

Regardless of how good programs were when they came out of the Washington office, they were translated on the operating level into a Farm Bureau version of the original idea. But in spite of these basic controls, the Farm Bureau needed to bolster its membership, so someone thought of adapting the check-off principle to farm organization. In many Southern States it has worked like this. Big planters who have always been Farm Bureau members and understand that the bureau is working for their interests have agreed to sign up all their tenants and croppers for the bureau. The member rarely knows he has joined; his \$2 dues are just deducted from his crop or his Agricultural Adjustment Administration check and turned over to the bureau directly. Under this ingenious system, membership in the South has shot up, and the Georges, Byrds, Glasses, and McKellers have an equivalent respect for the Farm Bureau interpretation of agricultural economics.

As things stand now, Ed O'Neal and the five-hundred-thousand-odd members he has now are lined up against the Farm Security Administration and its 600,000 low-income farm families. O'Neal's well-to-do planters are producing almost to capacity at present. If we are to meet the requirements of our victory food program, it will have to be through increasing production by the 3,000,000 farm families who now fall in the under \$600 annual income group. It is the Farm Security program which is capable of doing this—not the Farm Bureau program. It is our Baldwins who can win the war for us; our O'Neals who can lose it.

HELEN FULLER.

WASHINGTON.

Mr. BYRD. Let me point out to the Senator from Tennessee that the article to which I have just referred was sent at Government expense to a large number of the clients of the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me say that, so far as I am concerned, the statement made in that article is just as false as the other many falsehoods which have been circulated by this same organization. I think it is the worst set-up that we have in the Government. I want to be perfectly frank. The Senator knows that I usually speak my mind. I shall speak my mind right now. I think Mr. Baldwin is a Communist. I do not think he is really in favor of our American institutions. I think he is doing the poorest job of almost any job performed by anyone connected with the Government. To my mind the Farm Security Administration is the most wasteful and extravagant agency or activity we have. I have no confidence in Mr. Baldwin as an administrator, and I know that he is giving enormous sums of money to some very trifling people. I do not believe in his philosophy of life. I think it is hurting the morale of the farmers, the morale of the youth, and of people generally. The teachings of Mr. Baldwin in regard to it being the duty of the Government to give away its money to people who will not work for it is fallacious and indefensible. I forget how many hundreds of millions of dollars this young man has given away; I do not have the exact information at hand at the moment.

Mr. BYRD. I think it has been nearly a billion dollars.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Virginia says it has been nearly a billion dollars. I do not know the exact figures. I think Mr. Baldwin is the most extravagant administrator of all administrators of activities in the Government, barring none. I do not believe he is doing the farmers a particle of good. I think he is injuring them in the greatest degree. That is one of the reasons why in the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-essential Federal Expenditures I voted to put a brake on this man.

What he may have said about me or what he may have published and passed through the mails about me, at Government expense, is wholly immaterial; it makes no difference in the world what Mr. Baldwin thinks about me, or what he does not think about me. I have but one idea in the world in what I am doing in this body, and that is to see that the work of the Government is administered honestly and as fairly and as justly and as economically as it is possible to administer it. At a time such as this, for us to throw away money for such things as the trailer systems and migratory farm camps, which do not bring in any return, to my mind is indefensible, and I am willing to vote to abolish the whole thing.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Of course I will not interrupt the Senator from Tennessee if he prefers not to be interrupted.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; so far as I am concerned I am glad to have the Senator interrupt in any way he pleases.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, we often speak about bureaucratic agencies doing injustice to those of us who serve in the legislative branch of the Government; and yet oftentimes we rise on the floor of the Senate when the victim of our views is not here to defend himself, and, with the light-heartedness of a cavalier, denounce him as a Communist. Of course, being a Communist is an offense; one who is a Communist is diametrically opposed to our form of government, and membership in the Communist Party disentitles a man to the right to draw a dollar of pay as a Government official; and under such circumstances the acceptance by a Government official of any Government money as pay would make him a criminal. All of us know that to be a fact; and yet we offer to our colleagues or to the country or to the official under criticism no itemization or justification whatever for the claim, so far as I understand. I think it is only fair that such justification be stated.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will read the hearings, he will see that, in substance, I have made exactly the same statement to Mr. Baldwin to his face when I have cross-examined him.

Mr. BYRD. I can certify to that.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no secrets; I am not saying anything in this body that I will not say anywhere else in the world.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not question the right of a Senator to make any statement he may desire.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not only the right, but, if Mr. Baldwin wants to sue me, let

him go ahead; I will waive the fact that I am a Senator.

Mr. PEPPER. As one Senator, I should like very much to hear the Senator produce some evidence of the basis upon which he charges a public official with being a Communist. I know that in one instance that was involved in the Senator's remarks, but I do not agree with his statement of fact.

Because he referred to throwing away money that goes for the benefit of the migratory workers of this country, I wish to say that, as a personal observer of the improvement in living conditions the Farm Security Administration has brought to the migrant workers who work in my State, I know of no agency of the Government that is doing more good and is more deserving of support from the Congress than is the Farm Security Administration. If that work be called extravagance, it is to belittle the dignity of a human being living in a decent house and not being compelled to wash his clothes in the same stream in which the refuse from his body is carried away.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if it be a matter of giving Government money, other people's money, to these people for a purpose which betters their condition temporarily, the Senator is right in his defense, but, to my mind, it is indefensible for the Government to make these vast appropriations for men who are gallowing around the country doing nothing but drawing their support from the Public Treasury through grants from this young man. The Senator can have his own views about it; I am not criticizing him; every man thinks about these things as he pleases, but, so far as I am concerned, I still think, notwithstanding what the Senator has said, that the little good it may do—and it is like a kind-hearted person giving a hand-out to a man who asks for it—is very significant indeed compared to the injury to the morale of the farmers of this country and to their independence. Causing men to travel over the country in automobiles or trailers and having the Government, in part, support them in that kind of work, I do not believe contributes one single particle to the produce grown on the farms of this country. Can the Senator tell me of any organization of this kind the efforts of which have resulted in farm products being secured for anybody?

Mr. PEPPER. I can say to the Senator that, quoting from the United States census report, in the spring of 1940 in the State of Florida alone many thousands of these itinerant workers were engaged in the cultivation and the harvesting of vegetables which were sent forth from that State to various consuming areas of the Nation. Those migrant workers, not so fortunate as some of us to be able to reside in satisfactory and sanitary homes, follow the market and follow the vegetable and fruit crops which come into maturity at various times in various sections of the country. They go from the Southeast up the Atlantic seaboard; some of them reach the State of Kentucky and perform there a

kind of work different from that which they perform in Florida.

The question is not whether they are going to keep on migrating. Mr. Baldwin did not start them migrating. They were migrating when Mr. Baldwin came in; they were migrating when some of us came to the Senate years ago, when this type of agriculture developed in America, and when there was need for a large number of people, more than the area could normally support as a stable population, to go into certain areas at certain seasons. Consequently they move from period to period and place to place. The only thing Mr. Baldwin has done, the only thing the Congress has done, since this administration has taken cognizance of their poverty, their squalor, is to take them out of insanitary houses, out of squalid conditions, and give them decent abodes in which they may repose while they are at a given place.

Mr. McKELLAR. What about—

Mr. PEPPER. I hope the Senator will excuse me for a moment. Let me finish this statement; then I will gladly yield.

I never knew a great deal about these migratory labor camps until 2 or 3 years ago when I happened to be driving across the highway in the area of Lake Okeechobee in Florida, which is a great vegetable-producing area. I saw a little chain of houses on the banks of a stream, which was used in one instance for the washing of clothes and in the other instance for the sewers of the area. I cannot conceive of a Negro community, I can hardly conceive of a peasant area in any country in the world more deplorable, more obnoxious than that area was. Yet just a short time before I passed there that was the abode, the residence of men, women, and children who are American citizens, who had come there in response to the seasonal demand to aid in the cultivation and harvesting of the vegetable crops. About a half a mile away from there I was shown a camp, neatly laid out, with grass on the ground, with little houses, sufficiently large for two families, with the privies back a proper distance from the residences, and then, in front of that picture was a flagpole on which was floating the American flag. I said in my heart, "Thank God for a country that will take its citizens out of squalor and put them in decent abodes where they may have repose in the nighttime and while they are home in the daytime resting from their labors in the field."

In everyone of those camps the United States Employment Service has put its own representative. Those in the camps do not lie there in idleness and indolence; they are assigned to a field not by the person who comes for their labor but by a public representative, and, if they do not work, they are thrown out of these houses.

So the man who says they are permitted to indulge themselves at public expense and do nothing is not informed. I have seen them, as other Senators in this body have seen them. It is not fair to those people to have them held up to ridicule and scorn because they happen

to migrate for particular crops and seasons from one section of the country to another.

As it is now, this appropriation has been cut down to a point where only half the existing camps can be maintained unless the occupants are required to pay a charge for the use of the facilities.

This is one agency, Mr. President, that gets down into the humble class of American citizens who are making less than \$500 and less than \$750 a year and even less than \$500. It is all right to give a subsidy to the big farmers, as we do give a subsidy for soil conservation and other benefits; it is all right to subsidize business and manufacturers, but if we give a poor devil \$75 a month on W. P. A. or if we teach him to be self-sustaining upon a tenant farm, in the opinion of some able Senators it is squandering public funds.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think I know as much about the poor people of this country as does the Senator from Florida, for I am one of them; I have been poor all my life; I have gone through the school of hardship and I know what I am talking about. I have seen these camps, too, I will say to the Senator from Florida, and I think many of them, especially the trailer camps, are a stench in the nostrils of decent people. Those whose homes are in the localities are regretful that the camps are there, and the only reason they are there is that they are upheld by our Government.

We are just as much to blame as are the migrants themselves when we keep them there at Government expense.

When times were hard, when there was real necessity for helping these people because of the depression which came upon us several years ago, we all voted for all that was necessary to take care of them because their plight was not their fault. But times have changed; there is no man who wants work in this country today who cannot get it. Why should we be subsidizing any group of our people when the work of all groups is necessary? Any man who is strong enough to work, who is physically able to work, has an opportunity to work just as much as the Senator or I have. For the Government to support these people in the way we are doing, to my mind, I say again, is indefensible. It is hurtful to the young men of our country; it is hurtful to the very men to whom we give these benefits in such large measure. It affects them so that they are dependent upon the Government, and do not depend upon themselves.

Mr. President, for these reasons I believe that these appropriations should not be made. I voted in the committee to cut them down in every way possible, as the chairman of the subcommittee, the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], knows. I feel the same way now. I wish to add that I think I am quite as sympathetic with the class of people in question as are those who take the opposite view.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Tennessee if I may.

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. I notice at the top of page 74, line 3, a provision for \$450,000,000, which apparently has come to us from the House without change in any way by the Senate committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I note the provision.

Mr. DANAHER. That is a considerable sum of money. Did the Senate committee make any effort to change the amount?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall have to refer that to the Senator from Georgia. I am not on the subcommittee.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not hear the question of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will not the Senator from Connecticut repeat his question?

Mr. DANAHER. I ask the Senator from Tennessee this question, then, if he cannot answer the first: Can the Senator from Tennessee tell me who is to get the \$450,000,000?

Mr. McKELLAR. Again I shall have to refer the Senator to the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the subcommittee, because I am not on the subcommittee.

Mr. RUSSELL. That amount is to be paid to the six-million-odd thousand farm families for meeting certain definite requirements of the Department of Agriculture in order to preserve the fertility of the soil of this Nation. It is paid out only to those who comply with the requirements of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. There have been many people who have been much concerned at the great depletion of our lands. We know from the history of other nations which have come and gone, empires which have risen and fallen, that the basic, underlying cause of many of the tragic happenings of history which wiped out great civilizations has been the depletion of the fertility of the soil. The money here appropriated is to be paid out, as it has been for years past, to those who conform to the requirements of the Department for preserving the soil.

I may say to the Senator that this year for the first time, recognizing the very unusual conditions which obtain, a reduction of \$50,000,000 has been made in the appropriation. For the past 7 years the appropriation has been \$500,000,000. This year, in the effort to economize in every case where money could be saved, this appropriation has been reduced by \$50,000,000.

Mr. DANAHER. That was a reduction the House put into effect?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; it was recommended by the Budget Bureau, approved by the House committee and the House, and approved by the Senate committee.

Mr. DANAHER. Without change?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield further?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I direct attention to page 77, where I see the language in line 8, "there are hereby reappropriated the unobligated balances of the appropriations made under this head by the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Acts for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942, to remain available until June 30, 1945. How much money is represented by those unobligated balances?"

Mr. RUSSELL. Approximately \$2,000,000—to be exact, \$2,015,000.

Mr. DANAHER. What is the purpose, then, of providing that they shall be reappropriated until June 30, 1945?

Mr. RUSSELL. I really know of no necessity for their being made available until June 30, 1945. I can tell the Senator the reason why this has been done in the past.

The parity payments are made to farmers who comply with the crop-reduction program and the soil-conservation program of the Department. Ofttimes there has been a controversy within a county as to whether a farmer has earned his parity payments. In such case the county committee passed upon the matter. If a farmer is dissatisfied with a decision of the committee, he has a right to appeal to his State committee. Sometimes it takes a considerable period of time to develop all the facts, and to conduct a hearing before the State committee. If the State committee decides against the farmer, he has a right to appeal to the Secretary of Agriculture. In some cases the question whether a farmer was entitled to a parity payment has been involved in the process of appeal for more than 2 years; so that funds were made available for a period of 3 years to enable the Secretary to take care of such appeal cases.

Mr. DANAHER. Then, under this language, such farmers will be guaranteed, I take it, full parity payments. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes.

Mr. DANAHER. In each of the instances mentioned we are paying part of the \$450,000,000 to farmers who already own their farms.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; the Senator is entirely in error in that respect. Under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 the payments are not confined to farmers who own their land, but the small farmer or the tenant farmer gets increased payments over and above that received by the farmer who is a large operator. The payments are not confined to landowners; the money goes to all those who work upon farms.

Mr. DANAHER. Under this parity program we give a guaranty to those who produce in accordance with the requirements of the Agricultural Adjustment Act; do we not?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Do we make any provision for a farmer reducing acreage as a condition to receiving any part of these payments?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes; that is true with respect to wheat and cotton. Due to the great surpluses which have been piled up, there has been a very drastic reduction in wheat acreage and in cotton acreage. The cotton acreage has been

reduced from 16,000,000 acres, and the wheat acreage was reduced this year to approximately 55,000,000 acres. I do not recall the aggregate acreage prior to the reduction.

Mr. DANAHER. I am impelled to ask these questions by the observation of the Senator from Tennessee, who thereafter referred my questions to the Senator from Georgia, let me recall. He had been talking about the need for production in wartime, with which I fully agree, and about the need of our doing everything we could to stimulate production. Yet we find these enormous sums—\$450,000,000, on the one hand—to be paid to farmers who are already established on farms, whether they own them or not, and, on the other hand, a guaranteed minimum of parity payments is provided for others who reduce their quotas in certain instances.

I assume that when we are doing that much for those people it is eminently proper that we take into account yet one other class of farmer, as to whom the Congress hitherto has not declared a policy. I do not understand, let me say to the Senator from Tennessee, that either he or the Senator from Georgia, or anyone else, is making any attack here on the policy represented by the appropriation. Their quarrel is one with the amount of the appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; our objection is to the way in which certain amounts of it are paid. So far as concerns the appropriation which the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Georgia have discussed, they are entirely right; the appropriation applies to large farmers, small farmers, all farmers. It applies to farmers who want to buy land and who are helped, and that is a fine thing. The evil about which I had something to say was the evil of the so-called migratory farmers. They are not farmers; they are merely migrants who are going all over the country. They get automobiles and go to various sections of the country and stop at trailer camps, and the Government helps support them. I do not think that should be done. They are not attempting to make homes for themselves; they are not trying to become farmers; they are not trying to help the country produce things which will be of aid to the country. Collecting together and making nuisances of themselves, they are undertaking to get something from the Government to which they are not entitled. That class of farmers we cannot help. What we give them is thrown away. They are no good from an economic standpoint, and, to my mind, the system followed is destroying the morale of those who receive the money from the Government without compensating return.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator from Tennessee tell me who will harvest the crops if these migrants do not?

Mr. McKELLAR. There will be a sufficient number of farmers to harvest the crops. We would be disappointed if we depended on these migrants, who go over the country in old Ford cars, collecting in migratory stations, taking their cars into trailer camps. By the way, these camps are most unsanitary. Talk about the

Government furnishing better sanitation for them; anyone who will go near one of the camps will observe that the Government is not furnishing the sanitation for the camps, at any rate. These people are a nuisance to those around them; they are no good to the farmers; they are not workers; they are migrants. They are naturally roving people, who are not farmers, and many of them do not claim to be farmers.

Mr. DANAHER. Many of them?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; many of them.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me for another question?

Mr. BYRD. I should like to proceed with my statement, Mr. President.

Mr. DANAHER. I ask the Senator to yield for only one further question, and I thank him for his forbearance. Is there any provision in the bill for the payment for sugar quotas this year and, if so, how much?

Mr. BYRD. There is a provision for paying on the same basis as last year. The amount is \$47,000,000, is it not, I ask the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is only \$500,000 below the amount for the current year. It is some forty-odd million dollars.

Mr. BYRD. Forty-seven million dollars, I believe.

Mr. DANAHER. And that sum is to be paid to those who keep their sugar quotas within limit; is that true?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not an expert on the sugar question. In our committee we have several experts on that question, one of them being the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and one of two other Senators. This year we have reversed the policy. This year we pay for increased production rather than pay the farmers to decrease their production.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say to the Senator from Connecticut that there seems to be an erroneous impression that this \$450,000,000 is received entirely by farmers. It is my understanding that much of it is received by landowners, who are not necessarily farmers, and it applies to owners of forest land, and particularly it applies to a great many banking institutions and insurance companies in the East that own land in the West on which they collect soil-conservation payments. In my State there are two companies which collect the maximum of, as I recall the amount, \$10,000. If the Senator from Connecticut examines the record, I believe he will find a great many such institutions in his State which are collecting \$10,000 each from this \$450,000,000 appropriation. Senators will notice that there was a proposal made to cut the maximum payment to \$1,000, but that was not agreed to. The \$450,000,000, however, is not all paid to farmers; it is paid to landowners for improving their soil and protecting the soil. Part of it goes for control of river-bank erosion, at least for supervision of the work, and for other purposes which cannot directly be called farming operations.