

"We can make a large reduction in the number of Government automobiles in the Department of Agriculture in Washington...."

Savings: Amount unspecified.

Source: Mr. Douglas, Senator from Illinois, Congressional Record, July 27, 1951, p. 9201.

\* \* \*

"...Reduce to the 1948 level the agricultural appropriations of REA, farm loans, conservation and research, thereby saving \$250,000,000."

Savings: \$250,000,000.

Source: Statement by Mr. Robert C. Hendrickson, Senator from New Jersey, March 31, 1951, p. 2.

\* \* \*

"To recapitulate, the reduction in funds for the agricultural conservation and land resources program; administrative expenses and acreage allotments and marketing quotas, and for the Commodity Credit Corporation price-support program afford opportunity for reductions in the Department of Agriculture well in excess of \$150 million. All of this reduction stands on substantially the same reasoning. The administrative expenses asked for in these three programs are respectively \$25,250,000 for the so-called ACP program; \$24,000,000 for the allotments and quotas administrative expense; and \$20,200,000 for CCC administrative expenses--a total of \$69,450,000.

"A study of these items, among others, caused the board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation to conclude that a saving of \$30,000,000 in the administrative expenses of the Department of Agriculture should be the minimum goal in this economy effort."

Savings: \$30,000,000--\$150,000,000.

Source: Mr. Kline, President, American Farm Bureau Federation, in Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Department of Agriculture Appropriations for 1952, Part 2, p. 1267.

\* \* \* \* \*

PERSONAL SERVICES

"...[Sen. Douglas] said...the Department of Agriculture were the worst offenders in the matter of overstaffing."

Savings: Amount unspecified.

Source: Mr. Douglas, Senator from Illinois, as reported in the New York Times, May 2, 1951, p. 35.

\* \* \* \* \*

RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946

GENERAL

"The committee approves \$4,700,000 for 1952 [For the Research and Marketing Act], which is \$1,232,000 less than funds available for 1951 and \$800,000 less than the estimates for 1952. This represents a general reduction of 10% in all projects included in this appropriation together with a reduction of approximately 50% in funds requested for the project 'Expansion of outlets for farm products.' In view of the recent trend away from a buyers market, it is doubtful that the same attention needs to be given to the expansion of foreign outlets and to the study of consumer preference and demand."

Savings: \$800,000.

Source: Report of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Department of Agriculture Appropriation Bill, 1952, p. 6.

\* \* \* \* \*

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"...I cannot agree that we should spend \$2,150,000 on the more or less theoretical and nebulous end of the work of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics pertaining to economic investigations.

The subcommittee did take away from the estimates given by the Budget for this item the sum of \$379,000 and allowed \$2,150,000...."

. . . . .

"All my amendment does is to further decrease that particular appropriation by \$150,000. It would still leave those people for this work \$2,000,000 and with which to make investigations and studies, based on data which they gather under the other portion of this appropriation, for which we will allow them \$2,850,000.

"...\$2,000,000 is a lot of money. It will hire approximately 400 people, at the least. Surely this should be sufficient personnel to analyze the results of the statistical data gathered by the further expenditure of another \$2,850,000."

Savings: \$150,000.

Source: Mr. Andersen, Representative from Minnesota, Congressional Record, May 10, 1951, p. 5321.

\* \* \*

"A total of \$5,000,000 is recommended for 1952, \$2,150,000 for economic investigations and \$2,850,000 for crop and livestock estimates. The amount approved for crop and livestock estimates is substantially the same as for 1951,...the committee has reduced funds for economic investigations substantially [\$395,000] in view of the absolute necessity of reducing expenditures."

Savings: \$395,000.

Source: Report of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Department of Agriculture Appropriation Bill, 1952, p. 6.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

##### OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

##### Salaries and Expenses.

"...The sum of \$560,000 for the Office of Administrator, a reduction of \$27,500 in the amount available for 1951 and \$27,000 in the 1952 estimates, is recommended in the interests of economy.

The committee expects this reduction to be made in such a manner as to not interfere with the extension of the role of the advisory committees in the research programs of the Department."

Savings: \$27,000.

Source: Report of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Department of Agriculture Appropriation Bill, 1952, p. 7.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA

"...The committee recommends \$250,000 for 1952 ~~for~~ For Research on Agricultural Problems of Alaska 7, a decrease of \$30,000 below the 1951 appropriation and the 1952 budget estimates. Since approximately \$50,000 is available to Alaska under the appropriation for the Office of Experiment Stations, this reduction appears advisable in the interest of economy."

Savings: \$30,000.

Source: Report of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Department of Agriculture Appropriation Bill, 1952, p. 7.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

##### Salaries and Expenses.

"...The sum of \$1,350,000 is approved for 1952 ~~for~~ for the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics 7 a reduction of \$133,100 in the level for 1951 and \$132,500 in the estimates for 1952. The committee feels that some projects of this Bureau should be postponed during the current emergency."

Savings: \$132,500.

Source: Report of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Department of Agriculture Appropriation Bill, 1952, p. 7.

\* \* \*

"I have asked that this item 'Human nutrition and home economics' be cut from a proposed \$1,350,000 to \$1,000,000 recognizing first that the committee already has allotted less than the budget estimate and less than the money contained in the bill in fiscal 1951. But...the appropriation proposed for this Bureau is approximately five times what it was a decade ago....That would indicate that this bureau, along with many other bureaus of the Government, has mushroomed more than there is justification for, and that it can and should be trimmed."

Savings: \$350,000.

Source: Mr. Sikes, Representative from Florida, Congressional Record, May 10, 1951, p. 5328.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

##### Salaries and Expenses.

"...The amount recommended for the Bureau of Animal Industry, \$23,800,000 is \$435,100 less than funds available in 1951 and \$1,050,000 less than estimates for 1952. This reduction has been made primarily in the funds for animal research, which the committee believes can be curtailed in view of the emergency situation and the Federal financial deficit...."

Savings: \$1,050,000.

Source: Report of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Department of Agriculture Appropriation Bill, 1952, p. 7.

\* \* \* \* \*

##### Meat Inspection Fund.

"I come here today to present to you the considered judgment of this 54-year-old organization of commercial beef cattle producers on the proposal to permit reimbursement by any person, firm, or organization for the expenses of Federal meat inspection in excess of those which can be met from the amount appropriated for such purposes each year...."

"...We [The American National Cattlemen's Association] believe it not to be in the interest of good government because it will remove from congressional control the expenditures of an administrative agency, and we believe it will tend to put the burden of payment of public health service upon the livestock industry."

Savings: Amount unspecified.

Source: Mr. R. Hall, Assistant Secretary, American National Cattlemen's Association, in Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, Senate, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Agricultural Appropriations for 1952, p. 630.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

##### Salaries and Expenses.

"...The amount approved, \$1,450,000, is a reduction of \$139,500 below funds available for 1951 and \$139,000 below the estimates for 1952. The committee feels that the work of this Bureau [Dairy Industry] should continue on those projects which are of the most direct value to the current defense effort. The reduction is recommended for this item in view of the need to curtail expenses wherever possible."

Savings: \$139,000.

Source: Report of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Department of Agriculture Appropriation Bill, 1952, pp. 7-8.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY

##### Salaries and Expenses.

"...The committee approves \$7,200,000 for this Bureau [Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry] for 1952, a reduction of approximately 10 percent from the appropriation level for 1951 and the budget estimates for 1952....The reduction, which is recommended



in the interest of economy, will require a complete re-evaluation of the work of the Bureau and the elimination of those projects which are less important to the welfare of the country at this time."

Savings: 10 percent of budget estimate.

Source: Report of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Department of Agriculture Appropriation Bill, 1952, p. 8.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

##### General.

"...A total of \$12,425,000 is approved, \$10,625,000 for salaries and expenses and \$1,800,000 for the control of emergency outbreaks of insect and plant diseases. This is a reduction of \$1,405,060 below the funds available for 1951 and \$973,000 below the estimates for 1952...."

"The committee [on Appropriations, House of Representatives] has been particularly concerned with the operations and administration of this Bureau for the past several years. The original survey made by the investigative staff of the committee more than a year ago showed some very serious defects in its programs...."

"The committee has never been fully satisfied with the extent of cooperation and funds received from State and local organizations with respect to most of the control programs of the Bureau...."

. . . . .

"In addition, the committee seriously questions the advisability of continuing work on certain of the programs such as those concerning the Japanese Beetle, the Golden Nematode, and Hall Scale. Based on evidence received, many of the methods employed in eradicating various insects and plant diseases are questioned...."

Savings: \$973,000.

Source: Report of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Department of Agriculture Appropriation Bill, 1952, pp. 8, 9.

\* \* \*

Salaries and Expenses.

"Last year the [Department of Agriculture Appropriations] committee also was very critical of the fact that you [Mr. Hoyt] had paid extremely high rentals for certain airplanes.

"I note from Mr. Hoyt's general statement you have set out to correct that situation. However, the report of the subsequent investigation shows that on the gypsy moth program you have two pilots. The aircraft pilots received an annual salary of \$39,000 and their services were utilized only about 2 months during the year. Occasionally they were transferred to other programs to perform other flying duties."

. . . . .

"...At Greenfield, Mass., you had on hand 595 pairs of snowshoes with an estimated value of \$7,000 at a cost of \$12 a pair. One hundred pairs is all you need in one trapping season. It is quite an expense to keep them in condition with shellacking. I realize you can pick out isolated cases but I would like to see something done."

Savings: Amount unspecified.

Source: Mr. Whitten, Representative from Mississippi, in Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Department of Agriculture Appropriations for 1952, Part 2, pp. 977, 978, 980.

\* \* \* \* \*

CONTROL OF FOREST PESTS

GENERAL

"The sum of \$5,000,000 has been recommended for this activity for the fiscal year 1952, \$1,700,000 for the Forest Pest Control Act and \$3,300,000 for White Pine Blister Rust. This amount is \$2,158,458 less than funds available for 1951 and \$4,150,000 below the estimates for 1952...."

"It is believed that further consolidations of field offices and reductions in supervisory levels in the White Pine Blister Rust program will permit the absorption of the reduction without any curtailment of program."



Savings: \$4,150,000.

Source: Report of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Department of Agriculture Appropriation Bill, 1952, p. 10.

\* \* \*

"...The Forestry Department last year requested an appropriation of \$2,800,000 to get rid of the spruce-bark beetle in an area in Colorado that is equal to the size of several of your New England States. Each tree has to have special treatment from top to bottom. You have to go into those areas and treat all those trees. They estimated that you would have to treat 725,000 trees to do the job. There were many questions involved that did not seem to hold water with me and I opposed it and kept it out, but it was put in in the other body [Senate]. This was handled, incidentally, by the deficiency subcommittee. Two million dollars was included in this deficiency bill of last year. Instead of treating 725,000 trees, which they said would do the job, they treated 850,000. This year they come back to the views substantially I had last year and now they say instead of taking \$2,000,000 and treating 850,000 trees, it will take \$13,000,000 and we have got to treat 67,000,000 trees...."

Savings: \$13,000,000.

Source: Mr. Whitten, Representative from Mississippi, Congressional Record, May 9, 1951, p. 5213.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### WHITE PINE BLISTER RUST CONTROL

"...This is an amendment to reduce the appropriation for white-pine blister rust [by \$300,000]."

. . . . .

"I believe it is obvious to anyone who studies the operation of this [white pine blister rust] program that there has been inefficiency in its operation, and that taxpayers' money has been wasted."

. . . . .

"The amendment which I offered calls for a cut of \$105,000 in the amount which is transferred from this program to the Department of Interior. Under the amendment \$400,000 will be transferred to the Department of the Interior instead of \$505,000. The amendment further calls for a cut of \$195,000 in the fund of approximately \$700,000 designated for leadership, coordination, and technical direction. This is more than the whole program cost in 1933, and I think the cut proposed in the supervisory end of it is thoroughly justified. I have not proposed to touch at all by this amendment the \$1,750,000 appropriated to pay for the actual work done in the field."

Savings: \$300,000.

Source: Mr. Davis, Representative from Georgia, Congressional Record, May 10, 1951, pp. 5329, 5330.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### FOREST SERVICE

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"...The committee recommends a total of \$38,342,525, for Salaries and Expenses<sup>7</sup>, a reduction of \$100,000 below funds available for 1951 and \$2,657,475 below the 1952 estimates. The funds provided should permit the Forest Service to continue its activities at the 1951 level of operation...."

Savings: \$2,657,475.

Source: Report of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Department of Agriculture Appropriation Bill, 1952, p. 11.

\* \* \*

"...with expenses mounting daily there can be no justification for the Forest Service of the United States Department of Agriculture throwing away money.

"On bid invitation 312 from the United States Department of Agriculture for the Forest Service, northern region, for a portable rock drill, the Syntron Co., of Homer City, Pa., submitted a bid of \$400. With no explanation whatsoever the United States Department of Agriculture accepted a bid of \$545. While the amount is small indeed, the principle is large and shows bureaucratic indifference to careful expenditures to the taxpayers' money."

Waste: \$145.

Source: Mr. Saylor, Representative from Pennsylvania, Congressional Record, November 9, 1951, p. A7197.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

"...An appropriation of \$11,500,000 is recommended, which represents substantially a continuation of the 1951 program. The committee has disallowed the increase of \$6,000,000 requested for new road construction in the belief that the timber operators should provide the means of getting timber out in connection with their logging operations. Since States receive 25 percent of timber receipts, Federal construction of roads which could be provided by timber operators not only increases Federal expenditures but also increases payments to States beyond the intent of the law...It should be noted that the Forest Service has had in excess of \$50,000,000 for this item during the past five years."

Savings: \$6,000,000.

Source: Report of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Department of Agriculture Appropriation Bill, 1952, pp. 11-12.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS, WEEKS ACT

"This particular amendment that I am offering is in relation to the acquisition of land under the Weeks Act<sup>7</sup>. This amendment proposes to cut from \$100,000 to \$50,000 for the acquisition of land for the Forest Service. I am wondering in this time of stress why is it necessary to buy any more land for the Forest Service?..."

Savings: \$50,000.

Source: Mr. Smith, Representative from Virginia, Congressional Record, May 10, 1951, p. 5336.

\* \* \* \* \*

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS, SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST, MINN.

"...While I am a friend of the Forest Service, I believe we should make this \$50,000 reduction in the appropriation for the acquisition of forest land within Superior National Forest, Minn.

"This amount of money involved is not great, but by adopting this \$50,000 reduction we...will be saying to the Executive Departments of the Government that the Congress is unalterably opposed to the constant efforts of these Federal agencies to constantly gaining ownership of more and more land by acquiring additional blocks of private holdings and placing them under Federal governmental ownership and control.

"At the present time, 35 percent of all the lands in the State of Washington are owned by the Federal Government. The Federal Government owns almost 46 percent of all the land in California and owns more than 52 percent of all the land area of Oregon.

"Of all the landed area of Nevada, the Federal Government owns nearly 85 percent and barely more than 15 percent is in private ownership.

"The Federal Government now owns 54.31 percent of all the land in the 10 western States of this Nation."

Savings: \$50,000.

Source: Mr. Mack, Representative from Washington, Congressional Record, May 10, 1951, p. 5339.

\* \* \* \* \*

STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

"...The committee recommends \$10,750,000 for State and Private Forestry Cooperation for 1952, \$82,800 less than funds available for fiscal year 1951 and \$70,000 less than 1952 estimates. This nominal reduction, which is made in the interests of economy, should not curtail any of the programs financed from this appropriation."

Savings: \$70,000.

Source: Report of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Department of Agriculture Appropriation Bill, 1952, p. 12.

\* \* \* \* \*

FLOOD CONTROL

GENERAL

"This amendment will give to this particular division Department of Agriculture, Flood Control, the same amount of new money which was given to them for the 1951 fiscal year. I am proposing to reduce the \$8,000,000 now in the bill to \$6,112,800. Let me call to your attention how a division or a bureau keeps on growing and growing. In 1947 we gave to this particular small division only the sum of \$2,101,000. That was upped 50 percent in 1948, giving it about \$3,000,000 of new money. In 1949 the appropriation was doubled and the Congress gave them \$6,000,000. In 1950 we gave this bureau \$9,500,000. In 1951 we gave them \$10,312,000.

"What happened to the \$10,312,000 that the Congress last year said was necessary? If you will recall the Congress instructed the President under the one-package bill last year, and mistakenly so, to make a \$550,000,000 reduction at his discretion in the one-package bill...."

"...The President, in order to achieve that \$550,000,000 cut last year, took from this particular item the sum of \$4,200,000. To my mind by that action, the administration stated that they had little confidence themselves in this particular program as it was being operated."

. . . . .

"...the cut which I propose through this amendment should be applied largely at the expense of preliminary examinations and surveys...."

Savings: \$1,887,200.

Source: Mr. Andersen, Representative from Minnesota, Congressional Record, May 15, 1951, p. 5472.

\* \* \*

"The budget request of \$1,475,000 contained in House Document 243 provides for tributary works of improvement and land treatment measures in 15 critical watersheds in the Kansas-Missouri area to supplement work recommended for the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. Investigation revealed that surveys have been completed on only three of the watersheds and none are covered by approved survey reports. Therefore, there is no authority for the Committee to approve such request. In an effort to speed up the work in these areas, however, the Committee does recommend that \$186,800 be provided to expedite investigations and surveys in these and other critical watersheds in the Missouri and Upper Mississippi Basins."



Savings: \$1,288,200.

Source: Report of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1952, p. 9.

\* \* \*

"...this amendment would cut the appropriation from \$8,000,000 to \$2,500,000, of which not more than \$1,800,000 may be expended in watersheds heretofore authorized for necessary gully control, flood-water detention, and floodway structures in areas other than those over which the Department of the Army has jurisdiction and responsibility."

. . . . .

"In addition to the \$2,500,000 which would be available, I think we can anticipate there will be a carry-over of up to \$2,000,000 from last year's appropriation. In 1949 there was a carry-over from the previous year. From 1949 to 1950 there was a carry-over of over \$1,250,000. From 1950 through 1951 there was a carry-over of over \$3,000,000. Of last year's appropriation, which was \$9,000,000-odd, the total funds obligated as of April 30, are about \$6,000,000 which means there is an unobligated balance of over \$3,000,000. So that we can anticipate at that rate of expenditure that there will be a carry-over this year, as there has been in past years, of up to \$2,000,000 which will mean the total appropriation, if my substitute is accepted, will be nearly \$4,500,000. I do not think there is any doubt that this program can stand this cut."

. . . . .

"...these 11 watersheds are divided into sub-water sheds and many of these sub-water sheds have not had work commenced on them, and they can be postponed until another year....there is no clear-cut connection between this work this year and defense this year...."

Savings: \$5,500,000.

Source: Mr. Kennedy, Representative from Massachusetts, Congressional Record, May 15, 1951, p. 5475.

\* \* \* \* \*



## SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

### GENERAL

"...numerous reorganization surveys have been conducted during the past 5 years. Failure to adopt the reorganization plans resulting from these surveys indicates that the opposition of vested interests within the Department is so strong that this long overdue reorganization can only be accomplished by congressional mandate.

"The national soil conservation program, as currently administered by the United States Department of Agriculture, is permeated with duplication, overlap, conflict, and lack of coordination, and what has been aptly described as a state of 'civil war' exists in many areas between the Extension Service, the Agricultural Conservation program branch of the Production and Marketing Administration, Soil Conservation Service, and Farmers Home Administration. All of these bureaus, with the exception of FHA, are competing for control of this program due to the rising importance of conservation in the national economy--and service to the American farmer suffers. This situation was found to exist in the majority of the States and counties visited."

Savings: Amount unspecified.

Source: Report of the Staff of Committee on Appropriations quoted in Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee in Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Department of Agriculture Appropriations for 1952, Part 2, p. 688.

\* \* \* \* \*

### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"In substance, it /the amendment to Department of Agriculture Appropriations bill/ would reduce by roughly \$13,000,000 the amount which was allowed by the Senate Committee. This is a cut in the item for soil conservation, which is distinguished from soil conservation and domestic allotment in that the later item, of course, deals with soil-conservation payments which are made to farmers. This item of soil conservation is essentially a personnel item. As I recall, roughly 85 percent of the entire appropriation is devoted to the payment of salaries of those engaged in the field, not only in experimental and demonstration work, but in the practical work of teaching farmers soil-conservation practices.

"For the fiscal year 1952 I understand that the budget estimate indicates that there will be 11,825 persons engaged in this work in various sections of the country. It occurs to me that when we reach an item like that--and I have watched soil conservation grow from \$10,000,000 to well over \$53,000,000--the time has come to stop and ask a few questions, to determine whether or not there is duplication of service, and whether or not, in the interest of a balanced budget and in the interest of drying up some of the public expenditures which go into the economic stream of the country and thereby become an inflationary force, a reduction could be made....such an item should be viewed with a very careful and baleful eye."

. . . . .

"The great and good sovereign State of Georgia is, I believe, at the top of the heap, in that about 38 percent of the tillable land has been reached by the practices which are taught and demonstrated by the Soil Conservation Service. But there are some 22 States in which this work is at a level less than 10 percent of completion. So, while a cut may delay the program a little, it cannot be very persuasively argued that such a cut would particularly harm the program or set it back very much.

"The second argument which I make in behalf of reducing this appropriation is that in my considered judgment the States ought to do more of this character of work...."

"The third reason which I assign for a rather substantial cut in this field is that there is a rather interesting conflict in agricultural policy. We have one agency, the Soil Conservation Service, with more than 11,000 employees going forth and teaching practices designed to conserve the topsoil, to prevent wind erosion and rain erosion, to prevent the soil from leaching away and getting into the watercourses and going into the Gulf of Mexico. They are doing all the necessary things in order to preserve the fertility of the soil and the alluvial topcrust of soil, which is indispensable of course, to a productive agriculture. But while that is going on, we have in the selfsame Department of Agriculture policies which are designed to deplete the soil."

Savings: \$13,000,000.

Source: Mr. Dirksen, Senator from Illinois, Congressional Record, July 24, 1951, pp. 8932-8933.

\* \* \* \* \*

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

GENERAL

"...In the past year the Appropriations Committee discovered, I believe, that the Production and Marketing Administration had accumulated reserves available from prior year operations of \$25,750,000. That had not been stated to the Congress when the Bureau of the Budget asked for the appropriation...."

. . . . .

"Of course, if Congress appropriates money for a Government agency, the tendency of the agency is to spend the money. If in the past there have been unobligated reserves which the agency has not fully revealed to the Congress, I believe it is a good plan for the Congress to reduce the appropriations in the future, so that the temptation to spend will be avoided.

"If the Production and Marketing Administration gets into trouble because of a shortage of funds, it is my understanding that it can always borrow from the Commodity Credit Corporation in order to be able to meet any commitments which it may have made."

. . . . .

"I have made a slight adjustment in the House figure, allowing a cut of about \$21,000,000, instead of a cut of \$23,000,000."

Savings: About \$21,000,000.

Source: Mr. Douglas, Senator from Illinois, Congressional Record, July 26, 1951, p. 9162.

\* \* \* \* \*

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

"The item Production and Marketing Administration, Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources...relates to money which will be made available, and is in the nature of authorization for the program which is to come. Therefore, the item of \$280,000,000 which I proposed to reduce to \$150,000,000 will in no way affect the conservation program for the 1951 crop.

"I am frank to say that it would not save any money in the fiscal year 1952. I believe the chairman of the subcommittee will bear me out when I say that the only saving will come in the year 1953."

. . . . .

"...the adoption of my amendment would not hurt farmers particularly. Some 3,100,000 farmers are participating in the program. If I am correctly advised, the average payment would be about \$85. Of course, that is an amount which can be sacrificed by the farmers, and it is an amount which the farmers would sacrifice in the interest of the common good..."

"...if we do not make the cut now, it cannot be done later, because this is the authorizing language in the bill. It would be only fair to do it at this time."

Savings: \$130,000,000.

Source: Mr. Dirksen, Senator from Illinois, Congressional Record, July 25, 1951, p. 9059.

\* \* \*

"...I want to point out, if I may, that the pending bill provides that the payments shall be formulated--and I read--on the basis of a distribution of the funds available for payments and grants among the several States in accordance with their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary."

. . . . .

"I should be perfectly willing...to have the Secretary of Agriculture, who will have the power, use all this money to help the poorer areas where soil conservation is needed the most....I do not want to hurt the program greatly in those areas which need it the most, but I do say that in central Illinois, where the farm land is as rich as in any other area of the country, the overwhelming opinion of the farmers is that they do not need the appropriation."

. . . . .

"...I think there is too much of a tendency to treat the farmers as incompetents and as wards. The farmers, in the main, are self-respecting dignified persons. In the majority of cases they do not need Federal agents constantly coming around to them and telling them to use phosphate and lime and to do this and that. They have



the county-agent system to help them in such matters, to give them information on general agricultural practices as well as the technical assistance of experts in the Soil Conservation Service. They do not need a bribe. They do not need a bonus.

"The areas where the soil is badly depleted, in the Southern States, in certain sections of my own State Illinois, particularly the southern portion of the State, can continue to receive payments out of the \$150,000,000 which would still be authorized. What we would be eliminating would be the \$130,000,000 bonus to the prosperous farmers in rich farming areas who do not need it, who do not want it, and who believe that in the cause of self-respect they should not ask these payments for themselves which they are not willing to accord to others. As they properly demand economies in the budget as a whole, they are willing to take economies in the matters which lie close to their own interests."

Savings: \$130,000,000.

Source: Mr. Douglas, Senator from Illinois, Congressional Record, July 25, 1951, p. 9069.

\* \* \*

"This amendment ~~to~~ strike out \$280,000,000 and appropriate \$200,000,000 deals with the subject, 'Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources,' the program of payment to farmers to build terraces, use fertilizers, rotate crops and so forth. This is not a liquidation of commitments. This item deals with the 1952 program; in other words, it is the authorization to enter into agreements with farmers as to what work they will be paid for next year.

"If any measurable reduction is to be made in this program, it must be done in this item, now. Next year's appropriation will be measured by the authorization we establish in this bill.

"Pertinent data respecting this item is as follows:

- (a) The budget estimate is \$285,000,000.
- (b) The House provided \$225,000,000.
- (c) The Senate committee recommends \$280,000,000.
- (d) Allan Kline, President of the American Farm Bureau Federation recommended \$150,000,000."

Savings: \$80,000,000.

Source: Mr. Ferguson, Senator from Michigan, Congressional Record, July 25, 1951, p. 9102.

\* \* \*

"Senator Ellender....Are you advocating any cuts whatever?"

"Mr. Kline. Yes; we American Farm Bureau Federation have suggested this cut of \$135 million from the budget estimate in ACP payments. We suggest a 20 percent cut in administrative costs as a goal; that a real effort should be made to cut administrative costs 20 percent.

"Senator Russell. And a substantial cut in the administrative costs for Commodity Credit.

"Mr. Kline. Yes."

Savings: \$135,000,000.

Source: Mr. Kline, President, American Farm Bureau Federation, in Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, Senate, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Agricultural Appropriations for 1952, p. 532.

\* \* \*

"As an indication of the earnestness with which we approach the problem of reducing Government expenditures, we are recommending that the authorization for the 1952 agricultural conservation program be reduced from the budget recommendation of \$285 million to \$150 million. Because of the advanced stages of development of the 1951 program, we do not feel that commitments made should be interfered with. We call attention to the fact that our recommendations to the Congress for 1951 was for a \$250 million program as against the \$285 million appropriated."

Savings: \$135,000,000.

Source: Mr. Kline, President, American Farm Bureau Federation, in Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Department of Agriculture Appropriations for 1952, Part 2, p. 1266.

\* \* \*



"I have offered this amendment to reduce the \$225,000,000 figure to \$150,000,000. This proposal is designed to reduce the amount of allotments to be made under the act of February 29, 1936, as amended. It has the endorsement of the American Farm Bureau Federation,..."

"This matter is in somewhat the following situation: These funds have been spent or supposed to be spent for different items that have been handed to the farmers to use on their farms: Inorganic fertilizer to the tune of 50 percent; protective green manure crops, 15 percent; erosion-control practices, 15 percent; range and pasture improvement, 15 percent; and other items, 5 percent. The figure last year was \$285,000,000 and the budget submitted that figure to do in the bill for this year and the committee cut it to \$225,000,000."

. . . . .

"That is a part of the situation. I have been up against that situation in my own territory many times. I have had many farmers come to see me about it. This is what has happened. Several hundred pounds of fertilizer would be dumped in the corner of a lot, and the farmer on whose land it was dumped would not even know it was there. At other times they have brought in fertilizer that was not suitable for the land in question, and left it with the farmers. Many times they have brought in lime where the soil was underlaid with limestone, and it would be absolutely useless to try to put lime on it with any desirable effect."

. . . . .

"...I know there will be farmers who will want to have this money handed to them, but this is not a soil conservation program....This is a program where we turn over money to the farmer to use on his own soil if he uses it."

"I believe any friend of the farmer can come to realize that unless we do away with these things that are costing money and are for the benefit of individual farmers and for the benefit of farmers as a class, outside of such advisory programs as the Soil Conservation Service and such things as agricultural research, we are really doing them a disservice. The longer we carry on with those things and the more money we spend that way, the more we make the farmer subject to being a target of other folks."

Savings: \$75,000,000.

Source: Mr. Taber, Representative from New York, Congressional Record, May 15, 1951, pp. 5482-5483.

\* \* \* \* \*

ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS AND MARKETING QUOTAS.

[Amendment of Mr. Douglas to strike out the appropriation of \$12,000,000 for Acreage Allotments and Marketing Quotas and insert an appropriation of \$10,000,000.]

"In view of the fact that the Production and Marketing Administration work has shrunk from almost 200,000,000 to 7,000,000 acres, what justification, fundamentally, is there for a \$12,000,000 appropriation?

"The Production and Marketing Administration wanted \$6,000,000 to publish and distribute a pamphlet, a copy of which I hold in my hand, entitled '1951 Production Guide,' comprising 75 mimeographed pages of statistics and advice to the American farmer.

"I have looked over the pamphlet with some interest,...it never justified an original request for \$6,000,000. I hold the copy in my hand, and I should like to have Senators inspect it."

. . . . .

"So the Department of Agriculture was originally asking that we furnish these copies to the farmers at an average cost of \$1.20 per unit--5,000,000 copies....I believe the estimate of the committee is an allowance of \$4,200,000 for this 1951 Production Guide, which on the basis of 5,000,000 farms, would produce an 80-cent cost."

. . . . .

"...To my untutored mind it could be reproduced by mimeographing at from 15 to 20 cents a unit. If printed by the millions it could be done at a somewhat lower figure...."

. . . . .

"I am very much interested in the statement of the Senator from Connecticut, who is the head of the Encyclopaedia Britannica in this country--although that is an American publication, I hasten to say--that this pamphlet could be reproduced for a dime. Yet the Department had the effrontery to propose a unit cost of \$1.20; and the committee is recommending costs of 80 cents per unit."

. . . . .

"I may be wrong. I do not want to be unjust. But to my mind, this is the most bare-faced performance of raiding the Public Treasury in behalf of fake printing bills and in favor of an inflated organization I have seen for some time."

Savings: \$2,000,000.

Source: Mr. Douglas, Senator from Illinois, Congressional Record,  
July 26, 1951, p. 9170.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### REMOVAL OF SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

"Today, I want to call your attention to a story which appeared on page 1 of today's Washington Post. I would like to read the first two paragraphs of that story:

From June 30 to January 1--the first 6 months of the Korean war--the Army Quartermaster bought almost \$5,000,000 worth of potatoes for the armed services.

In the same period another Government agency--the Agriculture Department's Production and Marketing Administration--bought \$23,278,000 worth of spuds, and destroyed \$22,130,000 worth."

"The story which I quoted earlier goes on to report that the distinguished Senator from my own State of New Mexico, Clinton P. Anderson, when he was Secretary of Agriculture, urged Congress to either remove price supports from potatoes or change the law so that production could be curtailed. The present Secretary, Mr. Brannan, has joined in this appeal.

"These supports will end with the 1950 crop unless Congress moves to reinstate them. I certainly hope and urge that the Congress bring this shameful situation to a halt as soon as possible."

Savings: Amount unspecified.

Source: Mr. Dempsey, Representative from New Mexico, Congressional Record, January 24, 1951, p. A379.

\* \* \*

"There is not any basis for the recommendation that \$75 million be spent in 1952 for the purpose of removing from the market surplus agriculture commodities in view of existing and prospective conditions."

Savings: \$75,000,000.

Source: National Association of Manufacturers, Cut Non-Defense Spending Now, Economic Policy Division Series, No. 40, New York, February, 1951, p. 13.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

##### GENERAL

"On the basis of preliminary census information, the U.S.D.A. says there still are more than 750,000 farmers without electric service. The REA, which is required by law to determine each year the farms receiving central station electric service, had estimated previously that 86.3% of the nation's farms had central station service, while the private electric utility industry had estimated that 5,372,800 farms had electric service last December 31, or 92% of the farms as enumerated by the 1945 census and 99.9% by the 1950 census (farms are decreasing in number, but growing in size all the time.)

"What's at stake in this frenzied figuring by the U.S.D.A. is a lot of bureaucrats. If Congress ever got the idea that actually all farmers had electricity--which is true, since those not now served are virtually all isolated miles from any electrical line and could not economically be served with electricity until the population increases in the area--appropriations for the REA would go down faster. That would mean severing a few bureaucrats from the public payroll--and perish the thought!"

Savings: Amount unspecified.

Source: Forbes, Vol. 68, No. 4, August 15, 1951, p. 9.

\* \* \* \* \*

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"The committee recommends the budget estimate of \$109,000,000 for loan funds, \$100,000,000 for the electrification program and \$9,000,000 for the telephone program, which is \$188,000,000 less than

funds available for the current fiscal year. The sum of \$7,750,000 is recommended for salaries and expenses, a reduction of \$671,350 from the 1951 level and a reduction of \$750,000 in the 1952 estimates. Since the electrification program has now reached some 86 percent of all farms in the United States, it will undoubtedly reduce in size in the future, and the administrative work will be reduced accordingly. Information furnished the committee indicates that new electrification applications for the next fiscal year will run approximately \$145,000,000 and that a carryover of approximately \$45,000,000 of funds authorized for 1951 will be available.

"Including the amount approved for 1952, a total of \$66,500,000 has been provided for the rural telephone program. This amount appears to be sufficient to cover all applications received through the current date.

"In view of the decrease recommended in the loan funds for the electrification and telephone programs, a reduction is proposed for salaries and expenses. While a larger reduction might be indicated from the decrease in loan authorizations for 1952, it is recognized that a certain residue of work remains from loans made during prior years which must be handled on a continuing basis, regardless of the size of loan authorizations for ensuing fiscal years...."

Savings: \$750,000.

Source: Report of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Department of Agriculture Appropriation Bill, 1952, pp. 16-17.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### LOANS

"...if the Interior Department were to come to the Congress and ask us for money to build a steam plant, we probably would refuse them, and yet they can do that indirectly by getting a few cooperatives, say in Missouri, to come to the REA and get enough money to build this steam plant and then sell all the power to REA and then REA sells it back, what each cooperative needs, and thereby finances it that way. Do you think that is correct?"

Savings: Amount unspecified.

Source: Mr. Ellender, Senator from Louisiana, in Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, Senate, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Agricultural Appropriations for 1952, p. 109.



\* \* \* \* \*

FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

GENERAL

"The committee has approved loan funds in the amount of \$142,250,000, and recommends \$27,500,000 for salaries and expenses.... The loan authorization represents a reduction of \$5,250,000 below the program level for 1951 and is \$10,750,000 less than the estimates for 1952. The funds recommended for salaries and expenses are \$699,752 below the funds available for 1951 and \$2,200,000 below the estimate for 1952."

"...While the decrease in administrative funds may seem unduly drastic, the committee has every reason to believe that the usually fine administration of this agency will enable it to absorb the reduction with no serious impairment of its program...."

Savings: \$2,200,000 for salaries and expenses and \$10,750,000 less in loan authorization.

Source: Report of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Department of Agriculture Appropriation Bill, 1952, p. 17.

\* \* \* \* \*

AUTHORIZATION TO EXPEND FROM PUBLIC DEBT RECEIPTS

"...last year \$103,000,000 was spent for the program. The House committee recommended that the amount be cut to \$100,000,000 by 3 percent. The House of Representatives approved the reduction to \$100,000,000. The Senate committee has increased the amount to \$110,000,000, representing an increase of \$7,000,000 over the amount expended last year, without too much explanation as to why the increase is recommended.

"My amendment would retain for the coming year the same amount which was appropriated last year. My amendment is not a proposal to cut the funds of the program below the amounts used last year. It is merely a proposal to prevent the program from costing more during a period when we are faced with national defense costs of about \$50,000,000,000."



Savings: \$7,000,000.

Source: Mr. Douglas, Senator from Illinois, Congressional Record, July 26, 1951, p. 9176.

\* \* \*

"The program for financing farm ownerships seems inconsistent with the over-all credit restrictions which have been advocated by the government and could be reduced \$70,000,000. There seems to be available private capital to make loans for this purpose if the borrowers can establish that they can successfully operate their farms. With present farm prices, most farmers can establish credit with private lending institutions."

Savings: \$70,000,000.

Source: National Association of Manufacturers, Cut Non-Defense Spending Now, Economic Policy Division Series, No. 40, New York, February, 1951, p. 13.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

##### GENERAL

"The Farm Credit Administration has some \$300,000,000 out on interest-free loans and has permitted borrowers to invest some of it in government bonds. This is equivalent to a grocer borrowing money from a bank at interest for his petty cash, lending the money to customers interest free, and borrowing back from the customers at interest again."

Savings: Millions in unmade loans.

Source: Earl B. Steele, "Holes in Our Public Purse," Nation's Business, Vol. 39, No. 2, February, 1951, p. 62.

\* \* \* \* \*

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"...this amendment will take only 3 percent out of the item affecting directly the immediate office of the Secretary.

"I think it would be only good business to show to the gentlemen at the top of this vast organization of the Department of Agriculture, with more than 60,000 employees, that they themselves in that immediate office must try to do a little economizing. I can show the House...just where \$75,000 can easily be taken out of this item without harm in any way."

. . . . .

"...it is my opinion that the Office of the Secretary could well operate on a maximum of \$2,082,200 for the next fiscal year. Consequently, I am offering an amendment to reduce the figure in the bill from \$2,157,200 by \$75,000...."

. . . . .

"...Frankly, I question the advisability of the Secretary having, in addition to the three major positions directly under him, six assistants to the Secretary. You would think that one assistant to each of the top four officials would be sufficient. I also question the presence of four agriculturists in the Land and Water Resources Division. Certainly it seems that we should not have to spend \$124,700 in that particular little division in the Secretary's immediate office when we have the elaborate set-ups that are in some of the major divisions of the Department, such as Soil Conservation Service, which could well handle, it would seem to me, the bulk of that work. I question the need for the numerous chiefs of divisions and chiefs of sections. It makes me wonder just who really does do the work. It would seem that perhaps there should be a division in the Secretary's office devoted to examining ways and means of eliminating useless positions in the entire Department of Agriculture and also within his immediate office."

Savings: \$75,000.

Source: Mr. Andersen, Representative from Minnesota, Congressional Record, May 17, 1951, p. 5593.

\* \* \* \* \*

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"The amount recommended for this office Office of Solicitor for 1952; \$2,200,000, is \$352,100 below the amounts available for 1951 and \$263,000 below the estimate for 1952. This decrease is based on the reductions recommended in certain of the major programs of the Department serviced by this Office, including the Commodity Credit Corporation and the REA."

Savings: \$263,000.

Source: Report of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Department of Agriculture Appropriation Bill, 1952, p. 19.

\* \* \* \* \*

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

PRINTING AND BINDING

"...this amendment relates to the appropriation of funds \$1,215,268 for the Agricultural Yearbook..."

. . . . .

"Here is an opportunity for the Congress to cut itself. Oh, I know we ourselves do not get the books. It means nothing to us, financially, but it is one of the prerogatives we have--the opportunity to send to our favorite constituents these agricultural yearbooks. Here is an opportunity for the Congress to cut itself to \$878,268, and I believe that in so doing we shall set a good example--a good example, certainly, for the country and a good example of the application of this principle--that during this period when it is going to be necessary for this country to incur a deficit the Congress will make cuts in appropriations for purposes which may be desirable, but which are not absolutely essential."

Savings: \$337,000.

Source: Mr. Nixon, Senator from California, Congressional Record, July 26, 1951, p. 9178.

\* \* \* \* \*

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

OPERATING AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

"The other point we would like for you to consider is that a saving of about \$6 million can be achieved if certain expense items which we believe can properly be paid from premiums were deleted from the requested appropriation. We believe that it is the desire of this committee to economize wherever possible and that this substantial savings in the crop insurance appropriation can be realized without hindering or curtailing the program."

Savings: \$6,000,000 annually.

Source: Mr. F. W. Benson, Chairman. Special Crop Hail Conference Committee of the National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies, in Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, Senate, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Agricultural Appropriations for 1952, p. 862.

\* \* \*

...  
"...my amendment...would reduce the appropriation [\$7,949,911] to the amount the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation had for administrative expenses for the fiscal year 1950 [\$4,904,570]."

• • • • •

"...it is all very well to say that the Corporation has to sustain some kind of a sound level of operations on a sound actuarial basis. However, frankly speaking, when this Corporation has to put on a selling drive in order to sell the insurance to the farmers, and when the Corporation is up against the kind of a cancellation rate it has actually experienced, it seems to me we are justified in being very suspicious of the justification for this program and in believing that its operations are on a bad basis, and that if we were to appropriate further funds for this purpose, we would be throwing good money after bad.

"If the premiums the farmers are paying are not commensurate with the cost of doing this business--and certainly the premiums are not in keeping with the amount of indemnities which are being paid--the arrangement is not a sound one."