
Franklin D. Roosevelt — “The Great Communicator”
The Master Speech Files, 1898, 1910-1945

Series 1: Franklin D. Roosevelt’s Political Ascension

File No. 446

1931 October 26

**Albany, New York - Radio Address re Pending
Constitutional Amendments**

[Oct. 26, 1931]

Radio Address by Governor Roosevelt on the pending Constitutional Amendments broadcast at 6 P. M. Monday, October 26, over Stations WEAJ of New York City, WGY of Schenectady and WBEN of Buffalo.

In accordance with custom I am giving my personal views to the voters of the State on the 6 Amendments to our Constitution on which a referendum will be held on Election Day this year.

The First Amendment will, if it passes, make unneeded the holding of the State Census in 1935 and will base our legislative and congressional apportionments on the Federal Census of 1930 and each following ten years. I heartily approve this amendment and indeed recommended it to the Legislature in my first annual message three years ago. It will greatly simplify matters and save the State this wholly unnecessary expense.

The Second Amendment I regard as very dangerous and wholly indefensible. For a great many years the Constitution has prohibited a member of the Legislature from receiving any civil appointment from the Governor, or the Legislature, or a municipality, during the term for which he shall have been elected. The amendment would take away this prohibition and the result might be very disastrous to good government. The purpose of the existing provision is to prevent log-rolling and trading between the Governor and the Legislature. This safe-guard should at all costs be preserved. I hope the amendment will be snowed under. /

I come now to an amendment which I regard as of the very greatest importance to the people of this State. This is Amendment No. 3, the reforestation amendment. There has been a great deal of discussion of it and there seems to be some confusion as to just what it means, but after all it is a simple proposition. The amendment puts before the people for their approval a program for the reforestation of idle and unused land in the State-- land that is classed by soil experts as useless for agricultural crops because it can not be cultivated profitably in competition with the good lands of this State and other States.

Surveys have shown that there are close to four million acres of this kind of poor land in the State--land once used for farming but now out of use; and these poor, hilly farms are being abandoned at the rate of a quarter of a million acres a year. But the one way in which this land can be used profitably is in the growing of forest trees. The reforestation program embodied in Amendment No. 3 proposes that the State shall buy a million or more acres of this abandoned land and put it to work.

We are just beginning in this country to wake up to the fact that we need timber and that we need to think of the future. For centuries European countries have been renewing and caring for their forests so as to get the maximum of benefit from them. They treat timber as a crop. We treat our timber resources as if they were a mine, from which the ore can be taken once and once only. The United States is using timber today four times as fast as it is being grown. In New York State, the largest

consumer of timber of all the States, we are using it twenty times as fast as we are growing it. We have to haul the bulk of our supply from distant States in the west at a cost of forty million dollars (\$40,000.00) a year for freight--and even that supply is not going to last forever.

So there is the situation. We have plenty of abandoned farm land on which timber can be grown profitably. We need the timber and will need it more urgently as time passes. Shall we not put this idle land to use to produce it? And incidentally shall we not give employment to many people in the work of planting and caring for these young trees.

New York State, because of its great area of land suited for growing trees and its need of timber, should logically lead other States of our Country in this form of intelligent utilization of soil resources. Efforts have been made in this State to encourage reforestation by individuals and communities and counties. The State has been growing in its nurseries young forest trees for planting which have been sold at cost and State aid has been granted for county forests. But the results accomplished have been small in proportion to what needs to be done.

So a commission of eleven, four chosen by the Temporary President of the Senate, four by the Speaker of the Assembly and three by the Governor, of which Senator Hewitt was made chairman, started to study the question in 1928. The Commission unanimously worked out

FDR radio speech on Constitutional Amendments, Oct 26, 1931 #0446 Speed file

what is known as the enlarged reforestation program, which is embodied in Amendment No. 3. This amendment was first passed by the legislature of 1930 and then by the legislature of 1931 and I am happy to say that it was considered on a perfectly non-partisan basis, both Republicans and Democrats, leaders and rank and file, giving it their support. Senator Hewitt, who has given his time devotedly for several years to studying and working for reforestation, is here tonight to join me in urging you to vote for this amendment.

Now just what does the amendment propose to do? In the first place it sets up a schedule of appropriations which the legislature is directed to make over a period of eleven years. The appropriations begin at one million next year and rise gradually each year until they reach two millions. By the way, one million is only 1/3 of 1% of the State's annual expenditures. The aggregate sum to be appropriated in eleven years is nineteen million dollars. This program, it is estimated, means that not less than a million acres of abandoned farm land and probably considerably more, can be bought and reforested. The small start already made indicates plainly that this result can be achieved.

We are asked why it was thought necessary to include this fixed schedule of appropriations in the amendment. The answer is that it was partly for the sake of obtaining the express approval of the people of the State on the whole program and more definitely for the sake of assured continuity. We must provide nurseries next year for

trees to be planted four or five years later. We must obtain land by contract and give time for careful examination of titles before taking possession and planting it. Our whole plan of operations must be suited to the size of the job we have to do. The work can't be done in hand-to-mouth fashion.

The principle is not new. We have in the last few years morally committed future legislatures to spend specific sums for important social projects. Examples of this are the amendments to the constitution approved by vote of the people, one of them calling on the legislatures for ten years running to issue bonds and to spend ten million dollars (\$10,000,000) each year or a total of one hundred million (\$100,000,000), for parks, schools, hospitals and other public improvements; the other was the amendment practically telling the legislature to spend, from time to time, up to a total of three hundred million dollars (\$300,000,000) for the elimination of grade crossings. This year's proposal is a drop in the bucket in comparison with those other two. By the same token, when the Friedsam Act for increased State aid to public schools was enacted a few years ago, the legislature morally bound future legislatures to constantly increasing appropriations, for education, running to a vast sum. Under this Act this State aid to education has risen from forty-three million dollars (\$43,000,000) in 1925 to one hundred and ten million dollars (\$110,000,000) in 1931. This sum of one hundred and ten million dollars (\$110,000,000) means spending each year $5\frac{1}{2}$ times the total which it is

proposed to put into the reforestation of abandoned lands over a period of eleven years. It is true that these Constitutional Amendments and the Friedsam Act were in form permissive to future legislatures, but I am frank and clear in saying to you that each succeeding legislature and every member thereof would not dare to go against the expressed will of the people.

Let me clear up once and for all any doubt or fear that the splendid Adirondack or Catskill forest preserves are in any possible danger or are even affected. There is confusion over two wholly different kinds of land.

Please draw a mental picture: sixteen great counties of the State -- 12 of them ^{lying} between the Mohawk and St. Lawrence and extending from the Vermont line to past Utica, the other four extending from just south of Albany and the Hudson River over to the Pennsylvania line. These sixteen counties are known as forest preserve counties. They contain over $1/3$ -- nearly $1/2$ -- of all the land in the State.

Within these sixteen counties lie two inner areas, ~~one~~ known as the Adirondack Park and the other as the Catskill Park. These inner areas are bounded by what is known as the blue line. Within this blue line not one stick of timber can be cut from State land and not even a twig can be removed, and Amendment No. 3 absolutely reaffirms this State policy in language identical with that used in the Constitution at the present time.

What, therefore, does the amendment accomplish? Outside of the Adirondack and Catskill Parks, but still within these sixteen counties, lies $1/4$ of all the idle land in the State - not timber land but abandoned farm land.

Under the existing Constitution any trees planted on this abandoned farm land would be locked up forever and could not be used for the future benefit of the people of the State. All we seek to do is to put this abandoned farm land to work, including not only the abandoned farm land in the outer margins of the sixteen forest preserve counties but similar land throughout the State.

Heretofore our conservation policy has been merely to preserve as much as possible of the existing forests. Our new policy goes a step further. It will not only preserve the existing forests but create new ones.

I want every man, woman and child in this State to understand this simple point. This amendment does not affect a single acre in the Adirondack or Catskill parks or a single acre now owned by the State in the sixteen bordering counties. Every one of these acres and any future acres to be acquired in the Adirondack or Catskill parks will be guarded against cutting just as jealously as hitherto. You can take my solemn word for that. What we do seek is to buy abandoned farms outside the Adirondack and Catskill parks and to make these now useless acres produce a splendid crop of trees for the use of our grandchildren. Remember that these tiny trees will not come to maturity for two generations and in the meantime every year we waste by failing to plant means a greater shortage of timber.

We will not have to look to the distant future for all the benefits to men, women and children which will flow from this policy. There will be immediate gains. The

young forests will clothe what is now barren ugliness with the beauty of new growth. They will serve to prevent soil erosion and floods. They will contribute to purifying water supplies. They will be used also for public hunting areas and for the propagation of game. Already 30,000 acres of the areas planted in the last two years have been thrown open by Conservation Commissioner Morgenthau for this purpose.

There will be still another gain which warrants the prediction that this nineteen millions will be returned to us many times over. These areas of unfit land now call upon the taxpayer for money to support roads and little one-room schools. They draw upon the consumer's purse for the expense of electric light and telephone lines. They default in their tax payments. Remember please that land and its proper use is, in the last analysis, still the basis of the prosperity of a State. I want to build up the land as, in part at least, an insurance against future depression.

17 m-2

Thus it seems to me that reforestation as proposed in Amendment No. 3 is a sound business policy and represents besides a moral duty which we owe to ourselves, our State and our children. I ask your support of this amendment.

Amendment #4 proposes to cut in two the present Second Judicial District which is now made up of the counties of Richmond, Kings, Queens, Nassau and Suffolk, - in other words, all of Long Island and Staten Island. The Legislature, two years running, passed bills to do this but I vetoed them on the ground that they were unconstitutional in that a Judicial District could be divided only

by amendment to the Constitution. Those favoring this amendment point out that the present Second Judicial District is much larger than any other in the State. There are nine Judicial Districts in the State for our 12,750,000 people or an average of about one and one-half million people per district. In the Second District, however, there are now four and one-quarter million people.

I am frank in saying that on the ground of equalizing population and of preventing any one district from becoming top-heavy with judges, there is much to be said in favor of this amendment and a vote for it can be justified on the broad ground of keeping the judicial districts approximately equal in size.

On the other hand there is no question that a great deal of politics has been played in the Second Judicial District in relation to this Amendment as well as to the making up of judicial slates of candidates for the Supreme Court. The voters of the Second Judicial District have had plenty of notice of these politics. I do not mind saying that for this reason personally I expect to vote against this amendment, though I am free to admit that from a theoretical point of view as to equalizing the population of districts there is much to be said for it.

The Fifth Amendment is wholly proper and I hope it will pass without opposition. All it does is to change the name of the Department of Charities to the Department of Social Welfare. This gets away from the old-fashioned idea of mere charity and makes the Department the real instrument for the general improvement of the social welfare of the whole State.

In speaking of the Sixth Amendment which relates only to the County of Westchester I am torn between my entire approval of the elimination under it of a great number of local tax assessors in each township by creating a central board of assessors for the whole county; and on the other hand, my disapproval, first of this piece-meal legislation which affects only one county and secondly, of giving the Legislature the right to impose this central board of assessors on Westchester County without a referendum vote in that county.

Because I am so greatly interested in the broad principle of reducing the number of local town officials throughout the State I personally am going to vote in favor of this Amendment. But I serve notice at the same time that if on election day the voters in Westchester County themselves do not clearly express their approval of this amendment, I will next winter veto any act of the Legislature which compels Westchester County to set up this centralized Board of Assessors against the will of the county itself.

-----O-----

p. 772

**Radio Address on Pending Constitutional Amendments to be Voted
on at General Election, Albany, October 26, 1931**

*State Census, Legislature Civil Appointments, Reforestation, New Judicial
District, Changing Name of Department of Charities, Central Board of
Assessors, Westchester County*

In accordance with custom I am giving my personal views to the voters of the State on the six amendments to our constitution on which a referendum will be held on Election Day this year.

The first amendment will, if it passes, make unnecessary the holding of the State census in 1935 and will base our legislative and congressional apportionments on the Federal census of 1930 and each following ten years. I

heartily approve this amendment and indeed recommended it to the Legislature in my first annual message three years ago. It will greatly simplify matters and save the State this wholly unnecessary expense.

The second amendment I regard as very dangerous and wholly indefensible. For a great many years the constitution has prohibited a member of the Legislature from receiving any civil appointment from the Governor, or the Legislature, or a municipality, during the term for which he shall have been elected. The amendment would take away this prohibition and the result might be very disastrous to good government. The purpose of the existing provision is to prevent log-rolling and trading between the Governor and the Legislature. This safe-guard should at all costs be preserved. I hope the amendment will be snowed under.

I come now to an amendment which I regard as of the very greatest importance to the people of this State. This is amendment number 3, the reforestation amendment. There has been a great deal of discussion of it and there seems to be some confusion as to just what it means, but after all it is a simple proposition. The amendment puts before the people for their approval a program for the reforestation of idle and unused land in the State—land that is classed by soil experts as useless for agricultural crops because it can not be cultivated profitably in competition with the good lands of this State and other states.

Surveys have shown that there are close to four million acres of this kind of poor land in the State—land once used for farming but now out of use; and these poor, hilly farms are being abandoned at the rate of a quarter of a million acres a year. But the one way in which this land can be used profitably is in the growing of forest trees. The reforestation program embodied in amendment number 3 proposes that the State shall buy a million or more acres of this abandoned land and put it to work.

We are just beginning in this country to wake up to the fact that we need timber and that we need to think of the future. For centuries European countries have been renewing and caring for their forests so as to get the maximum of benefit from them. They treat timber as a crop. We treat our timber resources as if they were a mine, from which the ore can be taken once and once only. The United States is using timber today four times as fast as it is being grown. In New York State, the largest consumer of timber of all the States, we are using it twenty times as fast as we are growing it. We have to haul the bulk of our supply from distant states in the west at a cost of forty million dollars (\$40,000,000) a year for freight—and even that supply is not going to last forever.

So there is the situation. We have plenty of abandoned farm land on which timber can be grown profitably. We need the timber and will need it more urgently as time passes. Shall we not put this idle land to use to produce it? And incidentally shall we not give employment to many people in the work of planting and caring for these young trees?

New York State, because of its great area of land suited for growing trees and its need of timber, should logically lead other states of our country in this form of intelligent utilization of soil resources. Efforts have been made in this State to encourage reforestation by individuals and communities and counties. The State has been growing in its nurseries young forest trees for planting which have been sold at cost and State aid has been granted for county forests. But the results accomplished have been small in proportion to what needs to be done.

So a commission of eleven, four chosen by the Temporary President of the Senate, four by the Speaker of the Assembly and three by the Governor, of which Senator Hewitt was made chairman, started to study the question in 1928. The commission unanimously worked out what is known as the enlarged reforestation program, which is embodied in amendment number 3. This amendment was first passed by the Legislature of 1930 and then by the Legislature of 1931 and I am happy to say that it was considered on a perfectly non-partisan basis, both republicans and democrats, leaders and rank and file, giving it their support. Senator Hewitt, who has given his time devotedly for several years to studying and working for reforestation, is here tonight to join me in urging you to vote for this amendment.

Now just what does the amendment propose to do? In the first place it sets upon a schedule of appropriations which the Legislature is directed to make over a period of eleven years. The appropriations begin at one million next year and rise gradually each year until they reach two millions. By the way, one million is only one-third of one per cent of the State's annual expenditures. The aggregate sum to be appropriated in eleven years is nineteen million dollars. This program, it is estimated, means that not less than a million acres of abandoned farm land and probably considerably more, can be bought and reforested. The small start already made indicates plainly that this result can be achieved.

We are asked why it was thought necessary to include this fixed schedule of appropriations in the amendment. The answer is that it was partly for the sake of obtaining the express approval of the people of the State on the whole program and more definitely for the sake of assured continuity. We must provide nurseries next year for trees to be planted four or five years later. We must obtain land by contract and give time for careful examination of titles before taking possession and planting it. Our whole plan of operations must be suited to the size of the job we have to do. The work can't be done in hand-to-mouth fashion.

The principle is not new. We have in the last few years morally committed future legislatures to spend specific sums for important social projects. Examples of this are the amendments to the constitution approved by vote of the people, one of them calling on the legislatures for ten years running to issue bonds and to spend ten million dollars (\$10,000,000) each year or a total of one hundred million (\$100,000,000), for parks, schools, hospitals and other public improvements; the other was the amendment practically telling the Legislature to spend, from time to time, up to a total of three hundred million dollars (\$300,000,000) for the elimination of grade crossings. This year's proposal is a drop in the bucket in comparison with those other two. By the same token when the Friedsam Act for increased State aid to public schools was enacted a few years ago, the Legislature morally bound future legislatures to constantly increasing appropriations, for education, running to a vast sum. Under this Act this State aid to education has risen from forty-three million dollars (\$43,000,000) in 1925 to one hundred and ten million dollars (\$110,000,000) in 1931. This sum of one hundred and ten million dollars (\$110,000,000) means spending each year five and one-half times the total which it is proposed to put into the reforestation of abandoned lands over a period of eleven years. It is true that these constitutional amendments and the Friedsam Act were in form permissive to future legislatures, but I am frank and clear in saying to you that each succeeding Legislature and every member thereof would not dare to go against the expressed will of the people.

Let me clear up once and for all any doubt or fear that the splendid Adirondack or Catskill forest preserves are in any possible danger or are even affected. There is confusion over two wholly different kinds of land.

Please draw a mental picture: sixteen great counties of the State—twelve of them lying between the Mohawk and St. Lawrence and extending from the Vermont line to past Utica, the other four extending from just south of Albany and the Hudson river over to the Pennsylvania line. These sixteen counties are known as forest preserve counties. They contain over one-third—nearly one-half—of all the land in the State.

Within these sixteen counties lie two inner areas, one known as the Adirondack Park and the other as the Catskill Park. These inner areas are bounded by what is known as the blue line. Within this blue line not one stick of timber can be cut from State land and not even a twig can be removed, and amendment number 3 absolutely reaffirms this State policy in language identical with that used in the constitution at the present time.

What, therefore, does the amendment accomplish? Outside of the Adirondack and Catskill Parks, but still within these sixteen counties, lies one-quarter of all the idle land in the State—not timber land but abandoned farm land.

Under the existing constitution any trees planted on this abandoned farm would be locked up forever and could not be used for the future benefit of

the people of the State. All we seek to do is to put this abandoned farm land to work, including not only the abandoned farm land in the outer margins of the sixteen forest preserve counties but similar land throughout the State.

Heretofore our conservation policy has been merely to preserve as much as possible of the existing forests. Our new policy goes a step further. It will not only preserve the existing forests but create new ones.

I want every man, woman and child in this State to understand this simple point. This amendment does not affect a single acre in the Adirondack or Catskill parks or a single acre now owned by the State in the sixteen bordering counties. Every one of these acres and any future acres to be acquired in the Adirondack or Catskill parks will be guarded against cutting just as jealously as hitherto. You can take my solemn word for that. What we do seek is to buy abandoned farms outside the Adirondack and Catskill parks and to make these now useless acres produce a splendid crop of trees for the use of our grandchildren. Remember that these tiny trees will not come to maturity for two generations and in the meantime every year we waste by failing to plant means a greater shortage of timber.

We will not have to look to the distant future for all the benefits to men, women and children which will flow from this policy. There will be immediate gains. The young forests will clothe what is now barren ugliness with the beauty of new growth. They will serve to prevent soil erosion and floods. They will contribute to purifying water supplies. They will be used also for public hunting areas and for the propagation of game. Already 30,000 acres of the areas planted in the last two years have been thrown open by Conservation Commissioner Morgenthau for this purpose.

There will be still another gain which warrants the prediction that this nineteen millions will be returned to us many times over. These areas of unfit land now call upon the taxpayer for money to support roads and little one-room schools. They draw upon the consumer's purse for the expense of electric light and telephone lines. They default in their tax payments. Remember please that land and its proper use is, in the last analysis, still the basis of the prosperity of a State. I want to build up the land as, in part at least, an insurance against future depression.

Thus it seems to me that reforestation as proposed in amendment number 3 is a sound business policy and represents besides a moral duty which we owe to ourselves, our State and our children. I ask your support of this amendment.

Amendment number 4 proposes to cut in two the present Second Judicial District which is now made up of the counties of Richmond, Kings, Queens, Nassau and Suffolk,—in other words, all of Long Island and Staten Island. The Legislature, two years running, passed bills to do this but I vetoed them on the ground that they were unconstitutional in that a Judicial District could be divided only by amendment to the constitution. Those favoring this amendment point out that the present Second Judicial District is much larger than any other in the State. There are nine Judicial Districts in the State for our 12,750,000 people or an average of about one and one-half million people per district. In the Second District, however, there are now four and one-quarter million people.

I am frank in saying that on the ground of equalizing population and of preventing any one district from becoming top-heavy with judges, there is much to be said in favor of this amendment and a vote for it can be justified on the broad ground of keeping the judicial districts approximately equal in size.

On the other hand there is no question that a great deal of politics has been played in the Second Judicial District in relation to this amendment as well as to the making up of judicial slates of candidates for the Supreme Court. The voters of the Second Judicial District have had plenty of notice of these politics. I do not mind saying that for this reason personally I expect to vote against this amendment, though I am free to admit that from a theoretical point of view as to equalizing the population of districts there is much to be said for it.

The fifth amendment is wholly proper and I hope it will pass without

opposition. All it does is to change the name of the Department of Charities to the Department of Social Welfare. This gets away from the old-fashioned idea of mere charity and makes the Department the real instrument for the general improvement of the social welfare of the whole State.

In speaking of the sixth amendment which relates only to the county of Westchester I am torn between my entire approval of the elimination under it of a great number of local tax assessors in each township by creating a central board of assessors for the whole county; and on the other hand, my disapproval, first of this piece-meal legislation which affects only one county and secondly, of giving the Legislature the right to impose this central board of assessors on Westchester county without a referendum vote in that county.

Because I am so greatly interested in the broad principle of reducing the number of local town officials throughout the State I personally am going to vote in favor of this amendment. But I serve notice at the same time that if on election day the voters in Westchester county themselves do not clearly express their approval of this amendment, I will next winter veto any act of the Legislature which compels Westchester county to set up this centralized Board of Assessors against the will of the county itself.

4-6-61

this may be a
draft for speech of
Oct. 26, 1931

ALJ

So many inaccurate statements have been made regarding the effect and purpose of the third amendment, relative to reforestation, that it is worth while to draw a simple picture.

Picture to yourself two great areas of the State - one area running from the Mohawk Valley to the St. Lawrence River and from the Vermont border to west of Utica. This area comprises twelve counties.

The other area is north of the Mohawk Valley and runs from the Hudson River to the Pennsylvania and New Jersey lines and comprises four counties.

These sixteen counties, as a whole, constitute the so-called forest preserve counties. They are called this because in both of these areas there has been set aside by the Constitution two great parks - The Adirondack Park in the north and the Catskill Park in the south. These two great parks occupy a comparatively small area out of each of these counties. Hamilton is the only county wholly within a Park. The land in these two great Parks is surrounded by what is called the blue line. At the present time the State must leave all land within these two great Parks absolutely in its natural state, and can not do any forestry work within the Parks. The new amendment reiterates and reaffirms the safe-guarding of the two great Parks. That is perfectly clear and not open to dispute, though many people opposing the amendment try to confuse this point, and make people believe that their great heritage of the Adirondacks and Catskills may be taken away from them.

The State is embarking on a great program of reforesting abandoned farms - not buying existing forests but only buying land

which is now absolutely useless for all purposes - old abandoned pastures and cleared land grown up with worthless bushes.

This program of the State will give a real future value to these worthless lands, but it must be remembered that the actual method of cutting the timber, if every it is to be cut at all, need not be decided for at least forty or fifty years because it will take that long for the timber to grow. What we want is the right to buy this abandoned land at probably \$5.00 an acre or less, and plant it with trees which will make valuable timber.

Nearly a third of the whole area of the State lies in the sixteen counties mentioned above and less than one third of that area lies in the present Adirondack and Catskill Parks. All that this amendment number three seeks is to give the State the right to purchase land outside of the Adirondack and Catskill Parks and plant it with trees. This is not forest land, and it was never contemplated by the present Article VII of the Constitution that it would ever be acquired as part of the Adirondack and Catskill Parks.

Therefore, it is perfectly clear that the amendment applies only to land not now owned by the State and to land which would never be acquired by the State for the Adirondack or Catskill Parks.

It has been argued that this amendment makes future appropriations binding on future legislatures. This perfectly true but it is little more than mandate given by the people to the Legislature to spend in successive years sums aggregating \$100,000,000 for hospitals and prisons and the sums aggregating \$300,000,000 for the elimination of grade crossings. The present amendment calls for a total expenditure of \$20,000,000, and this sum will in the future come back to the State many times over in the increased value of the property and the value of the timber thereon.

If this amendment does not go through, the great forestry program is the State would ~~shrink~~ to the central and western part of the State and would eliminate the abandoned land in the eastern and northern parts of the State which is far and away the best land in the State for quick timber growing. Remember, that a great majority of all the abandoned farms in the State lie within these sixteen counties.

As a matter of fact, this amendment is also part of the new State policy of using only the best lands of the State for agricultural purposes and thus providing better and cheaper supplies and better market conditions and therefore cheaper food for the millions who live in New York City. This amendment in the long run is of just as much interest to the people of New York City as it is to the people upstate. It is a direct step for improving the living conditions here in New York.

One other point. Lumber is still used to the extent of millions of feet every year throughout the state including the City of New York. We are getting most of our lumber now from the Pacific coast and we are using in this State twenty times as much lumber every year as the State produced. The more lumber we can grow in our own state, the cheaper lumber will be for building and other purposes in New York City and neighboring plants.