



AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
OF
AGRICULTURAL ECONOMISTS

HELD AT
CORNELL UNIVERSITY,
ITHACA; NEW YORK,
AUGUST 18 TO AUGUST 29, 1930

The Collegiate Press
GEORGE BANTA PUBLISHING COMPANY
MENASHA, WISCONSIN

1930

A SUMMARY OF STATE PROGRAMS IN ADJUSTMENT TO THE AGRICULTURAL SITUATION

C. L. STEWART

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, URBANA, ILLINOIS

THE SUBJECT as stated might be interpreted to include special efforts of the agricultural colleges, experiment stations, and extension services, as well as legislative and administrative efforts of the more formal governmental variety. For example, the so-called Agricultural Adjustment Conferences inaugurated in Illinois in 1928 under the leadership of Dean H. W. Mumford and the somewhat similar developments in other states, some earlier, some later, afford a temptation to give considerable space to descriptive analysis. To confine the discussion to more strictly governmental activity is believed desirable, however, partly because the opportunity to obtain information from colleges as to their special efforts is clearly open to all and has been taken advantage of by many, while, in general, studies of agricultural administration and legislation, national and state, have attracted the sustained attention of but few of our agricultural college people.

The present effort at a summary of certain features of state governmental activity affecting agriculture can but turn a single furrow in a wide and, for this country, all but unbroken field. How many bumble bees may be turned up by any effort to plow in this old pasture, whether on the state or national side of it, is one feature which adds to the interest if not to the activity displayed in this field.

The states may be said to get the first chance at the control of the production and marketing of an overwhelming proportion of practically all of the agricultural products raised in the United States for domestic and foreign consumption. It is true that there is an area of unappropriated and unreserved federal land and a nearly equal area in national forest reservations which together contain nearly a third of a billion acres, or almost the same acreage as is devoted to crop production on all the farms of the country. The unreserved and unappropriated federal lands are diminishing while the federal forest lands are increasing. However, federal lands play a considerable part in affording pasture to livestock in the eleven western states. Use of the grazing resources of the national forests under a system of allotment per-

mits, and unauthorized use of the grazing resources of the unappropriated and unreserved federal lands, has been made by stockmen whose livestock and livestock products are primarily subject to state jurisdiction.

When a movement into interstate or foreign commerce takes place federal authority applies. When public health is in danger federal as well as state authority is frequently involved. In general, however, it is state authority which is dominant at the point of production of all of our farm products. This influence bears upon the quality of many products and extends to quantity as well.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE SUBJECT MATTER OF STATE LEGISLATION AFFECTING AGRICULTURE DURING THE PAST TEN YEARS

The International Institute of Agriculture has rendered a valuable service almost from the time of its foundation in publishing the "International Yearbook of Agricultural Legislation." However, if one turns to this yearbook hoping to get a fairly complete picture of the legislative enactments of the 48 states during the period of the agricultural depression, he will be disappointed. Enactments of the various states for the years 1920 to 1922 are available in the French editions with about the same degree of incompleteness as that which characterizes the listings in the English edition for the years 1923 to 1926. For the four years for which the English edition is available no enactments are shown for 20 of the states, and the list of enactments for the remaining 28 states is far from complete. The number of enactments listed for all states included in the International Yearbook was as follows: 1923, 153; 1924, 13; 1925, 141; and 1926, 9. Practically no information concerning enactments in the individual states is to be found in the Yearbooks for the years 1927, 1928, or 1929.

In order to obtain for the years 1927, 1928, and 1929 at least a rough idea of the volume and distribution of state enactments framed in the interest of agriculture, an examination was made of state session laws. Probably less than ten per cent of the enactments were omitted in this survey. There were 5,582 enactments catalogued, an average of 116 for each state, or, expressed on an annual basis, 1,861 for the 48 states, or 39 per state. The amount of such legislation is believed to have been somewhat larger during

the years 1927 to 1929, inclusive, than during any similar period in the decade. The annual grist of such laws has not been growing smaller even in states where agricultural production and marketing is not ordinarily thought of as being prominent, relative to other activities.

States having the largest number of new laws affecting agriculture out of the total of 5,582 laws examined, were as follows: New York, 336, or 6.0 per cent of the total number of laws examined; Idaho, 303, or 5.4 per cent; California, 282, or 5.1 per cent; and Florida, 279, or 5.0 per cent. The eight states which had enacted the smallest number of laws affecting agriculture during these three years were: West Virginia, with 21 laws; Kentucky, 23; Arizona, 31; New Mexico, 34; Utah, 45; Alabama and Oklahoma, 54 each; and Ohio, 55. No one of these states contributed more than one per cent of all the enactments examined.

In the 48 states as a whole, out of every 100 laws enacted in the interest of agriculture during the three years under consideration, 25 were for the protection of animals, dealing with such matters as hunting, fishing, and the trade in fish and game. Between 12 and 13 per cent of the laws were in one or another of the ten fields dealing more strictly with agricultural marketing. Next in order of prominence came laws for assisting in land improvement, the purchase and transfer of farm real estate, and land settlement. These three groups of laws together accounted for about 20 per cent of all laws passed in the interest of agriculture.

Some of the differences in the laws enacted by the five principal groups of states may be of interest. The North Central States have enacted a larger number of laws than have the Northeastern and Far Western States. Enactments have been less numerous in the South Atlantic, and in the South Central States.

There has been considerable emphasis upon land improvement and land settlement in the laws passed in the Far Western and South Atlantic States. The emphasis upon the marketing of food-stuffs and agricultural raw materials has been marked in the Far Western and Northeastern States. Legislation designed to protect game, animals, fish, and so forth, has been relatively prominent among the laws passed in the South Atlantic and Northeastern States. A distribution, according to subject matter, of the laws affecting agriculture (enacted during the years 1927 to 1929, inclusive) is given in table 1.

Table 1. Distribution According to Subject Matter of State Legislation Affecting Agriculture Enacted During the Calendar Years, 1927, 1928 and 1929

	Group of States					
	United States	North-eastern	South Atlantic	North Central	South Central	Far Western
Number of laws enacted	5,582	1,333	976	1,490	490	1,293
Subject matter field	Per cent of laws enacted					
Special census of agriculture, etc.	0.6	0.9	0.2	0.9	—	0.3
Marketing of foodstuffs, etc.	12.5	12.8	11.1	11.6	11.4	14.6
Anti-monopoly legislation, etc.6	.3	.9	.6	.8	.5
Regulation of transportation, etc.7	.8	.2	.7	.4	1.0
Exchanges, markets, etc.	1.6	1.1	.2	3.7	3.3	1.6
Taxes on articles of consumption, etc.3	—	.8	0.3	.2	.1
Taxation of real estate	2.4	3.2	1.6	2.1	1.8	2.9
Taxation of income, etc.8	.5	1.1	.2	3.3	.7
Regulation as to special crops, etc.1	.1	—	.2	—	.1
Control of water courses	5.9	6.7	2.8	5.7	7.3	6.9
Forestry and forest products	3.7	3.7	3.4	5.0	2.0	3.1
Land improvement	8.7	3.4	9.7	9.0	9.8	12.7
Stock breeding	1.5	0.6	1.4	1.1	1.6	3.0
Diseases of animals	3.5	4.0	2.6	3.3	5.3	3.6
Protection of animals, etc.	25.08	32.6	37.3	22.3	16.7	14.4
Agricultural organization and training	5.2	4.6	2.4	7.2	11.8	3.3
Provisions for advisory bodies for agriculture	2.6	2.0	2.5	2.2	1.8	4.0
Control of vegetable and animal pests	2.5	1.2	1.8	3.3	1.8	3.6
Agricultural cooperation	0.9	0.8	1.1	0.9	—	1.1
Agricultural insurance	0.4	0.2	—	1.1	—	0.2
Agricultural credit	1.0	0.5	0.8	1.1	1.6	1.4
Methods of purchase and transfer of real estate	6.6	6.5	7.5	7.1	3.1	7.0
Land survey and land registration	2.9	3.6	1.4	1.5	8.2	2.9
Land settlement	6.4	8.4	4.1	6.1	5.7	6.5
Regulation of agricultural tenancy contracts, etc.	2.0	0.5	2.7	1.7	1.0	3.7
Regulation of hiring agreements in agriculture, etc.	0.3	0.1	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.4
Rural dwellings	0.02	0.1	—	—	—	—
Rural public health	0.4	0.2	0.3	0.5	—	0.5
Policing of country districts	0.5	0.7	1.5	0.1	0.2	0.1
Other topics	0.3	0.1	—	—	0.2	—
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

The emphasis in the legislation of the last three years is believed to differ somewhat from that which prevailed during the earlier years of the decade under consideration. The later years appar-

ently show more emphasis upon legislation affecting the marketing of general food supplies, grain, vegetable oils, and oil-bearing fruits; on measures regulating rail, water, and truck transportation of plant products, livestock, dairy, and other animal products; on exchanges, markets and chambers of commerce; on real estate taxes, taxes on income and production and on the control of water courses; on land improvement; on the protection of animals, including hunting, fishing and the marketing of game and fish; on methods of purchase and transfer of farm real estate; on the regulation of agricultural tenancy contracts, rents, leases, and so forth; on the regulation of hiring agreements in agriculture and the protection of agricultural workers, and on matters affecting public health in rural districts.

The International Yearbook is, of course, unsatisfactory as a basis for judging the emphasis of the legislation passed during the earlier years of the decade. Many states were omitted from the Yearbook. This may have been only partially the result of efforts on the part of workers in the Institute to apply some basis of selection that may have been thought to bear a relation to the importance of the legislation.

In considering either the volume or the distribution of the subject matter of the legislation, it is necessary to note that many states considered themselves well equipped with agricultural legislation long before the decade now closing. The newer states have in some cases, perhaps, been recently going through legislative stages passed through long before in older states.

In order to obtain some idea as to which of the agricultural administrative and legislative measures enacted during the decade were regarded as important by farm organization leaders in the Grange, the Farm Bureau, and the Farmers' Union; by agricultural college leaders, and by state agricultural officials, the writer resorted to the use of a questionnaire. The pains taken and the courtesies shown by officials in providing the information needed for this paper are such as to call for the writer's appreciation. The object was to ascertain to what extent there might be agreement concerning the importance of the legislation. In formulating the check-list it was found possible to take considerable advantage of the categories developed by the International Institute of Agriculture and used in the index to the International Yearbooks. It is only fair to say that this basis of classification is one which deserves

more widespread attention among agricultural economists inasmuch as it is likely to prove helpful to anyone who wishes to follow in a systematic manner, the subject of state agricultural administration and legislation.

There was naturally a considerable difference of emphasis as between the three groups of replies, even when relating to the same state. The tendency for the educational leaders to refer to regulatory work, which in many cases has been intrusted to the state colleges and experiment stations, and to emphasize the trend toward research in marketing, disease control and so forth, as measures for the minimizing of losses, is one which would naturally have been expected. Farm leaders, on the other hand, placed much more emphasis upon pending legislation, as for example, state income taxes and other adjustments, for which they have doubtless been instrumental in preparing the ground during the past several years. State department officials placed considerable emphasis upon the changes in administrative practice, the impression being that much more thorough-going administration has been a feature of recent years.

All three groups tended to point out that many of the enactments of the last decade and particularly of the past few years, have simply been revisions of, or amendments to, more basic legislation which had been placed upon the statute books at an earlier date. In some respects one gains the impression that the past few years have been characterized by many helpful amendments and by a general tightening of administration.

In general, the replies from the three groups of officials show very clearly the need for a better understanding on the part of all three, as to the whole scope of state efforts in behalf of agriculture. It is not to be wondered at that a state college official should be most conversant with those state laws which have been personally causing him trouble, or at least requiring his repeated attention. It is believed that there is not a single institution in the country that has a chair of agricultural administration and legislation, either attached to its service in agricultural economics and farm management, or otherwise.

Probably the best way to call attention to the achievements in the various states will be to make a brief summary of outstanding measures illustrative of the kind of thing which states have undertaken in the interest of agriculture during the depression.

The New York laws which have attracted attention in other states include several that have a genuine importance such as:

1. The enactment of the two-cent gasoline tax, 20 per cent of the returns going to the counties for highway construction.
2. The provision whereby the state assumes the minimum salary for rural school teachers.
3. The amending of the public health law so far as it relates to the sanitary control and inspection of milk and cream, thereby helping to protect the market for New York State producers.
4. Doubling the amount of state money provided rural counties for the construction of dirt roads and side roads.
5. The appropriations for the establishment of additional forest nurseries and for the beginning of the purchase of land that is submarginal for agriculture, for the purpose of re-forestation.

In New Jersey a Farm Relief Commission was established in 1929 to investigate facilities for marketing within the state. Up to a few days ago no significant action had been taken by this commission.

Pennsylvania has given a great deal of attention to the improvement of the marketing of farm products. The Pennsylvania Bureau of Plant Industry has centered its attention on the control of the European corn borer and the Japanese beetle.

The last legislature in North Carolina increased the state school equalization fund in order to relieve rural taxation. The Governor of North Carolina has a small group known as the Agricultural Advisory Board which considers agricultural problems and makes recommendations to the legislature. This board is not essentially different from the Governor's Agricultural Commission and the Agricultural Advisory Commission of the Legislature of New York.

In Ohio, organized agriculture has recently obtained an order from the Ohio Public Utilities Commission which will provide for securing rural electrification upon a more favorable basis.

In Wisconsin, progressive steps have been taken toward relieving the cut-over lands of much of the tax burden. These lands have been rapidly passing out of the hands of private owners because of forfeiture for non-payment of taxes.

In Illinois, Iowa, and Washington, special attention is being given to revising the tax systems so as to make possible a larger use of state income taxes.

These measures are selected, more or less at random, from New York and some of the other important states which did not wait for the Federal Government to pass all the farm relief laws that might be needed.

SUMMARY BY SELECTED TOPICS

In taking an airplane view of the state agricultural administrative and legislative situation, there are eight points which may be emphasized.

1. States such as New York, Vermont and California, have safeguarded the strength of the rural interests in the state legislatures by assuring that at least one of the two chambers shall be strongly representative of the rural areas. One of the basic problems in state legislation in many states is that of obtaining representation in state legislatures in such a way that the chamber having smaller numbers may represent the less populous portion of the state since the larger house may be assumed to represent the more populous portions.

2. Agricultural advisory boards for service at the state capital, and elsewhere on call, are likely to be useful devices. Such a board should be such as to gain and hold the confidence of all farm organizations. In states in which such boards lack official status as well as in other states, it is frequently advisable for the state farm organizations to have their presentations of evidence and programs so unified as to avoid confusion on the part of legislators. California, Ohio, and Wisconsin are believed to be leading states in the development of unified representation by farm organizations. New York and North Carolina seem to have made effective use recently, of formally organized boards for advising executive and legislative officials. Possibly the Vermont Commission on Country Life serves somewhat the same purpose.

3. State agricultural census enumerations have reached an annual basis in Iowa, Indiana, and several other states. Florida has a five-year census plan by which the state census years fit about midway between the federal quinquennial dates. In many states the census work has been expanded and strengthened in recent years.

There is a widespread need for better agricultural statistics. Tax assessors in some cases can collect basic material correctly. In

Iowa 10 per cent of the salary is deducted if the statistical service is not performed.

4. In the field of land legislation there is not a single state of the Union which provides legislatively for compensation as between landlords and tenants for changes in the residual value of the real estate as a result of special contributions. Compensation for tenant-made improvements left on the termination of tenancy, was contemplated in a bill introduced into the Illinois legislature in 1919. Professor Hibbard testified and the movement promptly subsided.

Laws for facilitating the Torrens plan for land title legislation have found their way upon statute books in a number of states.

Land settlement laws have been important in California and in the Lake States. Laws to restrain transactions in farm real estate have had little prominence in this country.

An interesting type of land utilization legislation was enacted in California a few years ago. It provided that when a sufficient number of owners of land suitable to the production of cotton, for example, had agreed upon the variety of cotton preferred by them, other varieties could be excluded from the area in which these growers held the necessary predominance.

5. Marketing legislation has been abundant and of many varieties. Where the public health of the population could be alleged to be at stake, sanitary regulations sometimes take a form that leads to the virtual exclusion of out-of-state products. The New York law does much to hold the market for whole milk and cream for New York producers. Connecticut apparently blazed a path for the edification of New York State farmers.

Standardization and grading, usually along lines promulgated by the United States Bureau of Agricultural Economics, has moved forward rapidly in nearly all of our states. In the horticultural field, maturity standards have been established, some of the most drastic being provided in the Florida citrus fruit legislation of 1929.

State marks and brands have been given much consideration, but in general little application.

Marketing departments and bureaus have been established or extended in nearly all of the states.

Laws facilitating the organization of cooperative marketing associations have been placed upon the statute books of practically all of the states.

6. This is not the place for extended analysis either of the administrative or legislative developments in the field of taxation. Professor Hibbard discussed yesterday the movement to displace general property taxes with income taxes. Only a third of the states have income taxes as yet.

State equalization funds for schools have gained increased headway recently. There is a question as to how far this movement can go in our larger states without endangering local control of schools, a matter of considerable importance in democracies.

Further reference is made to legislation for the construction and maintenance of roads and bridges only for the purpose of pointing out that much of the future trend in state agricultural and legislative policy may develop in relation to the revolution which such improvements are bringing about in our rural life.

In January, 1925, between 2 and 3 per cent of the farms of the United States were located on concrete or brick roads. The mileage of brick, block, sheet asphalt, bituminous, and portland cement concrete roads, has been increasing about one-third every three years. It is possible that about 4 per cent of all farms will be shown to have been located on concrete or brick roads at the time of the 1930 Census. In 1925, 5 per cent of the farms were located on macadam roads. By April, 1930, this percentage may have increased to 6 per cent. Not more than 10 per cent of the farms in the United States face concrete, brick, or macadam roads at the present time. When gravel and chert roads are included, the proportion is increased to about 30 per cent. It would not be surprising if the 1930 Census should show that one-third of the farms in the United States are on some one of these three types of roads. It is obvious that a change in rural transportation is taking place which may go far toward remaking the economic and social pattern of our rural life.

The first problem is that of getting service from custom operators of trucks and buses for farms and farm homes, that will afford economically sound transportation and fit our rural needs. In the case of bus service, the fact that much of it is interstate and therefore comes under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission has already led to a measure of public control and a systematic development of services and charges which may justify giving them little attention in this discussion.

The case of trucks, however, cannot be dismissed so easily. It

is certain that the truck already occupies an important position in bringing about a rapid and convenient movement of products directly from farms to points of ultimate consumption in the case of fruits, vegetables, milk, cream and other perishable farm products, and in bringing livestock to stockyard cities. The extent to which local shipping points are thus circumvented, and in some cases the chain of responsibility between producer and urban buyer weakened, is deserving of closer attention than it has generally received from students of rural-urban problems. When peaches, for example, are taken a hundred miles or more by truck operators who, for the time being, become transient traders, sometimes merchandising the product from house to house, it is clear that the householders may receive the product with inadequate warranty as to quality and condition. Again, when livestock is taken long distances to terminal markets by truck, the attitude of the driver toward cooperative and other commission agencies may too often determine the choice of such agencies, rather than the wishes of the farmer or farmers whose products are included in the load. The result in many cases has been to break down local cooperative shipping associations without a corresponding transfer of patronage to the terminal cooperative commission agencies.

In spite of some increase in stability, the rates charged by truck operators must still be characterized as irregular and at times are so highly competitive as to give indications that at least a part of the operators are not fully aware of their total costs.

Speaking figuratively, the trucks have brought into land transportation some of the features of marine transportation, so that while there may be some semblance of organization for "liner" service the more dominant characteristic is "tramp" service. It is possible that the liner characteristic will have to come into truck transportation in somewhat the same way that air and bus transportation is being developed by railways in some instances, that is to say, by coordination and integration. An approach in this direction is being made by some of the railroads of the United Kingdom. Isolated efforts of intra-state railways have been made in some of the states.

Among the possible features in the new pattern of rural community organization is the substitution of state district action for county action. A state like Illinois does not need a county for every 560 square miles, or at least does not need a full panoply

of county functions at every county seat. Western states with their larger counties did well to anticipate the coming of motorization and good roads. The pressure for lower taxes may find an outlet either in the merging of counties or in the transfer of functions such as jailing, to state district centers.

The codification of the whole body of agricultural legislation, state by state, seems to be in the interests of progress. Probably not more than four or five states have undertaken the molding of an agricultural code. It is difficult for one to review the annual deposit of new legislation, however, without feeling that an effort to systematize legislation within states, and, in the case of some problems, to develop more uniformity between the states, would not only benefit agriculture but would also improve the results to be had from the application of administrative and legislative energy, to the whole group of state problems.

Cooperation between the states is one of the problems likely to be more pressing in the near future. One instance of cooperative action among states is the effort made to acquaint the growers of potatoes in the southern end of Maryland, in conjunction with those of the states of Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina, with the possibility of reducing acreage so as not to cause an over-production. An interstate potato committee was formed in the fall of 1928. There was a definite movement to include all factors in the situation—growers, fertilizer companies, interested bankers, buyers, and so forth—with a view to placing economic facts before them and urging an intelligent handling of the crop so as to prevent the very severe losses that were suffered in 1928. This has proved very helpful, although it cannot be said that all of the reduction in acreage was obtained in 1930 that was desirable for the good of the industry.

The states, acting as 48 laboratories for the framing and trying out of various legislative patterns, gives this country some advantages and some disadvantages compared with some other countries where the central government is looked to more exclusively. State experience can often be profitably used in drafting federal laws, as in the adoption of quarantine and other regulations affecting the marketing of agricultural products, and the purchasing of such commodities as seed, feed, and fertilizers. In general, there is need for more uniform legislation in the control of such commodities as the above.

On the other hand, federal legislation might be much more effective in some fields if there were some readjustment of jurisdiction between the state and federal governments in the direction of the latter. This can be illustrated by a legislative proposal given consideration by the Mississippi State Senate early in 1930. It provided penalties for planting more than 60 per cent of any separately owned tract to cotton, but left it to the Government to determine whether or not other states, which produced ten million bales of cotton in the aggregate, had similar legislation, before making the penalties effective in Mississippi. A member of the Senate writes that the legislation was regarded as a gesture that would have an educational value. The thought was to indicate that the matter of acreage control might be taken up as a legislative and executive matter by some or possibly all of the important cotton producing states. Possibly this points in the direction of treaties between the states on the matter of the reduction of acreage of certain crops, just as treaties between the states have touched upon such problems as the Colorado River improvement, and the Boulder Dam project.

In rare instances, the power of the federal government to make treaties with other countries has provided a basis for preserving, if not exactly uniform state patterns, at least uniform minima in some essential points. In a period in which amendments to the Federal Constitution may be difficult to obtain, it would seem that there might be a special advantage in exercising the international treaty-making power on problems such as restraint of land settlement, abstinence from expansion along certain lines of production, and even reduction of acreage in the case of certain crops. Uniform state action within the United States would run parallel with uniform action within a whole group of countries whose adherence to any such plan is a prime requisite to preventing undue depression in prices of products that have world markets and are subject to excessive expansion.

It may be noted that any attempt on the part of our federal government to use coercive authority in directing the utilization of farm real estate in the various states would be beyond the pale of acceptable constitutional authority without either a special constitutional amendment or a treaty. Anyone who would expect the United States Senate to ratify an international treaty on acreage control, unless it included countries producing nearly all of

the remainder of the world's export surplus, would be an optimist indeed. To expect that body to support a constitutional amendment which would transfer to the federal government power to invade the jurisdiction of the several states, without some reservation that the federal government must confine its use of such jurisdiction to land uses affecting supplies of products made the object of a practically universal parallel control in other countries, is no less optimistic. A universal equalization fee or other arrangement for levying an administrative check-off or even penalizing a failure to keep crop plantings, or harvestings, or animal breedings, within agreed limits, may come eventually. The system of jurisprudence in the United States is proof against the coming into this country of coercive control of production until a treaty brings it, and for all practical purposes, that means a treaty binding not merely one other country, but enough other countries to make patent to a majority of the representatives of the states, as they sit in the United States Senate, that the project is as promising of beneficial results to our farmers, as a result of the restraints upon farmers in other countries, as restraints upon our farmers would be to producers elsewhere.

Efforts to reduce the volume of production of the United States are, of course, legal, if voluntary on the part of our individual farmers. There is no chance for them to become other than voluntary except as farmers of other countries likewise become subject to a coercive procedure. When the project for simultaneous universal treaty action is ready, however, our frame of government is of such shape as to permit this country to carry out its share in such negotiations. Until that time, and possibly even after that, the 48 American states stand secure in their sovereignty over the farm property within their borders.

In the meantime, the Conference of Governors, committees of the American Bar Association, and other agencies, must be depended upon to open the way to more uniform state legislation affecting agriculture. The pattern value of federal acts is not acknowledged in the states in any automatic way. There is both legal fact and psychological force in the independence of the states in real estate matters.

CONCLUSIONS

The disappearance of efforts on the part of the International Institute of Agriculture to follow the enactments of the various states of our Union might properly be followed by some special efforts on the part of our federal government to institute on a broad basis studies in comparative state agricultural administration and legislation. There might logically be established in Washington, possibly in connection with the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, a clearing-house where studies in this field would be fostered. The studies of state marketing laws, now under way in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, might be regarded as an entering wedge in this development. The results should be made available to any and all persons needing them in this country or abroad.

It may be said that the states are not generally to be criticized for their failure to undertake individually to modify the supply of staple products entering the world's markets. They have been generally wise in concentrating their legislative efforts upon products having more localized markets, upon the improvement of quality, upon minimizing losses through the protection of plants and animals, and in general upon these lines lacking somewhat in the colorful characteristics that make the front page of the daily papers. Nevertheless, during the past decade, there has been a marked toning up, a new economic interest and impulse, actuating this activity.

Much is to be learned by interchange of experience. Significant beginnings have been made. A more systematic understanding of the problems is needed.