propram to include. but not be limitud to. studies and surveys of erosion and sediment damages, flood plain identification and utilization. land use changes and trenda. and deg. ratlation of the environinent resultiog from improper use of soil, water, und refated rissourirs. This Secretary shall issue at ut tess than five-year iutervals a land inventory report riflectiag soil, water, and related resource conditions.
Pub.L. 92-419. Title IIt, § 302. Aug. 30. 1972. 86 Stat. 670.
Historical Note




## Library References

Agricuthure ©
§ 1011. Powers of Siecretary of Agriculture
To effectuate the prandan provided for in section 1010 of this $t i-$ le, the Secretary is authorizell-
 Stat. 607.
(b) To irotect improve develop. and administer any property so arquired and to construct such structures the reon as muy be neces sary to adapt it to its most heneficial use
(c) To sell. exchange, Icasce or otherwine disposc of with or with. out a consideration, any propurty so arquired. under such terms and conditions as he deems will best accomplish the purposes of this subehapter. but may salle, exihanke. ar primit shali he made only to public authoritics and agencies and only on condition that the property is used for public purposes: fropided. hawerer. That an exchange may te made with private owners and with suladivisions or change may he made with private owners and with sulativisions on agencies of Stute sotcramenty in :uny case where the Secretary of Agriculture finds that surh exchange would not conflict with the: purposes of the Art. and that the valur of the groperty received in exchange is substantiafly equal to that of the jroperty conveycd. The Secictary may recunmenal to the: President other Federal. State. or Territorial agencics to administer surh profierty. together with the conditions of use and administration which will best serve the purposes of almadernacrvation and land-utilization prograna. and the President is autharizad to trassfar such moperts to such agencies.
(d) With respert to any land, or any interest therein, acquired hy. or transferred to, the secretary for the purposes of this subehapter. to make dedications or krunts. in his discretion. for any public purpose, and to grant licinses und casemants upon such terms as he. deems reasonable.
(c) To coopreate with Foleral. State territarial, and other pullic gencies and locil wonkort ink itizalions in devcloping plans program of hand conscrvation antil land utilization or plans for the conservation. ilevelopment, and utilization of witer for aquacultural purposes, to assist in carrymg out such plans by means of loans to State and local pablic agemeites and local nomprofit organizations designated hy the State legishature or the Governor, to conduct surreys and investig:itions relitime to conditions and factors affecting. and the methods of arcomplishing must effectively the purposes of this subehapter: und to disseminate information concerning these

510
activities. As used in this subsection. the term "aquaculture" means the culture or husbundry of aquatic animals or plants. Loans to State and local public agencies and to local nonprofit or ganizations shall be made only if such plans have been submitted to and not disapproved within 45 days by, the state agency having su pervisory reabonsibility over such plans, or by the Governor if there no such State agencs: No appropriation shall be made for any single loan under this subsection in excess of $\mathbf{\$ 5 0 0 . 0 0 0}$ unless such loan has heen approved by resulutions adopted by the Committec on Agriculture. Nutrition, und Forestry of the Senate and the Comnit tee on Agriculture of the Nousc of Representatives. Loans under this subsection shall le made under contracts which will provide under such terma and conditions as the Secretary deems appropri ate. for the repayment thereof in not more than 30 years, with inter est st the average rate. as determined by the Secretary of the Trea sury, payable by the Trcasury on its marketable pulatic obligations outstanding at the bexinning of the fiseal year in which the loan is made which are ucither due nor callable for redemption for is ycars from date of isuc Repuymen of princiual and interest on such louns thall herin wilhin 5 ycars U providing asgistance for earrying sut paus gevelun ycars. shall le authorized ta lurar such proportionatie shar: of the couts of instulling auy worky uf improvemeut auphicable to public water hased fieh und willifu ur ererational development as is determine ley him to le culit ble in cersider yne to rized for unce autharized for similia purposes under other Federal jrograms: Providid, That all cminecrim and other lechical ansistance cost vided further That when state ber public usency or loul cidernit or, ital wer "onkroft ongmintion participations in "phin developed under this oubchancer agrecs to oncrate and mainain any reservo or othe arca inchuded in a mian for hublic water-based fish and wildife or recreational developmen, the sccretais shall be authorized to brar not to exceed onc-half of the conts of (a) the land cascments. or rights-of-way acquired or to be acquired by the state or other pub lic agency or local nonjirofit organization for such reservoir or oth er area, and (b) minimum basic fucilities needed for public health and safety, access to. and use of such reservoir or other area for such purposes: Provided further, That in no event shall the Secritary share any portion of the cost of installing more than one such work of improvement for euch seventy-five thousand acres in any project: and that any such pullic water-bused fish and wildtifc or recreational developnient shall be consistent with any existing comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation slan found adequate for purposes of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965: and that such cost-sharing assistance for any such developunent shall be autherized only if the secretary determines that it cannot be provided under ot her existing authority.



#### Abstract

7 § 1012 FARM TENANCY Ch. 33 amount to be paid shall be divided equitably among the respective counties. Payments to counties under this section shall be made on the condition that they are used for achool or road purposes, or both. This section shall not be construed to apply to amounts received from the sale of land Juty 22, 1937, c. 617. Title III, § 33, 50 Stat. 526.

\section*{Repeals}

Section repealed by Pub.L. 94-579, Title VII, § 706(a), Oct. 21. 1976, 90 Stat. 2793, effective on and after Oct. 21, 1976 insofar as applicable to the issuance of rightsofiway over upon, under. and through the public lands and lands in the National Forest System.

\section*{Hibtorical Note}     
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## § 1012a. Townsites

When the Secretary of Agriculture determines that a tract of Na , tional Forest System land in Alaska or in the eleven contiguous Western Statcs is located adjacent to or contiguous to an estab. lished community, and that transfer of such land would serve indigenous community objectives that outweish the public objectives and enous community objectives that outweikh the publk object and values which would be served by maintaining such tract in Federal ownership, he may. upon application, set asside and designale as a townite an area of nol to exceed six hundred and forly acres of Na tional Forest System land for any one application. After public notice. and satisfactory showing of need therefor by any county. city, or other local goverumental subdivision. the Secretary may offer such area for sale to a governmental subdivion at a price not less than the fair market value thereof. Provid, however, That the Secretary may condition conveyances of townsites upon the enactment. maintenance, and enforcement of a valid ordinance which assures any land so conveyed will be controlied by the governmental subdivision so that use of the area will not interfere with the protection, management. and development of adjacent or contiguous National Forest System lands.
Pub.L. 85-569, July 31, 1958, 72 Stat. 438; Pub.L. 94-679. Title II. § 213. Oct. 21, 1976, 90 Stat. 2760.

Ch. 33
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## 1013. Onitted

## Illstorical Note



§ 1013a. Benefits extended to Puerto Kico and Virgin Is lands; county defined; payments to Governor or fiscal agent of county
The provisions of this subehapter shall ext.ad to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Istands. In the case of Alaska. Pucrto Rico, and the Virgin lalauds the torin "county" at uned in this subchapter may bir the cutire arca, or any andidision thereof as nay be determined by the Secretacy, and payments under section 1012 of this title shall be the secretary. and payments under wector of such subdivision.
July 22. 1937. c. 517. Title III, §35. as added Aug. 8. 1961. Pul, it 87-128, Title III. \& 342, 75 Stat. 318

## uistorical Note





# UNITED STATES CODE ANNOTATED 

Title 7<br>Agriculture<br>§§ 281 to 1099

1997
Cumulative Annual Pocket Part

Replacing 1996 pocket part in hack of 1980 bound volume


WEST PUBLISHIING CO.
St. PAUL. MINN.



## APPENDIX K

PART 213-ADMINISTRATION OF LANDS UNDER TITLE III OF THE BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT BANKHEAD BY THE FOREST SERVICE

Sec.
213.1 Deaigaacion. administrazion. a
velopment of Natlonal Grassiands.
2 Authomity for Chief. Forest Service. to 213.2 Authority for Chief. Forest anal grast group.
lands.

## Forest Service. USDA

213.3 Protection. occupancy. use. adminisarition. and exercise of reservations
213.4 Fitor rules and resulacions supersadod.
AUMFORYY: 50 Stet. 52s. as amended: 1 J.S.C. 1010-1012

## $\$ 218.1$ Desifonation adminintration and development of National Grame

 lands.(a) The land utilization projects administered by Department of Agriculture designated in parastaph (e) of this section hereafter shall be named and referred to as National Grasslands.
(b) The National Grassiands shall be a part of the National Forest system and permanently held by the Department of Agriculture for admindstration under the provisions and purposes of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.
(c) The National Grasslands shail be administered under sound and progresdive princtpies of land conservation and multiple use. and to promote development of grassland asticulture and sus-tained-yleid management of the forage. ash and wildife. timber. water and recreational resources in the areas of which the National Grasslands are a part.
(d) In the administration of the Na Honal Grasslands the resources shall be managed so as to maintain and 1 m prove soll and vegetative cover. and to demonstrate sound and practical principlet of land use for the areas in which they are located. The Chief of the Forest Service shall. to the extent such action is reasible provide that policies for management of the Federally-owned lands exert a favorable influence for securisg sound land conservation practices on associated private lands.
(e) National Grasaiands in the following States and counties are hereby crouped and designated as indicated:

| an to whith grestthe is toctud | Metiona Cratianc | Countras whert iocated |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Buthe Valkey | Sishivou. |
|  | Pemane ....... | Wend. |
|  | Comenene | Beca. Los Anmata Otero. |
|  | Cutave ........ | Oneial Power. |
|  | Cimmaron ..... | Mornor. Stevens. |
|  | Cotate ......... | Damer. Sioun. |
| Nem limies ...........- | Kiowe . ......... | Coltax. Hacing. Mort Union. |
| Datera ........... | Ceder River | Grant. Sioux. |

$\$ 213.3$

| Stue in which greser land at toctuen | Nationed gramend | Countes where 10 cand |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Okianoma $\qquad$ Odianome-Textas...... Oreon |  | Biminger Golden Vor mey. Mcxenze. Sloce |
|  |  | Cimeron. |
|  | Enant kewe | Proper Mils (Chde). Hempow (Texa) |
|  | Cructud | Sthargen. |
| Soun Ontrox momernemer | Euthores | Custer. Fell Finer. Jackion. Purr ningion. |
|  | Grand five | Corgon. Peotiong Zunech. |
|  | Fent Plare | Jonese bymen Sty Wy. |
| Teres ...enomonemane | Lynden 8. Johnten. | Monteque. Wiat |
|  | Cento........ | Ferrin. |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Nocianen } \\ & \text { Cruet. } \end{aligned}$ | Gray. |
| Whorting ...neneremen | Trunder Batin. | Conporan, Converse. Croak, Nioterme. Weeton. |

[25 FR 5945. Junc 24. 1980, as amonded at 27 FR 12217. Dec. 11. 1902: 28 FR 6288. Junc 19. 1963: 41 FR 38164. Sept. 9. 1976: 56 FR 8280. Feb. 28. 1991]

S218.2 Authority for Chief Forest Service, to croup, define, and rame nationel gramalaids.
The Chlef. Forest Service. is authorlzed to group the national grasslands into administrative units. deflne. change or modify their boundaries. and to provide such speciflc desigaations therefor as he flnds necessary and desirable for effective and economical administration thereof and for public and official reference thereto
[33 FR 12370. Sept. 4. 1968)
$\$ 213.3$ Protection, occupancy, uke, adminintration and exercise of reservationa
(a) The rules and regulations applicable to the national forests as set forth In title 36. Code of Federal Regulations. or as hereafter amended. supplemented. or promulgated. are hereby adopted as the rules and regulations to govern the exercise of reservations in conveyances to the Uaited States and to prevent trespasses on and otherwise regulate the protection. use. occupancy. and administration of the National Grasslands and all other lands administered by the Forest Service under the provislons of title III of the Banishead-Jones

## $\$ 213.4$

Farm Tenant Act insofar as is practical and consistent with said act: Provided. That Forest Service ofncers may continue under delegated authority to acquire lands. to make exchanges. to crant easements and enter into leases. permits. agreements. contracts and memorande of understanding involving such lands under such terms and conditions and for such consideration. fees or rentals as authorized by title III of the said Act.
(b) Exdsting valld rights, reservations easements. leases. permits. agreements. contracts and memorands of understanding affecting these lands shaul continue in full force and effect so long as they remain valid in accordance with the terms thereof.
[27 FR 9217. Sept. 18. 1962]
8215.4 Prior rules and regulations auperseded.
Except as provided in \$213.3, the rules and regulations heretofore issued for the land utilization projects are hereby superseded as to all such projects administered by the Forest Service, but not as to such project lands administered by other agencies.
(27 FR 9217. Sept. 18. 1967]

## APPENDIX L

## 

| T0: | William L. Evans, Director Range Management Division Forest Service |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Attention: Bob Williamson |
| FROM: | James P. Perry <br> Deputy assistant Cenerinidounsel <br> Natural Resources Division |
| StejECT: | Description of Legal Relationship Between Grazing Associations and the Forest Service |

Pursuant to your request, we have looked at the responsibilities of grazing associations and the Forest Service in an effort to state a general legal description of that relationship. Our description is only a generalization and does not purport to cover specific agreements. Each agreement betwe the Forest Service and an association is different as are each association's constitution, bylaws and rules of management. State laws under which associations are organized also vary.

The associations are organized under state laws of incorporation and/or cooperatives. The corporation is a separate legal entity from its members who have limited liability for corporate debts and obligations. Management and control is centralized in the hands of the board of directors and officers. Officers and directors are subject to certain fiduciary duties and responsibilities owed to the corporate entity and the members. Generally, these fiduciary duties include a duty of due care by which the directors are expected to exercise good business judgment and to use ordinary care and prudence in management, a duty of loyalty whereby the officer camot personally profit at the expense of the corporation (an unfair, personal transaction with the corporation profiting an officer can be held void in certain situations) and a duty to protect the interests of the other intracorporate parties. Limits on authority of directors and officers are usually specified in the articles of incorporation and bylaws.

State statutes grant broad powers to corporations and the corporate powers may be explained or limited by the articles of incorporation. Most jurisdictions recognize that corporations enjoy implied powers to do all things reasonably necessary to carry out their stated business purposes. All jurisdictions recognize the corporate power to sue and be sued in its corporate name.

For a grazing association to be recognized by the Forest Service and eligible to sign a grazing agreement, basic requirements must be met.
 grazi.: $\because$ : $\because$ : off:cers., iher inar the Secretary and Treasurer must be grazing on the invol:ec: :ange aliotment(s), officers must be elected by a majority of the assccinsion memers or by a specified quorm and the association must be governec by a constitution and bylaws acceptable to and approved by the Forest Supervisor.

The document signed by the authorized association officer and the Forest Supervisor is generally called a grazing and management agreement. This document essentially constitutes a grazing permit from the Forest Service to the associa:ion as to National Forest System lands within the pertinent allotrent $(\mathrm{s})$. Dy joining overall management of adjacent public and privat grazing lands, more efficient and sound resource management is intended to result. Pursuant to the agreement, the association assumes responsibility for various administrative and management duties for the allotment(s). liembers are issued permits from the association and not from the Forest Service. Permits issued by the association to individuals cannot exceed the tarm. period of the agreement between the Forest Service and the association.

A menber's grievances must be addressed through the association and pursuant to remedies provided by state law. The members do have a remedy as a group under federal regulations analogous to shareholder remedies under state corparate law in that the Forest Supervisor may withdraw recognition of the association, which would mullify the agreement, where a majority of the association grazing permittees or menbers request that the association be dissolved. See 36 C.F.R. § $222.7(a)(4)$. Recognition may also be withdrawn where the association becomes inactive and does not mee in annual or special meetings during a consecutive two-year period.

In turn, grievances of the Forest Service with members must be addressed through the association, the entity with which the Forest Service has a legal relationship. If a member's actions which are of concern violate $t$ agrement between the Forest Service and the association, the association may be considered in violation of its agreement if it has not acted. The specific responsibilities and rights of the Forest Service and associatic are those outlined by the parties in the grazing and management agreement Under this agreement between the Forest Service and the association, fins authority for any use of National Forest System lands involved in the agreement rests with the Forest Service.

The details of a specific grazing association arrangement can be found i several documents. The Articles of Incorporation are legal authorizatio to form a grazing association pursuant to state law. Articles of Incorporation usually contain the corporate name, the association purpos and powers, duration, structure, place of business, and registered agent The bylaws generally state how meetings will be called, membership fees, and the election, campensation, and authority of directors and of ficers. In addition, the association nomally writes association policies to cor more detail on office procechures, standing carmittees and so forth.

Specific information on the legal relationship with the Forest Service found in the Grazing and Management Agreement. The agreement states th
purpose and objectives of the agreement. the responsibilities of the Forest Service and the association, the joint Forest Service and association responsibilities. the term of the agreement and provisions for termination and amendment. Each agreement provides that the agreement is subject to all rules and regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture and the agreement may be revoked or suspended for noncampliance. The agreement also contains. the mutually agreed upon rules of management by which all association controlled lands are operated. Additional Forest Service policy on grazing agreements may be found in Part 2237 of the Forest Service Manual. (FSM). Under the decentralized organization of the Forest Service, internal direction for Forest Service personnel is published in a national Forest Service Manual with more specific guidelines published by each of the ten regional offices as to forests within that particular region.

In summary, two separate legal relationships exist under the management tool of grazing and management agreements with recognized associations. The relationship between the Forest Service and the association has separate and distinct responsibilities and duties. Complementary but distinct from this relationship is the relationship between the association and its individual members with its accompanying responsibilities and duties.

C:
R. Mbore
J. Perry
R. Fowler

Opin. Eile
chron. file

OCC:NRD: RDMDOre: 1 g 1/21/83

October 4. 1995

1. What is a "National Forest System unit?"
A. A "National Forest System unit" as that term is used in Section 504 (a) ; is an administrative unit of the National Forest System (NFS) which is governed by a land and resource management plan (LRMP). 36 CFR 219.4 (b) (3)
2. When will the allotment analysis schedules be issued?
A. The allotment analysis schedules will be issued by December 31, 1995.
3. How many schedules will be required?
A. One schedule is required for each NFS unit where allotments exist which require National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analysis. These schedules will be stand alone documents.
4. Must each schedule be identical or similar in their handling of allotments or the time frame in which the NEPA analysis must be completed?
A. By December 31, 1995, schedules for all allotments needing NEPA must be issued. NEPA must be completed on all allotments listed on the schedules within 15 years. This is a maximum time period. The actual length of the schedule could be shorter, depending on the number and complexity of analyses that need to be completed. This does not necessarily mean that the schedules will disappear in 15 years. Allotments will be added to the schedule in the future if conditions change to the extent that a new analysis is needed. The schedules will provide that not more than 20 percent of the allotments on them undergo NEPA analysis and decisions through September 30. 1996. The schedules will list allotments, in priority order, by 3 year periods, that is 1996-98, 1999-2001, and so on.
5. Why 3 year periods instead of yearly?

The schedule needs to provide for some annual variation, which is not predictable at this time, for differences in the complexity of the inventory, analysis, and decisionmaking process for each allotment.
6. How does the Forest Service interpret which allotments need NEPA?
A. NEPA is needed if: there is no existing completed NEPA analysis; the permit terms and conditions are being implemented yet monitoring indicates that Forest Plan or an existing NEPA decision requirements are not being met; monitoring indicates that vegetation trend is not moving toward or meeting the described desired condition in the Forest Plan or existing NEPA decision; analyses required under the Endangered Species Act. National Historic Preservation Act, Clean Water Act, or other relevant environmental
laws are needed; or a proposal is made to change the authorized grazing activity from that covered by an existing NEPA anaiysis.
7. How is the schedule affected by permit expirations and waivers?
A. The schedule should include all allotments needing NEPA, thus a permit expiration or waiver should not affect the schedule unless an applicant for a new permit proposes changes from an expiring or waived permit that are outside the existing NEPA analysis. Then the allotment would be added to the schedule. Changes proposed by an applicant that are outside the scope of existing analysis could not be implemented until a new analysis is completed.
8. Will allotments undergoing NEPA analysis as of the date of issuance of the schedule (no later than December 31, 1995) be included on the schedule?
A. Yes, as discussed in \#6 above, an allotment is in need of NEPA analysis until such time as the associated analysis and decision has been completed. As discussed in \#18 below, the NEPA analysis for a given allotment is completed when there is final agency action. Thus, if the NEPA process for a given allotment(s) has been initiated but there has been no final agency action as of the date on which the schedule is issued, but no later than December 31, 1995, the allotment(s) must go on the schedule regardless of how far the agency has gone in the NEPA process.
9. Should allotments be included on the schedule if the NEPA analysis was completed after the date of enactment of the Rescission Act (July 27. 1995 but before the date of issuance of the schedule (no later than December 3 1995)?
A. Strictly speaking, allotments should only be listed on the schedule if they need NEPA analysis. If the NEPA analysis for a given allotment(s) was completed prior to the date of issuance of the schedule, further NEPA analysis on that allotment(s) is not needed and it should not be included on the schedule. However, allotments for which the completion dates of the NEPA analysis occurred between the date of enactment of the Rescission Act and the date of establishment of the schedule must be identified for purposes of calculating the 20 percent cap on completion of NEPA analyses through FY 1996 that is specified in the Rescission Act.

If a unit has one or more allotments that fall into the latter category, it would be appropriate to develop a schedule that lists the allotments for which NEPA analysis is needed as of the date of issuance of the schedule and include a footnote, asterisk or some other notation identifying those allotments where the NEPA analysis was completed between July 27 and December 31, 1995. The notation would specify that these allotments. although no longer needing NEPA analysis, will be used to calculate the 20 percent cap on NEPA analyses through fiscal year 1996.
10. Who approves the schedules?
A. The Forest Supervisor will approve the schedule.
11. May a schedule be amended?
A. Yes. However, once the schedule is established, any amendments to it should be made judiciously in light of the Section 504 (a) requirement that the Forest Service "adhere" to its schedule.
12. Must the schedule be published in the Federal Register for notice and comment?
A. No.
13. Is this schedule available to the public?
A. Yes.
14. Will the schedules be subject to administrative appeal?
A. No. The establishment of a schedule and the priorities for completing NEPA analysis under 504 (a) are not appealable under current Forest Service regulations. 36 CFR 215,217 , or 251.
15. Could the Forest Service be held liable under the Administrative Procedures Act (APA) for violating Section $504(\mathrm{a})$ based solely upon the establishment of schedules?
A. No. unless the schedule exceeded the 20 percent limit on completing NEPA analysis and decisions through fiscal year 1996. The schedules required under Section 504 (a) are agency actions "committed to agency discretion by law" and thus not reviewable under the APA.
16. Must we complete NEPA analysis for 20 percent of the allotments for each National Forest System unit by the end of fiscal year 1996?
A. No. The 20 percent figure is an upper limit through September 30, 1996. As of October 1, 1996, there is no limitation on the number or analyses or decisions that can be completed in one year, except as provided in the units' schedules.
17. When do the provisions of Section 504 expire?
A. Section 504 does not contain an expiration date and will apply until it is repealed or amended, except as noted in question 16 .
18. When is the NEPA analysis and decision completed for purposes of Section 504?
A. There are repeated references in Section 504 to the "completion" of NEPA analysis and decisions. The NEPA analysis and decision is completed for the purposes of Section 504 when the agency has finished all administrative action related to the decision on whether or not to authorize grazing on a given allotment. Thus, a completed NEPA analysis and decision is equivalent to final agency action and would include not only the issuance of the decision document but also the exhaustion of any administrative appeals related to that decision document.
19. If a term grazing permit expires or is waived prior to the completion of the scheduled NEPA analysis, what terms and conditions will be included in the new terI grazing permit?
A. Section 504 (b) specifically states that the agency is to issue a new permit "on the same terms and conditions and for the full term of the expired or waived permit." The new permits would include any modifications currently included in parts 1,2 , or 3 of the permit including the allotment management plan and annual operating plan. Suspensions and or cancellations would be part of the new permit.
20. May the terms and conditions in a new term grazing permit issued pursuant to Section 504(b) include standards and guidelines from the applicable forest plan if those standards and guidelines were not included in the expired or waived permit? If the forest plan is amended to include new standards and guidelines after the issuance of a new term permit subject Section 504 (b), could the terms and conditions of such a permit be changed to include the new standards and guidelines? What about other changes brought about by compliance with other laws such as ESA, CWA, and NHPA?
A. All existing permits contain a clause stating, "This permit can also be cancelled, in whole or in part, or otherwise modified, at any time during the term to conform with needed changes brought about by law. regulation, Executive order, allotment management plans, land management planning, numbers permitted or seasons of use necessary because of resource conditions, or the lands described otherwise being available for grazing." Consequently, the terms and conditions of expiring permits and new permits issued on those same terms and conditions are, on their face, subject to modification to correspond with, among other things, changes brought about by amendments to the Forest Plan, a Biological Opinion, State water quality requirements, or implementation of National Historic Preservation Act requirements.
21. May a term grazing permit, issued pursuant to Section 504 , be cancelled, suspended or modified in response to resource conditions or violations of permit terms and conditions prior to the completion of the scneduled NEPA analysis?
A. Yes. The Forest Service is authorized to take action against any grazing permit issued pursuant to Section 504, to cancel, suspend, or modify in accordance with the provisions of 36 CFR 222.4 where resource conditions warrant or for violations of the terms and conditions.
22. Following the completion of the scheduled NEPA analysis, may the Forest Service cancel the new term grazing permit and refuse to issue another one based on the results of the NEPA analysis?
A. Yes. The key feature of Section 504 (b) is that the grazing activity may be made to conform with the signed decision associated with the completed NEPA analysis. Consequently, if that analysis and decision indicate that grazing should be temporarily or permanently discontinued, the agency must be able to implement the decision by terminating the permit.
23. Is the January 1995 strategy for evaluating allotments still valid?
A. Yes, the strategy is still valid to the extent that it can be reconciled with the provisions of Section 504 of the Rescission Act. In both cases, the environmental effects of the proposed actions are related to the allotment and are resource based. In the first case where NEPA is focused on permit issuance, new permits should be issued in conformance with the NEPA analyses and decisions. Further analyses would not be needed for those allotments until monitoring, new information, or changed conditions indicate the need for new analyses or the allotment is to undergo analysis pursuant to the schedule required by Section 504. In the second case, the analyses for allotments required under Section 504 should focus on environmental effects of the appropriate proposed action(s).
24. May units continue to "group" allotments for the purpose of analyzing the grazing activity pursuant to NEPA and other applicable laws?
A. Yes. With the exception of the 20 percent cap through fiscal year 1996, there is nothing in Section 504 which would preclude units from following this practice which was recognized in the January 1995 strategy.
25. What should the Forest Service do if a permittee submits an application for a grazing permit which has expired, and requests a new permit in accordance with Section 504?
A. As instructed in a August 8, 1995, letter to the Regional Foresters. issue a new permit for the same term, and with the same terms and conditions as the expired permit, if the sole reason that a new permit has not been issued is because the analysis required by NEPA and other applicable laws has not been completed.
26. What should be the duration of a new permit issued under Section 504 (b) resulting from a waiver?
A. The term of the new permit should be the same as the term of the waived permit.

## APPENDIX M

| Urited States | Forest | Washington | 14th \& Independence SW |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Department of | Service | Office | P.O.Box 96090 |
| Agriculture |  |  | washington. DC 20090-6090 |

File Code: 1510
Date: October 4, 1995
Route To : 2230

Subject: P.L. 104-19, Section 504

To: Regional Foresters, Regions 1 through 9

REPLY DUE DECEMBER 31, 1995

The 1995 Rescission Bill became law (Public Law 104-19) on July 27, 1995. Section 504 of Public Law 104-19 addresses allotment analysis, grazing permit issuance, and compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Preliminary advice for implementing Section 504 and a copy of the text of Section 504 was provided in my August 8, 1995, letter (see enclosed General Provisions). The enclosed "Questions and Answers" provide additional guidance. We anticipate completing amendments to the directive system in the near future.

Section 504 requires that each National Forest System unit develop and adhere to a schedule for completing NEPA analysis on all allotments where NEPA analysis is needed. These schedules will be issued by the responsible Forest Supervisor and are due in the Washington Office by December 31, 1995.

NEPA must be completed on all allotments listed on the schedules within 15 years. The actual length of the schedule could be shorter. depending on the number and complexity of analyses that need to be completed. Section 504 specifically prohibits the agency from completing the analyses and decisions on more than 20 percent of the allotments listed on the schedule on or before September 30, 1996. There are no such limitations in Section 504 regarding the completion of analyses and decisions after September 30, 1996.

The schedules will list allotments, in priority order, by 3 year periods. To the extent practicable, in establishing the schedules the units should take into account existing and anticipated budgets and other factors that may have a bearing on the units' ability to adhere to the schedule.

As stated in my August 8. 1995. letter, the following applies to any term grazing permit which has expired, or has been waived, and a new term permit has not been issued solely because the analysis required by NEPA and other applicable laws has not been completed:

You are to issue a new term grazing permit under the same terms and conditions as the original permit, including the length of term. Upon completion of the NEPA analysis and decision related to the allotment(s) to which the permit applies, the terms and conditions of the permit can be modified or a new permit issued, if necessary to conform to the analysis and decision. The line officer still has the authority to make a decisior not to issue a new permit for reasons other than not having the analysis required by NEPA and other applicable laws completed.

The process established in the January 1995 strategy for completing NEPA analyses and decisions on permit issuance is being supplemented by the Rescission Act requirement for a schedule for analysis by allotment. In those instances where the analysis has been completed in accordance with the 1995 strategy, further analysis is not needed and a permit may be issued based on that analysis, bearing in mind the 20 percent cap. Further analysis would not be needed for these allotments until monitoring, new information, or changed conditions indicate the need, or the allotment is to undergo analysis pursuant to the schedule required by Section 504. Similarly, information which has been gathered and analyzed using the 1995 strategy should be applied to the analyses of allotments scheduled under Section 504.
/s/Jack Ward Thomas

JACK WARD THOMAS
Chief
Enclosure

SEC. 504. (a) SCHEDULE FOR NEPA COMPLIANCE.--Each National Forest System unit shall establish and adhere to a schedule for the completion of National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) analysis and decisions on all allotments within the National Forest System unit for which NEPA analysis is needed. The schedule shall provide that not more than 20 percent of the allotments shall undergo NEPA analysis and decisions through fiscal year 1996.
(b) REISSUANCE PENDING NEPA COMPLIANCE.--Notwithstanding any other law, term grazing permits which expire or are waived before the NEPA analysis and decision pursuant to the schedule developed by individual Forest Service System units, shall be issued on the same terms and conditions and for the full term of the expired or waived permit. Upon completion of the scheduled NEPA analysis and decision for the allotment, the terms and conditions of existing grazing permits may be modified or re-issued, if necessary to conform to such NEPA analysis.
(c) EXPIRED PERMITS.--This section shall only apply if a new term grazing permit has not been issued to replace an expired or waived term grazing permit solely because the analysis required by NEPA and other applicable laws has not been completed and also shall include permits that expired or were waived in 1994 and 1995 before the date of enactment of this Act.
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Acting Assiscant Secrevary，NRE
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＝have decermined ：ha＝Ere National grassland grazirg fee Eor 1992 is to be $\$ 2.2 \equiv$ per anmmai uni＝morct．This was derermined by using Ei：e＂comnined l ？Stare grazing fee＂as se三orth in your May 29，－992，z＝1efise memorandinn to me．Futur Eees are to de derermined using the same approacr．The for 1993 is 52.04 ．This provides comparibiİty with the forese छrazing tee．
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GOVERNMENT ANNOUNCES PUBLIC LAND 1993 GTAZING FEES FOR 15 WESTERN STATES
VASHINGTON. JANUARY 15 .--The grazing foe for western pudic lanas adminisiered ov the U.S. Department c Agriculture's Forest Sevice and U.S. Department of Interior s Eureau or Land Management (SLM) wal decline by 6 cent: 7) 1993 under a formula ser by Congress.

Secreiary or Agriculture Edward madigan said the new ree is $\mathbf{\$ 1 . 0 6}$ per anımal unit month (AUM) down from the curren evel of 51.32 . An ammat unt montn is the amount of frage needed to sustain one cow and her calf. One horse. or five sheep or goazs for a month.

Tine ennually adịusted fee, which takes effect March 1. s compured by using a 1966 based fair market value of $\$ 1.2$ : per AUM month for livestock grazing on pudic lands in the 16 western states. The figure is then adiusted according ic zurrent private land lease rates, beef cattle prices and the cost of livestock production.

This tee applies to national forests and ELM land in Arizona. Callfornia, Colorado. Idano. Kansas. Montana, Nebraska Nevaga. New Mexico. North Dakota. Oklahoma. Oregon. South Dakota. Utah, Washington. and Wyoming and to nationa Yrassiancis in California. Idano. and Oregon.
in aduition. Maoigan announced the 7993 grazing tee for the national grassianas. Under the iormula adopted for the - ge2 grazing year to provide compatability with the Western oublic lanas grazing fee. Madigan said this fee will be $\$ 2.0$. ser AUM. a 21 cent decrease from 1992.
ris grazıng tee applies to national grasslanos in Coloraco. Kansas. Nebraska New Mexico. North Dakota. Oklanoma Souin Canote. Texas. and Wyoming.

Zoth tees decreased this year decause higher livestock production costs and lower deef catte drices offset slight ncreases in the private land lease rates. The fee rormula, establisned by Congress in the 1976 Public Rangelanos norovemert Aci nas continued since 1986 under a presidential Executive Order.

The Forest Ssrvice manages adout 191 mulion acres of tederal land in 44 states. Puerro Fico. and the Virgin Isianas ior mutidie public uses. including grazing. The BLM manaoes adout 270 millon acres of federat lana in 11 Western states and ilaska ior a vantety of public uses. sucn as grazing

## APPENDIX 0

sus.JET:
Ilele IlI, lavds
2710 Specisl Use Paralta
2820 xdneral Kakertale Leasian

T0:
Solm A. Keculse, Chilat Ferear sucule
ouls ralates to cha detias Depery Chlal's maprantion Karch 30, 1973.
 laghslative hlatory and lisd that tha proviolon ". . . But Eet to busla lodmetriel parke ar astabilish ptivate loduetrial
 of conference of bsth بhuses (Repore in. 2395, pe:e 3) and edopted and passad by the Congress. The propision ia sat deflined or disenssed in the lagislative history acd the find apthing to ladicice that the prortaion, or apy vord thernia. is to de given other thea ite octlonery maalif.
 (1) those owned by third parefien at the tif the lands wate acquirad by the Dinleed states, (2) thoac reserfed by grantors In convarmacas to the United states, and (3) those owned by the Dalted states.

1. The miacrale oract by thira parties mor be developed moder the taras of the grants or rehorvathoas under which thery are ovaed, subject to complianee with Fedarst, Stata or local havis and regulations. The Secretary of agrieulcure's ereulationa do not apily thereto, unless by azrement the sevelopreat of tha alrarals has been rabjected to then.
2. The ainerals reserrad by the awess in conveyances th the lindend ztates anj uc dsvaloped watar the segulations of the Secretary of Agriculture ettached
to mek converances. The dovelopmac af rech
 frdurel. State ad locel lows mad regulatioas.
3. The mburais ouned by ehe onited frates mest be dervloped, if ot all, weder tha terres of the leaces
 velid cortain provislone adequare to fully proceat the carrirogment and be its coupliesce with appllcable Pciegal lam sod regulacioge.

Un da not find anything la the act or ite legraintive biatery to le:traia that Conzress inteaded by the langugge peoted above to prahible the normal develapment of Goveram
 te are meceasary to cheiz zemoval. The wherilty th afre ard
 cetsblish on the precisaen powes planem or ether enmareled enturpiseas to consum or utilize the ninarals extracted.

## APPENDIX P

Novaiber 8, 3050

Tat lla:ornble
The Secretary of fariculture
liy dane dix. Senrotay:
Refercres fe ninde to letter of Catober 2A, 1950, frem the Aosivinnt Secretmy in response to raquest of Audust 24, 2950, for your viens vith respect to the preteco of the Soil Congervation Scryice of leasing lants covered by Titlo III of the Eavichond-Jones Fand Terant det at yaduca rentalo in redum for tine peafomarace by the pernittecs or lessees of ingrovonents, etc., to the lands, thus resulting in wint appared to be an auguentation of your Departacisis ancual appropriation for Fland Utiliaation and Redircnent of Parininl Ind," and resulting, also, in whit appazed to be a diversion of funds otincrise fayable to the county or counticu in waich such jands are aituated.

The letier of Cetober 2f, citea particularly as authority for suci practice the grovision of section 32 (c) of the act, supra, 7 U. S. Coda 1011(c), which autiroized the Secretary "To sell, exchange, leasa, 07 otherwise dispose of, with or sithout a consideretion, and pioperay so acquired, under such terns and conditican as be decns will best sccomplich the purenecs of sections 1010-1013 of the title." The 6ald lotter indicates thet the condition oftine innid dnteminacu .

 uso practicesm $2 x 0$ to bo faposed wizanacraitioca oi lecoses, and

That the fecs of rentale are estabifincd in relation to tion value of the use of tice land as it nay ba veed vader the requized land uso practices. In that conncation, it is pointed out tuニt the inads Which can be used uncer tine act vithout the necesoity of inposing additional land una practices bave a gatater value than lande vich, becsuse of tincia condition, require the ingosition of epecial land

 Farm Teant Act, and especially fac nuthority vested in the Secretary by scetion 32(c) tiercof io leasa lande, vith or witout consideration, under euch term and conditiona as will bast accomplici thenurese of the act, no further question will be raised ky tinin ofince witio respect to what had appeared to be an augnentation of funds resulang fican the Leasing practices referred to in Office letter of August 24, 2950.

Horcover, in vien of the fosegoing, it now appears tiat mo divercion of funds otherwice payable to the countics in ohich the lindo are situated hould rcsult fron tie above-mentioned leasing practices. Section 33 of the act; 7 U. S. Code 1012, requires that 25 par contun of the "net. reveruea receivad by the Secretary" from the usa of the land shail be paid to the county or counties in wisich the land is held by tie Secretiry. As stated in your Degartent's letter, it seens obvicus that eald section 33 req̧uires payncats to counties of no more than 25 par cent of what the Secrotiry actually rccejvas. Accordingly, n. furihcr objection will bo intcrpozed by thls ofilicy in that respect.

Sincerely yburs,
/8/ Lirdany turrem
Conjavilur Gcncial
of the Uaited $S$ atas

## 9 SEP 1992

MEMMORANDUM FOR DAROLD D. FOXFORTHY DIRECTOR, FISCAI AND PWBLIC SAFETY EORFST SERVICE

EROM:

SUBJECT:
James B. Snow
Deputy Aesistant General Counsel Natural Resources Division

Use of Eees Erom National Grasslands

## Issues:

This is in response to your memorandum dated May 19, 1992, in which you asked if the Forest Service has authority to fund conservation land use projects within the National Grasslands by either depositing into a special account certain revenues collected under Title III, section $32(c)$ of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act ( $7 \mathrm{U} . \mathrm{S} . \mathrm{C} . \$ 1010(\mathrm{c})$, or by requiring the holder authorizations to perform such activities in return for a reduction in the use fee.

## Discussion:

Question 1: Your first question was stated as follows:
May fees collected for the use of National Grasslands under special use permits, grazing permits, or mineral leases, issued under the authority of Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U.S.C. 1010-1013), be deposited into a special account for use by the Eorest Service in funding conservation land use projects within the Grassland?

In our opinion, the answer to this question is no.
There are stringent statutory limitations on how agencies and government employees must handle government funds. Under 31 U.S.C. §3302,' unless provision is made by another law, any

[^37]money received by an official or agent of the Government must be deposited in the Treasury without deduction for any charge or claim. This applies to fees collected from National Grasslands including grazing permits, special use permits and mineral leases. In addition, diversion of such funds for projects within the National Grasslands would be an unauthorized augmentation of appropriations. By appropriating funds the Congress not only provides funds but also establishes an authorized program level. Using funds from other sources would permit an agency to increase its program level without Congressional approval. ${ }^{2}$

In some situations, the Eorest Service has specific authority to retain and use revenues for particular purposes. Examples of such authorities include the Knutson-Vandenberg Act, 16 U.S.C. $\$ 576 \mathrm{~b}$, and the Brush Disposal Act, 16 U.S.C. $\$ 490$. However, we do not find such authority under Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

Under Title III, section $32(\mathrm{c})$, of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, the Secretary of Agriculture has broad authority to authorize the use of lands, with or without consideration, and under such terms and conditions as will best accomplish the purpose of the Act. ${ }^{3} 7$ U.S.C. S1011 (c). This broad discretion
and (4) exchanging the money for other amounts.
(b) Except as provided in section 3718 (b) of this title, an official or agent of the Government receiving money for the Government from any source shall deposit the money in the Treasury as soon as practical without deduction for any charge or claim.
[subsections (c), (d), (e), (f) omitted from this footnote]

2 There is no express statutory prohibition against the augmentation of appropriated funds. The concept does, nevertheless, have an adequate statutory basis although it must be derived from several separate enactments. For example: the Comptroller General has referred to 31 U.S.C. $\$ 628$ [recodified at 31 U.S.C. §1301] which restricts the use of appropriated funds to their intended purposes, and this coupled with the Miscellaneous Receipts Act, 31 U.S.C. $\$ 484$ [recodified at 31 U.S.C. $\$ 3302$ (b)], as implicitly precluding the augmentation of appropriated funds.
${ }^{3}$ Title 7, United States Code, Section 1011, authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture:
(a) repealed
(b) To protect, improve, develop, and administer any property so acquired and to construct such structures thereon as may be necessary to adapt it to its most beneficial use.
(c) To sell, exchange, lease, or otherwise dispose of, with or without a consideration, any property so acquired, under such
allows the Secretary to dispense with consideration altogether. However, if funds are actually collected under the terms of an authorization, the funds must be deposited in the Treasury. Nothing in the statute grants authority to either collect the money from holders of use authorizations and to deposit the money into a special fund, and then to spend the money to carry out conservation projects on other lands in the National Grasslands.

In your memorandum of May 19, 1992, you make reference to an unpublished 1950 decision of the Comptroller General" which deals with reduction of leasing fees under Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. In this decision, the Comptroller General does not create an exception to the requirements of 31 U.S.C. $\$ 3302$ concerning the deposit of revenues into the Treasury, or to the restriction on augmentation of appropriations. The decision only relates to a situation where the Forest Service imposes on the permittee the obligation to perform certain conservation measures to make the land more productive.

The Comptroller General consented to the imposition of permit terms with offsetting reductions in the fee charged for the permitted use. The rationale for the fee reduction is that the value of the use of the land is less where land use practices must be performed by the permittee. Nonetheless, the full amount of funds actually collected must still be deposited in the Treasury. This decision establishes the principle that fees may be reduced to carry out conservation projects. While the decision is limited to the narrow factual situation described therein, it does not discuss the issues represented by your second question.

Question 2: Your second question was stated as follows:
May the fees due from special use permittees or mineral lessees, in addition to grazing permittees, issued under authority of Title III of the BankheadJones Farm Tenant Act (7 U.S.C. 1010-1013), be reduced in return for the performance by the permittee or lessee, personally or by contract, of conservation land use projects anywhere within the boundary of the respective National Grassland?
terms and conditions as he deems will best accomplish the purposes of this subchapter...
[subsections (d), (e) \& (f) omitted from this footnote]
$4 \quad \mathrm{~B}-77467$ (November 8, 1950).

With some limitations, our answer to this second question is yes.

The above referenced language of the Title III, section 32 (c) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, gives the Secretary broad authority to set terms and conditions for the use of Title III lands. In our opinion, with limiting considerations noted below, such terms and conditions can include requirements on permittees or lessees for the performance of conservation projects anywhere within the boundary of the respective National Grassland.

We believe there is an implicit limitation of the statute requiring there be some nexus between the conservation practice being required of the permittee or lessee, and the impacts of the uses of the land being authorized. For example, if one conservation objective for a Grassland is the maintenance of wetland values, then it would be permissible to require a permittee to replace or enhance wetland values elsewhere on the Grassland in order to offset wetland values damaged on the area under permit. Similarly, adverse impacts on wildilfe habitat might be offset by restoration or enhancement activities performed elsewhere.

It is not possible to define in this memorandum the limits of the Forest Service's authority to allow for the off site expenditures by the permittee or lessee for conservation projects elsewhere on a National Grassland. Suffice to say that the more remote the nexus or connection between the expenditure for off site activities and the conservation objectives for the land under permit, the more likely such conditions might be deemed void as arbitrary and capricious. An extreme example might be a requirement that the permittee construct and pave a road in an adjacent county in return for rights to graze cattle. In such a case, it would be highly unlikely the Forest Service could establish that the condition of the permit (i.e. road construction in an adjacent county) bears any relation to the management objective for the land being permitted.

## Summary

In summary, it is our opinion:
(1) that the Forest Service does not have authority to deposit into a special account receipts generated from authorizations granted pursuant to Title III of the BankheadJones Farm Tenant Act, notwithstanding that such fees are to be used to fund conservation work on the National Grasslands; and,
(2) that the Forest Service has authority to impose terms and conditions on permittees and lessees under authorization of

Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act which require the performance of conservation measures anywhere on the National Grassland insofar as such measures relate to the conservation objectives for the use of the authorized land. In this case, the amount of the fees to be collected from the permittee or lessee may be reduced commensurate with the costs to the permittee or lessee of meeting the conservation requirements.

We would be happy to discuss any further questions you may have on this matter.

NRD: OGC:L.Hughes/J. Snow: 9/2/92
Fowler
Snow
Hughes
L.Jakub, OGC, Denver Chron

Subject file:
Bankhead Jones-Farm Tenant Act

C: \WR51\DRAFT\ESGRASS


[^0]:    ' A copy of the Report is included at Appendix A.
    2 A copy of the Action Plan is included at Appendix B.

[^1]:    3 Figures in the table are derived from the Forest Service publication, Land Areas of the National Forest System, (Jan. 1997).

[^2]:    4 The Homestead Act, 43 U.S.C. §161. governed the disposition of agrarian land for 114 years until it was repealed by the Federal Land and Policy Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA), 43 U.S.C. §§1701 et seq.

    5 By 1862 , approximately 440 million acres of the most valuable land in the West was already controlled by states. railroads, and indian tribes and was therefore unavailable for homesteading.

[^3]:    17 Indeed. Congress may, under the Property Clause, regulate conduct occurring off federal land if it affects federal land. Kleppe, supra; Duncan Energy Co. v. United States Forest Service, 50 F.3d 584, 589 ( $8^{\text {hh }} \mathrm{Cir}$. 1995).

[^4]:    18 Invariably. there will arise on occasion situations where there is an irreconcilable conflict between the applicable statutes. The general rule in these cases is that the most recent and more specific congressional pronouncement will prevail over a prior, more generalized statute. Natural Resources Defense Council v. United States Environmental Protection Agency, 824 F.2d 1258 (15 Cir. 1987).

[^5]:    preamble of a statute is not part of the statute. See, Jurgensen v. Fairfax County, Virginia, 745 F.2d 868, 885 ( $4^{\text {th }}$ Cir. 1984)("The preamble no doubt contributes to a general understanding of a statute. but it is not an operative part of the statute and does not enlarge or confer powers on administrative agencies or officers. Where the enacting or operative parts of a statute are unambiguous, the meaning of the statute cannot be controlled by language in the preamble. The operative provisions of statutes are those which prescribe rights and duties and otherwise declare the legislative will.") Second, to the extent that this preamble contributes to a better general understanding of the BJFTA, it must be considered in the context of the entire BJFTA, not just Title III in isolation. Third, it is not at all apparent from the BJFTA whether livestock grazing on national grasslands is even one (let alone the only) way that the secure occupancy of farms and farm homes may be promoted.

[^6]:    23 Interestingly, Title III was included in the House bill (HR 7562 introduced by Congressman Jones). but there was no companion provision in the Senate bill (S. 106 introduced by Senator Bankhead). The conference committtee accepted the House version of Title III which was incorporated into the enacted bill. A detailed review of the legislative history of Title III was prepared by USDA's Office of the Solicitor and is attached at Appendix I.

    24 As noted previously, only $\$ 20$ million was ultimately appropriated for that purpose. During the floor debate over the passage of the BJFTA, Congressman Coffee observed that

    Under Title III funds are authorized for the purchase by the Government of submarginal lands. This would be a continuation of the present program and in many states additional purchases are necessary to block together the purchases already made. The objective is to retire this submarginal land from unprofitable crop production and to turn it back to grass and in to grazing and forest areas. In purchasing the land. the Government will have something to show for the money it spent. It will help to relieve crop surpluses, especially in wheat. since in good years this submarginal land helps to swell the price depressing surplus. . .

[^7]:    30 Interestingly, two statutes that apply to certain national forests but not to the national grasslands are the grazing provisions of FLPMA. 43 U.S.C. $\$ \$ 1751$ et seq., and the Public Rangelands Improvement Act, 43 U.S.C. $\S \S 1901$ et seq, (hereafter "PRIA"). Subchapter IV of FLPMA specifically applies to grazing on "lands within National Forests in the sixteen contiguous Western States.' 43 U.S.C. §1752(a). PRIA contains an express exemption for national grasslands. 43 U.S.C. §1907.

[^8]:    33 This provision stipulates that the authority to "acquire lands, to make exchanges, to grant easements. and enter into leases, permits. agreements, contracts. and memoranda of understanding involving such lands under such terms and conditions and for such consideration, fees. or rentals" shall continue to be controlled by the BJFTA.

[^9]:    'Mr. Wooten is now redred.
    ${ }^{2}$ The term "submarginal land," as used here and elsewhere in the agriculcural field, generally refers to land low in productivity, or otherwise ill-suited for farm crops, which falls below the margin of profitable private cultavation.

[^10]:    ${ }^{3}$ Underscored numbers in parentheses refer to Bibliography, p. 64.

[^11]:    ${ }^{1}$ Projects transferred to jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior by Executive Orders 1936 to 1938.
    ${ }_{2}$ Figures on final acquisitions through 1946 are given in table 4, p. 18.
    Source: Annual Report of Administrator, Resettlement Administration, 2936-37 (154).

[^12]:    4Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, Public Law, No. 210, 75th Cong., 1st Sess., July 22, 1937.

[^13]:    ${ }^{6}$ Secretary of Agriculture's Memorandum No. 785, Ocrober 16, 1938.

[^14]:    125 projects, including 597,909 acres, were scheduled for transfer. Deduction of these projects mould reduce the number of original projects under the administering agency to 80 projects comprising $6,492,875$ acres.
    ${ }_{2}$ Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of July 17, 1937.
    3 Includes acreage in new projects and the additions to old or original projects. There had been 5 consolidations of nearby projects and discontinuance of 2 projects, which reduced the number of projects from the total reported earlier for old and new projects.

    Sources: Compiled from anmul reports and records on the land utilization program by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and the Resettlement Administration, 1936 to 1938. The figures in part are approximations since chronological records are not always uniform, are sometimes incomplete, and are of different annual dates.

[^15]:    ${ }^{1}$ There was nearly always a lag between the year that land was optioned and the year it was purchased and the case closed. Reporting time differed in 1942 and 1943 from that in other years.
    ${ }^{2}$ Iimited to land for which title clearance was completed and the case closed.
    ${ }^{3}$ Acreages acquired by Federal, State, and other agencies, with related information on their use and management, are shown in appendix $A$, which explains differences in number and size of projects that appeared in various annual reports on the land program, 1934-63.
    4 Less than 0.1 percent.

[^16]:    ${ }^{7}$ This section on relocation of familles, and those on relation of the program to local governments (p. 23) and appraisal of the program (p. 35) are in part from an unpublished manuscript, "Federal Rural Land Acquisition in the United States, 1930-42," by Margaret R. Purcell, Agricultural Economist, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Dec. 1945.

[^17]:    ${ }^{1}$ Nearly 00 percent was in hay.
    2 1962-47, total collections; 1948-53, total collections less refunds during calendar year. Includes same revenue from scurces not shown here, such as building occupancy, sales of improvements, minerals, and easements.
    ${ }^{3} 1$ month's grazing ennure on range by 1 mature cow or steer, or 5 sheep.
    ${ }^{4}$ 194i-53 average.

[^18]:    1 In 1957, about 6.5 million acres were grazed by more than 300,000 head of livestock owned by almost 5,000 permittees. About 5 million acres were under grazing agreements ( 10 years or less) with livestock grazing associations, soil conservation districts, and other local agencies.
    2 In 1958, more than 2 million acres of land utilization land were transferred to the Department of the Interior' for use in programs of the Bureau of Land Management. The acreage for 1958 is as of December 31. Most of the acreages for other years are as of June 30.

    3 Since 1960, when the land utilization land retained by the Department of Agriculture was incorporated into National Forests and National Grasslands, income and expenses for the former projects are not kept separate, except where they are complete unds such as ranger districts, but instead the accounts are kept with the units of which they now are a part.

[^19]:    ${ }^{8}$ An animal-unit month is 1 month's grazing tenure upon range by 1 cow or steer, or 5 sheep.

[^20]:    ${ }^{9} 25$ Federal Register 1960, page 5845; and 28 Federal Register 1963, page 6268: 213.1.

[^21]:    ${ }^{10}$ Discussed exchange of letters between the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior, November 1, 1937, December 10, 1937, and February 2, 1938.

[^22]:    12 Public Law No. 395, 74th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1936.

[^23]:    ${ }^{14}$ Buffalo Gap National Grassland records, Forest Service records, 1954-64, and unpublished notes of Loyd Glover, S. Dak. State Univ. and Expt. Sta., and Norman Landgren, Econ. Res. Serv., were used in preparing this section.

[^24]:    ${ }^{1} 1$ month's grazing by 1 mature cow or steer, or 5 sheep.

[^25]:    ${ }^{16}$ Soil Survey Report, U.S. Dept. Agr., Morton County, Kans., 1963.

[^26]:    ${ }^{17}$ Bibliography references used in preparing the secuion are (2) and (42).
    ${ }^{18}$ Survey by the Rural Resettlement Division of the Federal Emergency Rellef Administration and the Resettlement Administration.
    19 Bibliography reference (99) was used in preparing this section.

[^27]:    ${ }^{20}$ Bibliography references (131 and (176) were used in preparing this section.

[^28]:    ${ }^{21}$ This section, prepared with the ald of the Forest Supervisor of Bladen Lakes State Forest, is a summary of (22).

[^29]:    ${ }^{22}$ Bibliography reference ( 160 ) was used in preparing this section.
    ${ }^{23}$ Bibliography refr-ences used in preparing this section are (19, 92, and 131).

[^30]:    ${ }^{1}$ Annual Report of Resettlement Administration, 1936, table 2, pp. 127-131, Status of Title Clearance Under Old Utilization Program Prior to Authorization of Title III of Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, July 1937, Soil Conserv. Serv., Dec. 31, 1942.
    ${ }^{2}$ Status of Title Clearance Under Title III, Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, Feb. 28 , 1943. Reports of the Chief, Soil Conserv. Serv., 1943-46.
    ${ }^{3}$ Reports covering details of land acquisition by the Soil Conservation Service, under Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, prepared in 1942 and 1943, do not include all the land in process of acquisition. Consequently, the acreages reported in them are less than those in this table.

    4 New Hampshire, 45 acres. Rhode Island, 53 acres.

[^31]:    ${ }^{1}$ Record of land utilization projects transferred to the Forest Service, or placed under its custody, based on Forest Service tables dated May 15,.1961, as subsequently corrected and adjusted to June 30, 1964.
    ${ }^{2}$ Maine 465 acres; Iowa 360 acres; Indiana 523 acres.

[^32]:    ${ }^{25}$ This appendix was prepared from (a) A Chronology of the Land Utilization Program, 1933-1940, by P.K. Hooker, a 100-page unpublished manuscript, Soll Conservation Service, 1941; and (b) records and reports furnished by F.W. Grover, E.G. Grest, J.E. Elliott, and others of the Forest Service, 1949-1963; and by R.W. Rogers, R.K. Wright, Dorothy Long, and others of the Soll Conservation Service, all of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.
    ${ }_{26}$ U.S. Congress, Agricultural Marketing Act of 1929.
    27 National Conference on Land Utilization, Chicago, Ill. Proc. Nov. 1931.
    ${ }^{2 B}$ National Resources Board Report. Dec. 1, 1934; and Supplementary Report of the Land Planning Commitree. Vol. I and II. 1935.

[^33]:    ${ }^{29}$ For addidional information, refer to (150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155)

[^34]:    Source: Table 668, Agricultural Statistics, 1939, U.S. Dept. Agr.

[^35]:    
    

[^36]:    

[^37]:    1 Title 31, United States Code, Section 3302, states in part:
    (a) Except as provided by another law, an official or agent of the United Sates Government having custody or possession of public money shall keep the money safe without - (1) lending the money; (2) using the money; (3) depositing the money in a bank;

