

10-4-1951

Farm policy review

Charles L. Neill

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsjunction.msstate.edu/mss-stevens-papers>

Recommended Citation

Stevens (Boswell) Papers, Special Collections Department, Mississippi State University

This Document is brought to you for free and open access by the Manuscripts Division at Scholars Junction. It has been accepted for inclusion in Boswell Stevens Papers by an authorized administrator of Scholars Junction. For more information, please contact scholcomm@msstate.libanswers.com.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
State Agricultural Mobilization Committee

State Office
Post Office Box 1251
Jackson, Mississippi

October 4, 1951

To: Members of State Agricultural Mobilization Committee

From: C. L. Neill, Chairman, State Agricultural Mobilization
Committee

Subject: October Meeting

The purpose of this letter is to give you an idea of the agenda for the next meeting of the State Agricultural Mobilization Committee which, as you know, was set for Thursday, October 11. It will start at 10 o'clock in the morning and will be held in the second floor Assembly Room of the Woolfolk State Office Building here in Jackson.

Most of the time at this meeting will doubtless be required in preparation of the State report of the Farm Policy Review. As you will recall, we appointed at the last meeting a committee to review county reports and prepare a draft of a State report. This committee has completed and turned over to me a preliminary draft of a State report. This preliminary draft has been mimeographed and is enclosed for your study between now and the October 11 meeting. I hope you will find time to consider the various proposals contained in this report and that you will come to the meeting prepared to discuss this report and to raise any questions you have regarding these proposals. Other important subjects to be considered are the farm machinery conservation program assigned to State and county mobilization committees and a campaign for collection of scrap iron on farms.

I hope you will attend this important meeting if at all possible and, if not, you will send a representative.

C. L. Neill

FARM POLICY REVIEW

REPORT OF THE MISSISSIPPI STATE AGRICULTURAL MOBILIZATION COMMITTEE

Section 1 - Summary of County Reports

GENERAL

This summary of county reports on the Farm Policy Review was compiled by merely combining recommendations as submitted by the county agricultural mobilization committees. Some of the recommendations are what most people would think not well considered, while others recommend changes already within the authority of local groups, such as county FMA committees, to place in operation and do not require any changes at State or National levels. A few of the suggestions advanced as changes are in reality already included in the programs; however, to avoid any possibility of bias, the reports are summarized below exactly as submitted with the exception that where it was interpreted that several counties intended slightly different wordings to cover essentially the same change, all of those were recorded under one statement. Also, where suggestion of change as submitted by the county committee was not clear, it has been restated in an attempt to clarify it according to the interpretation the State Committee made of the report sent in from the county.

The State Committee has not indicated its approval or disapproval of any of the county recommendations and the committee would like to have it understood by all who read the report that the inclusion of a recommendation in this summary does not imply agreement or disagreement of the State Agricultural Mobilization Committee. Such views as the State Committee cares to express in regard to these recommendations have been set forth in Section II of this report.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

Two counties recommended that all agricultural research, so far as possible, should be handled through the land-grant colleges. Their view in this is that such a policy would result in research more nearly applicable to local farm problems. One county recommended that more funds should be provided for marketing research. Another county committee thought more attention should be given to the possibility of regional research. The view was expressed that this would result in more economical research and in many instances would give equally valuable results.

One county suggested that additional emphasis be placed on animal disease and parasite control; special attention should be given horse flies and anti-plasmosis. Another county expressed the need for more workers of the Bureau of Animal Industry located in scattered areas so that their services would be available to more farmers.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

Three counties expressed the view that current lists of crop reporters used in obtaining sample data for acreage, production, and price estimates are not adequate. These two counties thought that some revisions of the lists should be made in order that crop reporters will be farmers who are better qualified to fill in the questionnaires which are mailed out. Also in some cases they state that one farmer gets more than one questionnaire due to his name being duplicated on the list. Another county believes that a larger sample (more crop reporters) should be used as a basis for making crop acreage estimates. Still another county suggested that the list of crop reporters would accomplish its purpose better if local agricultural workers were asked to submit a list of average farmers to whom questionnaires should be mailed. The view was expressed that this system would result in more accurate estimates than present plans.

One county suggested that agricultural estimates and crop reports should be obtained through a more reliable source than those used at the present time. BAE, in their opinion, should not depend on voluntary reports throughout the country as these are not reliable. Another county suggested that BAE should take necessary steps to obtain more accurate estimates of acreages and crop production but did not give any suggestions as to how this might be accomplished. One county stated that methods should be provided for adjusting BAE crop estimates (this was interpreted to indicate some sort of appeal procedure where local farmers affected by acreage allotments based on official estimates believe the estimates to be incorrect).

One county expressed the view that BAE estimates were largely responsible for the decline in the price of cotton in 1951 between planting time and harvest time and that BAE should be more conservative in making reports during the cotton harvesting season.

One county suggested that BAE should develop methods such as weekly or monthly reports for obtaining wider dissemination of information it assembles.

One county suggested that BAE, Office of Information and Commodity Exchange Authority should be combined into one agency.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

The most common recommendation in regard to Extension Service pertains to need for additional county personnel. Three counties made this suggestion. Two counties suggested that an assistant be provided to the home demonstration agent. One county said that each county in the State should be given one assistant county agent before any county is allowed to have more than one. One county expressed a need for an assistant county agent. Another county said that county extension personnel should be based on the need and not on the county's ability to pay. One county recommends that additional specialist personnel be furnished on the county level to work with individual farmers.

One county suggested that the county agent should be invited to farmer meetings called by vocational agriculture teachers and that he should have the opportunity of distributing literature and making talks at such meetings. Another county believes there should be a closer coordination between Extension Service and Vocational Agriculture and Home Economics Education. One county recommended that a plan be worked out whereby all agricultural agencies could work more closely with county agents. Two counties suggested that more emphasis be given to 4-H and older youth club work.

Two counties think county agents should give more group instruction and demonstrations, such as pasture demonstrations. One county says Extension workers should plan their programs so as to contact a greater percentage of farm people. Two counties expressed the view that county agents and home demonstration agents should spend less time in their offices and more time in the field. One county says the Extension Service should give more assistance to small farmers.

Several suggestions along the line of personal service were sent in. Two counties said that county agents should assume responsibility for providing proper marketing facilities for marketing surplus products farmers have on hand or may produce. One county asks that county agents be allowed to keep on hand needed serums and vaccines. They expressed the opinion that these supplies would be cheaper and more readily available to farmers if handled in this way. Two counties think additional veterinary service should be provided at the county level by the Extension Service until the local demands for this service would justify a licensed veterinarian. Another county expressed the contrary view that Extension agents should do less veterinary work than they now perform.

One county suggested that representative samples of planting seeds and fertilizers should be taken by county agents from the stocks of all dealers in the county periodically and sent to the State Laboratory for analysis.

One county asked that more funds be made available for buying equipment and materials for carrying on an informational program. They mentioned specifically the need for a camera for making pictures and slides of local subjects needed in informational activities.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

Only three recommendations were submitted in regard to this agency. One county suggests that an informational staff be established on a State level in order to coordinate information from all farm agencies to be passed on to farm people in accordance with their needs. A second county recommends that the Office of Information coordinate its efforts with land-grant colleges in order to better fit its informational material to local farm situations. A third county suggested this agency be abolished. The view was expressed that this activity is adequately covered by the Cooperative Extension Service.

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

Agricultural Conservation Program

Most of the recommendations pertaining to FMA involve the Agricultural Conservation Program. The most commonly suggested change was that ACP assistance for fall practices should be announced earlier in the year than it has been in recent years. Seven counties said announcement should be made by August 1. Five other counties thought practice payment funds should be made available not later than July 1 for fall practices. Ten counties thought that the ACP program year should begin on July 1 rather than January 1 as it does at the present. This suggestion is related to the same difficulty that caused other counties to recommend an earlier announcement of fall practice assistance. One county recommended that individual farm allowances for ACP assistance should be announced a full year in advance so that farmers could better plan the use of these funds. Two counties expressed the view that farm allowances under ACP should be uniform from year to year so that farmers would know what to expect in the way of assistance in their farming operations. Two counties state that ACP should be announced earlier but did not give a specific date.

One county recommended that under the Agricultural Conservation Program terracing practice performance requirements should be liberalized to let the farmer select height and width of terraces he wants to build rather than complying with FMA requirements as they must do at the present. Another county stated that ACP performance requirements should be simplified. One county believes that ACP assistance should be granted for construction of livestock water ponds on each farm in the county without regard to the present supply of water. Under the ACP fencing practice one county recommends that the minimum diameter of black locust and mulberry posts should be reduced from three inches to two inches.

Four counties expressed the opinion that there should be no maximum payment restriction to an individual under any FMA program. Three counties recommended that ACP appropriations be maintained at the present or higher levels. One county recommends that the \$2500 maximum payment limitation under the Agricultural Conservation Program be continued. One county requests that practice payment funds to individual farms for planting forest trees should be unlimited. This same county suggests that there should be a special allowance for each farm for clearing land for pasture. Ten counties believe that additional assistance under ACP should be given to small farms. Six counties think that individual farm allowances under ACP should be increased. One county believes that more assistance should be given for leveling of eroded land. Another county suggests that a minimum allowance for land clearing should be established at \$100. One county recommends that minimum ACP assistance per farm should be \$100 and maximum \$400. Three counties recommend that the small payment increase in ACP should be eliminated.

One county recommends that mixed fertilizer be furnished under the ACP purchase order plan. Four counties say ACP assistance should be given for use of nitrogen under designated soil-conserving crops. One county believes ACP assistance should be given for mowing pasture.

Two counties expressed the view that FWA and SCS should be consolidated into one agency. One county emphasized that the present system of establishing fair prices on conservation materials and services under the purchase order plan should be continued. Two counties say enough copies of the ACP State Handbook should be printed so that each farmer could have one. One county believes fair prices on construction of livestock water ponds should be abolished. One county believes that FWA county committees and SCS county personnel should have authority to make changes in the FWA practice specifications to meet local conditions. Two counties believe that the rates of assistance under the ACP program where funds allocated to the county are not used near the end of the year should be increased and that the funds remaining unused should be prorated back to farmers who had participated rather than withdrawn by the State Committee and allotted to other counties. One county believes FWA should be authorized to set up demonstration farms to be supervised by the county USDA council, conservation practices on these farms to be financed by FWA for the purpose of demonstrating to farmers in the county improved conservation practices.

Marketing Quotas and Acreage Allotments

Three counties registered objection to having peanut marketing quotas applied in a county where there is no commercial peanut production although there are farms that grow enough acreage for home use to require acreage allotments. One county expressed the view that acreage allotments should be based on acreage alone without special provisions for small farms. One county had three suggestions in regard to marketing quota programs. The first is that acreage allotment regulations should be flexible enough to permit use of the entire county allotment. The second is that producers who will not use allotments should be required to release them by April 1 so that such acreage could be reapportioned to other producers. The third is that acreage reserves should be provided and county committees should have authority to make adjustments where there is change in ownership, a change in operator, or a change in farming operations regardless of acreage history of the allotment crop on the particular farm in question. One county stated that county committees should have more authority in making acreage allotments. Another county suggests that the method of distributing reserve acreage should be changed so that community committeemen may distribute reserve acreage after initial allotments have been sent to producers. The committeemen would then be in position to take into consideration a farmer's request for additional acreage and any data that might be presented to justify his request. One county recommends that acreage allotments for basic crops should be established on the basis of number of families on the farm instead of size of the farm. Another county recommends that provisions for benefits of small farms should be more flexible and that county committees should be given authority to adjust hardship cases.

Price Support

Three counties recommend that when the Government asks farmers to increase production of any commodity in the interest of National welfare as in the case of the 1951 cotton crop, the Government should give a specific price guarantee to producers before the crop is planted.

Five counties believe the present price support program of loans and marketing quotas should be continued and that direct payments to farmers should not be employed as a price support method. Two counties recommended that the present price support program should be continued and that the level of support should be raised to 100% of parity. Two counties recommended an increase in price support on cotton but did not give a specific level of support. One county expressed a need for some action at the national level to assure a more stable cotton market with a higher support price and a more stable supply from year to year. One county expressed the belief that there should be no limit to the amount of price support that could be given to any one producer. One county expressed the opinion that price support programs should be announced further in advance of the harvest season than has been done in the past.

Administration

One county recommends that FMA county employees should be under classified Civil Service. Seven counties recommend that local county and community committeemen be used more in policy making and program supervision. Five counties asked that more county office personnel be provided so that farmers can get quicker service when they come to the county office. One county suggests that additional administrative funds should be provided to be used in informing farmers of program provisions. One county says that the State FMA Committeemen should be elected by districts composed of counties of similar type of farming, topography, and other similar factors. One county recommends that FMA county personnel be given an increase in salary to put them on an equal basis with county personnel of other federal agencies doing similar work. One county believes that State Committeemen should be elected by county committees. Another county suggests that the number of community committeemen should be reduced from three in each community to one in each community and that the pay be increased from \$4 to \$6 per day and the county committeemen's pay be increased from \$6 to \$8 per day. One county recommends that a county administrative officer should be provided in each county (in all counties in Mississippi, except a few of the smallest counties, a county administrative officer is employed). Another county recommended that FMA committeemen should be elected for a period of three years to avoid necessity of annual elections. One county believes that community committeemen rather than delegates should elect county committeemen. One county believes that county committeemen should have less supervision from the State and National offices of FMA.

General

One county recommends that in the standards for grading cotton another grade should be established between Middling and Strict Low Middling in white and spotted cotton. They believe there is too wide a variation in the present grades, particularly in the loss of points from Middling to Strict Low Middling. In cases where the grade is on the border line and could be either the classer's decision to put it in the low grade costs the farmers too much, they say. One county expressed need for more prompt service to farmers in classing and grading of farm commodities. The same county expressed the view that no ceilings should be placed on price of farm commodities.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

The most common recommendation among the counties in regard to Soil Conservation Service programs is that Soil Conservation districts should be provided by the Government with more heavy equipment to do custom work on an economical basis for farmers. Eight county agricultural mobilization committees made this recommendation. One county reported that the dredging of streams by the U. S. Engineers has caused severe erosion to many streams in the loess area. This county suggests that the Federal Government should assume some responsibility in preventing or controlling this erosion. One county recommended that the watershed of Pearl River should be set up in a flood control project. One county suggests that SCS work programs should be planned on watershed lines rather than district or work unit lines. Another county recommends that a flood control project should be started in the Tombigbee watershed. One county expressed the view that SCS technical assistance should be provided on certain parts of a farm where this is requested rather than on the entire farm in all cases. Two counties suggest that land classification, land use maps, and farm plans should be made on all farms. Another county suggests that land use maps such as are furnished to farmers by SCS should also be furnished to other farm agencies in the county. Another county is of the opinion that Soil Conservation districts should generally consist of areas larger than counties. One county suggests that increased emphasis should be placed on the educational angles of conservation work in order to draw more public and private attention to the type and value of work that is being done.

One county expressed the view that SCS should have certain days on which the county offices will be open so that farmers may contact SCS personnel on designated days and not visit the county office and find that technicians are in the field. Two counties recommend that sufficient SCS personnel should be employed so that farmers will be able to contact someone in the county office at all times. Another county committee thinks that excessive paper work at the county level should be eliminated and that the entire time of the technician should be devoted to assisting farmers in the field. Another county says that the office work now performed in SCS county offices should be turned over to some other agency and the technician's time devoted entirely to field work. Seven counties recommended that SCS should have more working county personnel in order to get more field work accomplished. One county suggests an increase in SCS personnel in the district offices. One county made three recommendations in regard to SCS personnel: (1) that services of technicians should be equally available to all farmers and not concentrated to flood control and other special areas, (2) better qualified persons should be employed as aides, and (3) more aides should be employed during seasons when farmers have time to perform conservation practices. One county suggests additional soil survey men should be provided. Three counties asked that additional county SCS personnel should be provided to serve more promptly farmers who request soil maps for their farms. One county asked that a full time engineer be assigned to the Tallahatchie County Soil Conservation District. Two recommendations were received dealing with consolidation of SCS and FMA. One county suggests that there should be only one farmer committee for both agencies for the purpose of setting policies and making recommendations for conservation work throughout the county. Another county expressed the opinion that SCS and FMA offices should be consolidated into one agency.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Three counties recommend that the terms of loans made by agencies under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration should be more liberal, especially for purchasing cattle and equipment. These counties believe present methods of appraising and approving loans based on productivity of land is based on old records or obsolete cost data. They think the appraisal procedure should be revised to reflect current land and commodity values.

Each of the following suggestions was made by one county. No two counties made the same suggestion.

1. More liberal production loans should be available to family size farms.
2. Greater consideration should be given to farmers who are shifting from one type of farming to another where capital requirements are greater.
3. A more recent base period should be used in appraising farm land.
4. Loan requirements should be less strict.
5. There should be less supervision of operations of borrowers.
6. Cost of loans to farmers should be reduced, if practicable.
7. A wider educational program should be carried out to acquaint the public with different types of loans available to farmers.
8. The basis for appraisals on real estate loans should be revised to give consideration to income from timber land, dairying, and other sources of income not now considered.
9. Equipment loans should be made for three-year periods and livestock loans for five years.
10. Long-term loans should be made for purchase of cattle and development of tung farms.
11. Repayment of livestock loans should be made over a three-year period.
12. Federal Land Banks should be required to release all mineral rights to the purchaser when land is sold by the Bank.
13. Lower interest rates and longer term loans should be provided.
14. Production Credit Associations should continue to be operated in such a manner that Government capital will be available in an emergency.

One county suggested that Farm Credit Administration and Farmers Home Administration loans should be further integrated while another county suggests these two agencies be consolidated. One county recommends that the Farm Credit Administration should be removed from the Department of Agriculture and that credit agencies should be locally controlled.

One county expressed the view that the time which passes between application for farm planning and the time of actual completion should be reduced. Another county committee suggested that more local group meetings of farmers should be held to promote the conservation program. One county states that SOS practices should be protected by fences constructed with Agricultural Conservation Program assistance through FMA. One county expressed the opinion that more funds should be provided for flood control work.

One county recommended that SOS be used to make an analysis of lands in the National Forests to determine what lands are suitable to the type of farming prevalent in the area. That county further suggests that any such land lying on the outer edges of the National Forests should be offered for sale or exchange to farmers now located inside the forest area.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

The most common recommendation in regard to the Rural Electrification Administration is that the rural electric lines and telephone service should be speeded up. Two counties recommend that the building of rural electric lines and the furnishing of rural telephone service should be continued until all farms are served.

One county suggested that the power rates of REA cooperatives should be adjusted to conform as nearly as possible to those of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The amount of current furnished by TVA for the minimum rate at the present time is much greater than that furnished by the REA for the same minimum rate. Two counties suggest that more uniform rates should apply to the members of different REA associations.

Each of the following suggestions were made by one county. No two counties made the same recommendation.

1. Every effort should be made to keep private power companies from obtaining an interest in REA.
2. Electric service should be extended to isolated farms at a reduced minimum charge.
3. Greater effort should be made to furnish telephone service to all rural homes at reduced service rates.
4. The REA should be given authority to construct and operate their own generators.
5. Basic charges should be equalized for all lines both old and new. A farmer should not be required to pay higher rates for the reason that his home is not on a regular line.
6. Some provision should be made for obtaining right-of-ways for lines other than depending upon the good will of landowners over whose property the lines must pass. The present arrangement has delayed many farmers in obtaining service because neighbors would not grant right-of-way across their property.
7. Change present line construction limits to reach every farm family regardless of distance if farm family applies for service.
8. Improve power line facilities to provide farmers with ample electrical power to operate all of their equipment in peak low periods.
9. Differential in rates should be provided so that users on original lines would have lower rates than users located on new high cost lines.
10. A more democratic system of electing REA cooperative officials should be provided.
11. Growth of vegetation on REA lines should be controlled and services performed to reduce the frequency of minor interruptions with every rain or windstorm.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

The change most frequently recommended in connection with programs of the Farmers Home Administration is that more funds should be available for making loans since there are many more eligible farmers asking for loans at the present time than can be served with available funds.

Three counties suggested that applications for loans should be processed more rapidly. They felt there was too great a time element between application and final decision on the application. Three counties recommended that additional county office employees should be provided for supervision of farm home plans. Two counties thought that a more liberal system of appraising land should be used so that more farmers could get loans. Each of the following recommendations was made by one county; no two counties recommended the same change.

1. FHA farmer committeemen should be nominated and elected the same way as FHA committeemen instead of being appointed.
2. Borrowers should be given more freedom in deciding what phases of their farming operations loans are to be used for.
3. Authority should be given the FHA to make investment loans for timber production.
4. Local farmer committees and county FHA personnel should have more authority in administering programs affecting local farmers.
5. Less control should be exercised by FHA in the marketing of farm products by their borrowers.
6. Operation of FHA loan programs should be streamlined to eliminate "red tape."
7. Cost of processing loans could and should be reduced.
8. Repayment of adjustment loans for making major changes in farm operations should be scheduled over a longer period of time.
9. Loan funds for the rural housing program should be increased.
10. The maximum of loans should be increased to permit the purchase of good land which will provide a standard of living for borrowers equal to that of other farmers in the community.
11. Each loan made should be insured.
12. Functions of FHA should be absorbed by the Farm Credit Administration.
13. Building specification under the rural housing program are too technical and should be simplified.

14. The maximum loan should not be limited to \$10,000. Loans are not sufficient for expanding farm programs.
15. More money should be made available for making loans and loans should be available to farmers other than operators of family-type farms.
16. Farm ownership loans should be made available to non-veterans as well as veterans. Under the present program funds are so limited that only veterans have received ownership loans.
17. More "on-the-farm" supervision should be provided.
18. County committees of FFA should be increased to three members and these should be elected by farmers of the county rather than being appointed by the State Director. This system would provide a more democratic system of equal representation and equal consideration of loan policies.
19. More emphasis should be placed on worthy ownership.
20. The forty-year loan plan should be eliminated and loans not to exceed twenty-five years on real estate should be set as a policy.
21. It is recommended that more funds be allocated for making loans for growing of livestock and improving existing conditions on small family farms.
22. It is recommended that FFA, SCS, and FWA be combined into one agency.
23. The 10 percent down payment on insured mortgage loans should be abolished so that eligible farmers now disqualified by this requirement could secure loans through FFA.
24. Amount of the first loan a borrower can receive should be increased from \$3500 to at least \$5000.
25. Delay in closing real estate loans should be eliminated.
26. Interest rate for disaster loans should be the same as production loans made by public lending agencies.
27. Borrowing farmers should not be restricted in any way in changing the status of their farms from farm family units.
28. The following weaknesses in the program should be corrected:
 - a. Turns down and fails to help too many needy cases.
 - b. Too liberal for "dead beats."
 - c. Program is too slow in getting into effect.
29. The repayment period should be extended from five to eight years.

NEW BUSINESS

The committee recommend that certain NEW conditions be placed responsibility for holding loss adjustments.

Each of the following changes was recommended by the committee conditions:

1. Revisions new insurance policies should be classified. Terms should vary their insurance normally. Rates of coverage should be increased and premium rates should vary according to the risk involved.
2. The fact operator, type of load, and production history should be given added in determining eligibility for new insurance. The present new insurance policy is very poor and unsatisfactory. It is recommended that Federal New Insurance be classified unless it can be put on a sound basis.
3. New Insurance should be available to any newly store at any of the-UNIT THE FUTURE SOLID Insurance.
4. Premium rates should be reduced and coverage increased.
5. Premium rates should be established separately for individual store and farm operators.
6. Federal New Insurance should be maintained.
7. Major coverage should be provided by new insurance even though Major premium would have to be absorbed.
8. Under the action new insurance program the coverage per acre should be increased and the premium rate should be increased to the extent that the producers can pay their premiums at the end of the year and also in such a manner that premium payments will never seriously add up.
9. Federal New Insurance should be more closely related to determining coverage.
10. Operators of low-risk farms should be encouraged to participate in the insurance program by increasing coverage and lowering premium rates on low-risk land and lowering coverage and increasing new risk rates on high-risk farms.
11. The newly coverage premium rate is too high and should be lowered.
12. New Insurance should be sold on the basis of cash payment of premium in advance.
13. It is recommended that the new insurance program be operated on the full basis of any commercial insurance agency.
14. It is recommended that the loss adjustment procedure be revised so that it would be possible for a policy holder to collect fourth stage

loss occurring in the field. It was felt that this is necessary since the cost of production of a crop would not be revealed in this area except on the fourth stage collection. It was recommended that divided authority in the crop insurance program be eliminated and that one corporation or one agency be responsible for this program on a State and county level. County committees and farmers do not feel that the crop insurance program can be adjusted to meet the maximum needs of the county until the recommendations of the county committee are considered more than at present. It is felt that the FMA county committee should be an arbitrating board in cases of dispute arising at the time of loss adjusting. It was suggested that county check yields be in complete pace with rising cost of production; however, the requirements for good farming practice have kept pace with the very latest recommendations of the Experiment Station. It was recommended that personnel be provided for an inspection of every crop during the growing season in order that loss claims may be more properly divided. It was agreed that the operating agreement between the crop insurance corporation and county FMA committees does not provide adequate funds to perform the service requirements under the contract and it is recommended that an increase in these funds be provided if the program operates on the same basis as at present.

15. The Federal Crop Insurance Program should be abolished.
16. It is recommended that the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation discontinue insuring bad risks. It is also recommended that premium rates be reduced by at least 50 percent, especially for cotton. The reason for this recommendation is that if the bad risks were discontinued, good risks could participate and the corporation would be operated on a more sound basis.
17. The continuous contract should be eliminated and more coverage with less premium be made available. Closer screening of the applications for the purpose of eliminating personal risks should be adopted as a policy.
18. It is recommended that the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation make a study of the problems involved in insuring the tung production since this crop furnishes a strategic war material which is badly needed. After such study is made, it is recommended that the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation extend its crop insurance program to cover the production of tung oil.
19. The Federal Crop Insurance program should be operated entirely separate from FMA.

U. S. FOREST SERVICE

Two counties recommended that more "on-the-farm" assistance should be given in the field of forestry.

Each of the following recommendations was submitted by one county; no two counties recommended the same change.

1. In cutting and thinning timber on U. S. National Forest lands, more consideration should be given to the protection and preservation of wild life.
2. Shipments of tree seedlings should be made earlier.
3. It is recommended that the productive land which is now in the hands of the Forest Service be sold to local farm families where these families cannot buy sufficient land from other sources in order to have an economical farm unit.
4. More care should be exercised by nurseries to prevent damage to forest tree seedlings in shipping.
5. Long term loans and forest insurance should be made available to land owners.
6. A forest technician should be available in each county.
7. Recommend a better educational program and increasing the amount of planting stock.
8. It is recommended that a ranger be assigned to each county.
9. Watchmen should be maintained in fire control towers during critical burning seasons.
10. Appropriations for Forest Service should be increased for fire protection.

COMMODITY EXCHANGE

One county recommended that this program be abolished. Another county recommended that stiffer penalties for those who indulge in price fixing and dishonest manipulation causing a loss to the farmers in reduced prices in world markets be provided. It is also recommended that more emphasis be placed on keeping the markets honest and assuring the return to the farm family of the true value of crops produced.

Section II - State Agricultural Mobilization Committee Recommendations -
Family Farm Policy Review

GENERAL COMMENTS

In preparing the following suggestions as to ways in which USDA programs and policies can provide more effective and efficient service to farmers in Mississippi we have tried to follow generally the outline prescribed in Memorandum No. 18 for the county report. There are two points that deviate slightly from this plan. The first is that we are submitting several general recommendations which apply equally to most of the twelve USDA agencies rather than repeat these suggestions in regard to each individual agency. The second is that, in general, we have not tried to indicate portions of USDA programs that should be retained and continued on the present basis. In general the State Committee recommends that the various programs should be retained on the basis they are presently being operated as described in the Provisional Report of the Family Farm Policy Review unless otherwise indicated. Most of the programs covered by this general understanding would be programs we recommend to be continued. A few others are programs not applicable to our State and about which we know so little we believe a recommendation from our committee would not be in order. By mentioning in detail only those suggestions that would require changes in programs, elimination of programs, or addition of new programs, we think a good deal of needless repetition is avoided.

The general trend of suggested changes in the Provisional Report as we analyzed it and quite a few of our own suggestions are in the direction of increased activities, added programs, and consequently added personnel without very many recommendations for decreased activities, eliminated programs, or reduced personnel. If this tendency were followed, it would naturally lead to expansion of personnel and activities with a consequent increase in costs of operation. This we feel is contrary to the public interest at the present time. Accordingly, all of our suggestions for changes and expended activities are submitted with the definite idea that by exercising rigid economy and, if necessary, by postponing or eliminating entirely some projects which may be worthwhile but nevertheless not urgent, the recommended changes could be placed into operation without any over-all expansion or increased budget. By following this line of reasoning, we arrived at the conclusion that some programs which we have not recommended to be abolished might be discontinued merely because of their low priority.

The State Mobilization Committee has tried to confine its discussions and recommendations entirely to programs and policies without becoming involved in organizational changes that might result or that might otherwise need to be made. However, in a few cases policy is so closely tied in with the organizational plan that they are almost inseparable.

Although it might not be a proper suggestion for this report, the State Committee does want to express its approval of the plan now in progress of housing together on the county level all of the USDA agencies. In Mississippi USDA agencies at the State level have been housed together for many years and it

has been very beneficial to the programs and services rendered by each agency concerned. While many difficulties, mostly non-existence of adequate space, have slowed down our consolidation efforts in Mississippi, we have demonstrated where it has already been accomplished the great benefits obtainable from this plan of operation. We are proceeding in this State with the policy that all farm agencies, both State and Federal, should be housed together on the county level where this can be accomplished. We are particularly anxious that the Extension Service should have offices along with the other USDA groups.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

We have two general recommendations to make in connection with research. The first is that to the maximum extent possible Federal agricultural research of all types should be done through and in cooperation with the State Agricultural Experiment Stations. We recognize that certain types of highly specialized research may be more economically and more efficiently done on a regional or National centralized basis. However, we think the general policy should be cooperative research with the States. The second is that the principle of regional cooperation in research should be exploited to the maximum. This should be developed by mutual agreement among State and National research representatives so that the problems to be studied, the methods and techniques to be followed and the applicability of the results to the different States would be mutually acceptable to all States involved in one research project.

We recommend increased emphasis on the following types of research:

1. We need more research on a whole-farm basis to see what practicable combinations of enterprises and practices would pay off best for farmers in various sections of the State. Farmers would eventually determine this by trial and error, but proper combinations could be developed much sooner on pilot farms and could be discovered without so much loss of income to farmers who tried out the wrong combinations before they found the right ones. In addition to the pilot-farm method, we think such valuable information along this line could be learned through more survey-type farm management studies. In connection with pilot farms we believe that the land should be obtained on a leased basis so that when the research is completed, it could be readily returned to private ownership. Also, if the land is leased, the site of the research could be more readily transferred to another location if it should be decided that some other location would be better suited to the purposes of the study to be made.
2. There is need in our State for research to develop better equipment and methods for on-the-farm processing of farm products. This will afford one means of providing additional employment on small farms where production of commodities alone does not fully utilize available labor.

There is considerable need for improvement in efficiency of marketing farm products. However, any projects proposed for research under this heading should be critically analyzed to make sure that results obtained would be usable and practicable. In other words, it is our feeling that gathering and analyzing economic and marketing information just for the sake of having it is not of any particular value unless coupled with definite ideas to do something about problems involved.

3. The same comment could be applied to research on home management, farm housing, and family farm living. There is need for improvement in each of these fields and research can make definite contributions. However, those who plan research projects in these fields should be sure that the work leads to conclusions that would be of some practical value.
4. There is a wide-spread need for research to develop farm machinery adapted to small-farm operation.
5. There is an outstanding need in our State for maximum emphasis on research to strengthen forage production, forage utilization, and animal husbandry. From both conservation and income viewpoints we need a tremendous expansion of grassland farming in our State and an expansion of livestock production to utilize production of this acreage. Such an adjustment would make an important contribution to the National food supply.
6. We strongly recommend that all prospective acquisitions of land for defense purposes should be thoroughly studied from the viewpoint of soils and agricultural economics. In considering alternative sites, tracts of land less valuable for agricultural production should be used for defense areas where such tracts will adequately fill the needs.
7. There is a need for more presentation of research information to those people who need it. However, we think this is a job that should be left to the educational agencies, particularly the Cooperative Extension Service. The Extension Service can take the traditional type of research publication and from this develop simplified and popular informational material as needed. Too, the vocational agriculture teachers, though not a part of USDA, can be of great value in this connection.

We have no suggestions for entirely new programs to be undertaken by the Agricultural Research Administration.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

This agency is performing a very valuable function for all agricultural programs in their acreage, production and price estimates. Since farm forestry is becoming increasingly important, it is recommended that farm forestry products be added to the list of commodities for which monthly price and annual income data are collected. This type of information would be valuable to farmers who own woodland. The State Mobilization Committee has no recommendation for eliminating any of the BAE programs although we do have the following suggestions for changes or additional emphasis:

1. There should be additional study of the effectiveness of various types of farm management advisory services particularly in relation to low-production farms. This inquiry should be confined to a determination of factual information and should not in any way be connected with any idea of the Government furnishing this advisory service either directly or indirectly.
2. We need to study why farmers do not adopt approved practices and more efficient farming methods more rapidly. It has been said many times that while farmers need additional information, many of them are not farming half as well as they know how already. If we could discover means of getting in use proven techniques and methods that we know about already, we would have a vast increase in agricultural production.
3. While much good work has been done along this line, we still need additional study and analysis to establish standards for comparing farms with respect to efficiency of production and levels of living they provide their operators. The present method of cooperation between the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and the land-grant colleges has been most effective and should be continued. This is an excellent means of getting the most results from the limited funds available for economic research work in agriculture.
4. Although monthly price data for farm commodities on a state-wide basis are very valuable, we still need reports of agricultural prices on a county basis. We understand some States have this service where the State Government shares expenses. This matter has been considered by the legislature in Mississippi but so far funds have not been provided.
5. There is a need for more information about means of improving land tenure and lease arrangements. The customary leasing arrangements now in effect have been used for a good many years and it is possible that changes in the type of farming have made desirable a better land-tenure system. This should be closely coordinated with the Agricultural Research Administration and conducted entirely through cooperative efforts with the State experiment stations.

6. The effect of higher land prices and other capital costs on young people and others who want to get started in farming should be studied. With increasing costs it is becoming more and more difficult for farm families to get enough capital to get started on a large enough farming operation to provide an adequate income for the family. Specific information or factors that make it hard to get started in farm ownership may help in eliminating some of these obstacles.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

Our experience with the Agricultural Extension Service is that it is well adapted and organized for the job assigned to it and in general we have no suggestions for changes.

We recognize that there is a heavy workload on county Extension workers. However, we suggest that, in general, coordination with other agencies in using to the maximum their facilities and programs offers more practical opportunity for increasing the effectiveness of Extension work than the employment of additional county workers. Although made here with particular reference to Extension Service, we hold that this plan is equally applicable to all other agencies. There is greater need throughout all agencies, we think, for eliminating loss motion and working more closely with other agencies than there is for additional personnel.

The Extension Service should be free from any operating relationship which would in any way restrict availability of its services to all farmers in each county. It is and has been operated in this manner in our State and regardless of other arrangements developed elsewhere, it is recommended that the present operating relationship of the Extension Service in Mississippi be continued.

Closer contact and coordination between Extension workers and workers of others in the Department is needed both in Washington and in the States. However, in line with the general idea we have followed in developing the State recommendations, it is thought that this closer coordination can be accomplished by presently employed personnel and should not in any way require additional workers.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

Although this agency is essential, the State Committee feels that there is the same risk sometimes encountered in crop production programs, namely that of over-production. It is our belief that more careful planning and coordination of proposed publications would make possible substantially the same results with a considerably smaller list of publications. A few specific suggestions are set forth below:

1. There is a need for periodically reviewing outstanding publications with a view to keeping them up to date and making them as short as possible and to keep them in line with problems of current agricultural interests. This should be achieved without expansion of the writer staff by postponing or dispensing with some of the less important material.
2. Development of agricultural films, radio tape recordings, and planning of publications should be all coordinated closely with regional research results to give these materials as wide an area of use as possible.
3. It is recommended that any information field assistance either in preparation of publications or radio training for agricultural workers should be confined to sending specific assistance upon request from the States.
4. It is believed there is not sufficient need for digests of research developments for information of research workers or for a trade press service to justify formation of offices or units to perform these services.

We have no suggestions for new programs to be undertaken by the Office of Information.

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

In regard to the Agricultural Conservation Program the State Mobilization Committee believes that the Individual Farmers and Ranchers Program has not proven to be an effective approach to individual farm planning. Although there is a definite need for some simplified technique of farm planning to be used by the farmer while he is waiting for complete technical plans, the community committeemen in Mississippi have not had sufficient technical background and have not had the time to devote to this project to make it successful. It is recommended that further activities along this line by community committeemen be discontinued. It is recommended that the small payment increases now provided by ACP legislation be discontinued. The committee believes that this device is not effective in getting increased conservation.

The committee does not believe that additional funds should be provided for expanding the use of community committeemen. It is believed that funds presently available for this particular purpose are adequate.

It is recommended that marketing quotas not be extended to the non-basis storable commodities and to the perishable commodities until such time as serious financial loss to the Government in connection with price support operations occur (as did happen in the case of Irish potatoes). Equitable administration of marketing quotas on these commodities would be extremely difficult.

The committee believes that the present method of operating the price support program should be continued. The committee recommends that direct payments not be used as a price support measure. There should be no limitation on the amount of price support available to any person.

The State Committee discussed the activities of FMA at the present time in the field of marketing research. In this connection it is recommended that all research be done by the State Experiment Stations in cooperation and coordination with the Agricultural Research Administration. In the field of making research results available to farm people, it is believed that the Cooperative Extension Service is better organized to perform this function and that the responsibility for this should be assigned to that agency. This, of course, would not apply to making research results available to processors of farm commodities and other non-farm groups. This same suggestion is applicable to disseminating information about grades and standards of farm commodities.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

The State Mobilization Committee discussed the activities of SCS in determining and using a family-type neighborhood group approach in doing conservation work. It is suggested that the delineation and identification of these neighborhood groups should be the responsibility of vocational agriculture teachers and Extension workers with other agencies using such groups in their various activities after they are already identified.

The State Committee recommends that further progress be made along the lines employed in Memorandum 1278 of the Secretary of Agriculture in working toward a completely unified program of conservation activities by the Department of Agriculture.

It is recommended that no steps be taken in the direction of compelling farmers to adopt specified conservation practices on a soil conservation district-wide basis.

It is recommended that all conservation research work be done by State Experiment Stations in cooperation and coordination with the Agricultural Research Administration.

It is recommended that no further activities either in the form of studies or program development should be carried out looking toward further acquisition of land by the Federal Government. In the past considerable acreages of land considered to be sub-marginal under conditions existing at the time of purchase was acquired by the Government though that land today under present conditions would not be considered sub-marginal.

In connection with flood control work the suggestion is offered that at the National level more thought and effort should be given to speeding up the work of improvement and less emphasis on making surveys so far ahead of actual conservation work on the land. It is recognized that even after

surveys are made actual flood control work is dependent on Congressional action. Still it appears that actual conservation work on the land sometimes lags too far behind progress made in surveys.

FOREST SERVICE

The State Mobilization Committee believes that the water, timber, forage utilization, and recreational resources of the National forests should continue to be protected and operated in such a way as to obtain maximum use consistent with insuring permanence of these resources.

We hear that lack of funds with which to construct access roads is a severe limiting factor on the cutting of timber from National forests in some sections of the country. It seems to this committee that in a time of heavy usage of lumber in the National defense effort some provisions should be made to gain access to all mature stands of timber that are ready for cutting. Such access would have a tendency to relieve the drain on our rapidly dwindling timber reserves in Mississippi. It is recommended that the Forest Service be permitted to finance access road construction and timber stand improvement work at least in part from receipts of sale of timber from the National forests.

This committee would favor a plan by which the sale of a National forest stamp for the privilege of using recreational facilities constructed in the National forests at public expense would repay at least part of the cost of providing these facilities.

Prevention and suppression of forest fires is one of the major problems of private forestry in Mississippi. It is recommended that the U. S. Forest Service should continue its efforts in cooperation with State Foresters to continue expanding organized protection until all private lands are covered.

While this committee is very much in favor of Federal assistance through State and local Governments to increase and improve privately-owned forest resources, it is believed that such assistance should be coupled with definite conservation requirements. In some areas forest resources are depleted by improper cutting practices and lack of fire control more rapidly than they are built up with all forest improvement efforts combined.

Timber production in our State has been retarded by lack of adequate credit with which to purchase and improve timber land. In view of the long period of time between making of the investment and beginning to receive income from it, it appears that a system of credit especially designed for forest production should be made available to present and prospective owners of timber land.

The State Committee discussed possibility of a Federally sponsored insurance system for forestry enterprises but decided not to recommend that this project be undertaken at the present time.

In general the State Mobilization Committee is opposed to additional public acquisition of lands in the State of Mississippi for forestry as well as any other purpose.

It is recommended that forestry research as far as possible be carried out by the State Experiment Stations in cooperation with the Agricultural Research Administration.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The committee believes that the reduction of Government capital in production credit associations is a favorable development and recommends that this trend be continued as rapidly as possible. It seems advisable that this same plan should be followed in the case of banks for cooperatives. While the cooperative lending institutions under supervision of the Farm Credit Administration should be financed as far as practicable through investment of private funds, the organization should be maintained in such form that Government capital would be available in case of emergencies.

In the case of information activities in connection with agricultural credit, we suggest consideration be given to handling this work through regular channels of the Cooperative Extension Service.

The housing of PCA's and NFIA's in the same offices is a step in the right direction and continued efforts should be made toward achieving this goal.

There is a definite need in Mississippi for intermediate term loans to finance mechanization of farms and shifts in operation from row-crop production to grass-land farming. We think considerable study should be made of the best credit plans for meeting this need.

We hear considerable criticism among farmers that the land appraisal policies of the Federal Land Bank system is out-dated and does not permit adequate loans to serve the needs of the farmers. This committee recognizes the necessity of the Land Bank system being operated on a sound financial basis. At the same time we believe studies in cooperation with BAE and Land Grant Colleges should be made to bring appraisal practices as nearly in line as possible with present day farming costs and land values.

Closer cooperation between Farm Credit Associations, Production Credit Associations, and National Farm Loan Associations with county offices of the Farmers Home Administration is essential to assure that farmers who can qualify for loans through cooperative credit associations obtain their financing from these sources rather than from FHA.

As mentioned in connection with the Forest Service, it is believed that especially designed credit is needed to make long-term loans for forestry practices.

The committee discussed the desirability of developing a variable repayment plan for long-term loans. This would permit farmers to pay less in a year of crop failure and more in the years of good crops. It is suggested that this plan be placed into effect on a trial basis in some area where conditions seem favorable to see how it would work in actual practice.

It is believed that the present sources of credit for cooperatives are adequate and that no effort should be made to obtain additional sources.

Federal Land Bank loans should be equally available to all bona fide farm operators and should not be restricted to any particular class of operators.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

This committee believes that the farm ownership loan program of FHA has served a very useful purpose and should be continued on an increased scale so long as the program is operated in such a manner that borrowers are repaying the loans. The farm ownership program should be speeded up to the maximum extent. This same suggestion would apply to farm enlargement and farm development loans.

As in the case of Farm Credit Administration, it is believed that variation of annual repayment requirements should be made in line with production on the farm provided it is rigidly supervised to be sure that all who are able repay their loans on the established schedule.

It is believed that the ten percent down-payment requirement is a sound one and should be continued. We believe it is essential for the farmer to have some investment of his own funds in the farm.

In case of disaster loans we have heard considerable criticism in regard to the loan interest rate. The fact that the disaster interest rate is lower than other publicly sponsored agricultural credit causes some farmers to try to obtain disaster financing when they might be able to obtain financing otherwise. It is recommended that the interest rate be made the same as rates of the Production Credit Associations and that the definition of a disaster case be tightened up to the point that only farmers who experience a genuine disaster would be eligible.

The committee believes that the maximum repayment period of seven years is sufficient and should not be extended to ten years.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

This committee has little to suggest in the way of change to the program of the Rural Electrification Administration. Farmers in this State regard REA as one of the most valuable of all USDA programs. They believe it has done as much as any other agency toward making farm living more enjoyable as well as more profitable.

There is a great demand for a vastly speeded up rural telephone program. This committee strongly recommends that everything possible be done to increase the rate at which rural telephones are being made available to farmers.

Several of the county mobilization committees recommended that uniform rates be used by the various cooperative electric power associations. The State Committee does not share this view. This committee believes that the consumers in any one area should pay the costs involved in making electric current available to them. If some other association can operate more efficiently, users of that system should have the benefit of lower rates.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

This committee has found it difficult to make recommendations concerning Federal Crop Insurance. While we believe that there is a great need for a system of Government-operated crop insurance, we must at the same time recognize that so far the cotton crop insurance program in our State has been far from successful. Premiums collected have not been sufficient to pay losses and it is generally believed among both agricultural workers and farmers that in the counties where the program is now offered, the most successful farmers from crop-production viewpoint have not been interested in taking crop insurance. On the contrary, it has generally appealed more to the farmers on the hazardous types of land. We think generally the solution must lie in the field of more accurate classification of farms with reference to both coverage and premium rates.

It is recommended that this program be conducted and expanded on an experimental basis and that responsible officials maintain a liberal attitude toward trying out new plans where old ones have not proven acceptable.

COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

This committee is not sufficiently familiar with the Commodity Exchange Authority to make any specific recommendations. The principal objectives of this program are certainly worthwhile. Honesty in the market place is of vital interest to all farmers and it is recommended that the full authority provided by existing legislation be used to see that fairness prevails in the buying and selling of farm commodities.

Section III - Description of Procedure Followed in Developing the Farm Policy Review in Mississippi

Notwithstanding the fact that Memorandum No. 18 was dated June 22, it was not received by the Chairman of the State Agricultural Mobilization Committee until July 9, only three days before the time of the regular monthly meeting of the State Agricultural Mobilization Committee. Since other matters awaiting consideration by the committee had not indicated a need for a July meeting, no meeting had been scheduled for July 12. Three days was considered to be inadequate time for inviting all who should attend and consider plans for making the Farm Policy Review; however, the regular monthly meeting of the State FMA Committee was held on that day and the Farm Policy Review project was discussed briefly. It was decided that a representative of FMA and of PMA would go to Mississippi State College and meet with a group designated by the Director of Division of Agriculture and prepare a recommended plan for conducting the review in the State. This plan would then be presented for consideration of the State Agricultural Mobilization Committee at a meeting on August 2. This planning meeting was held at Mississippi State College on July 27. It was well attended by representatives of various departments, especially Agricultural Economics, and Rural Sociology. The Director of Division of Agriculture and the Associate Director of Extension attended this meeting and made valuable contributions.

The regular August meeting of the State Agricultural Mobilization Committee was scheduled for August 2. In view of the fact that the Farm Policy Review was to be discussed and plans adopted, representatives of all agencies which we thought would be interested in participating in the survey were invited to attend. The following is a list of those invited:

- C. L. Neill, Chairman, PMA
- M. S. Shaw, Associate Director, Extension Service
- * J. K. Garner, President, Mid-South Retail Farm Equipment Dealers Assn.
- * J. A. Rogers, Secretary, Mississippi Cottonseed Crushers Association
- * S. R. Evans, Secretary, Mississippi Seedsmen's Association
- J. R. Owens, Fertilizer Advisory Committee
- * W. W. Hollowell, President, Greenville First National Bank
- Charlie McNeil, General Manager, Mississippi Federated Cooperatives
- Boswell Stevens, President, Mississippi Farm Bureau Federation
- W. M. Garrard, Jr., Delta Council
- J. S. Smith, State Director, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation
- F. J. Hurst, Farm Credit Administration
- * R. L. Sullivan, Mississippi Employment Security Commission
- D. A. McCandless, Statistician, Bureau of Agricultural Economics
- * H. E. Mauldin, Vocational Education Department
- Si Corley, Commissioner, State Department of Agriculture
- * C. B. Anders, State Conservationist, Soil Conservation Service
- E. R. DeSilvia, Forest Supervisor, U. S. Forest Service
- T. B. Fetherree, State Director, Farmers Home Administration
- * A. A. Leggett, State Forest Service
- J. A. Hardy, PMA
- G. A. Hopson, PMA
- Leroy P. Percy, PMA
- J. M. Sessions, PMA

- T. M. Patterson, PMA
- W. A. Martin, Rural Electrification Administration
- * R. A. Roberts, Agricultural Research Administration
- Clay Lyle, Director, Division of Agriculture, Mississippi State College
- * W. F. Bond, Welfare Department
- * T. D. Davis, Executive Manager, Mississippi REA
- * Justin H. Doek, Executive Secretary, Mississippi Cattlemen's Association
- Mrs. John Hancock, President, Mississippi Home Demonstration Council
- * Morton B. King, Jr., Dept. of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Miss.
- * R. D. Morrow, President, Mississippi Land Use Development Council
- L. A. Olson, Contact Officer, TVA-State College
- * Frank B. Pittman, Executive Secretary, Mississippi Forestry & Chomurgic Assn.
- Duane B. Rosenkrans, Jr., Extension Editor
- * B. F. Smith, Secretary-Manager, Delta Council
- Dr. Felix Underwood, State Board of Health

* Those who did not attend either in person or by representation are indicated by an asterisk.

Along with the invitation we sent each person a copy of the Provisional Report and a brief statement of what we hoped to accomplish by the survey in Mississippi.

At the August 2 meeting the committee considered recommendations of the group designated to draft plans for conducting the survey and after making quite a few alterations, adopted the recommended plan and used it as a basis for instructions to county agricultural mobilization committees which were mailed to the county committees on August 3 as 1951 Agricultural Mobilization Letter 30.

No further steps were taken at the State level in preparing the report on the Farm Policy Review until the September 13 meeting of the State Agricultural Mobilization Committee. At this time there was a discussion of plans for reviewing and summarizing county reports and preparing the State Committee report. It was agreed that one representative each from PMA, Farm Bureau, Extension, Farmers Home Administration, and Vocational Agriculture would serve as a committee to prepare in draft form and present to the State Agricultural Mobilization Committee at its October 11 meeting a draft of a State report. After designations of representatives by agencies concerned, this committee was composed of the following: C. W. Sullivan, PMA; D. H. Echols, Farm Bureau; J. V. Pace, Extension; C. G. Deaton, Farmers Home Administration; A. G. Shepherd, Jr., Vocational Agriculture. This committee held three meetings on September 25, October 2, and October 9. A full day was spent in each case studying county reports, studying the Provisional Report, and drafting proposals for consideration of the State Agricultural Mobilization Committee.

At the October 11 meeting of the State Agricultural Mobilization Committee the committee appointed to prepare a draft of the State report, presented its proposed draft to the State Agricultural Mobilization Committee. After considerable discussion and modification, the report was adopted. The following persons representing agencies as indicated, attended the October 11 meeting and participated in the review and final approval of the State report:

(Names and organization of those attending the October 11 meeting will be listed here.)

No groups were contacted on the State level in making the Farm Policy Review other than contacts described above. In other words, all of the recommendations were developed and adopted in the regular announced meetings designated for that purpose.