

These are my questions, Mr. Graham.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes; we will furnish the first for the record.

(In answer to Senator Jordan's first question, Mr. Graham later supplied the following table:)

WHERE THEY ARE—GEOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS OF GRANGE MEMBERSHIP (DUES PAID)

Members Granges			Members Granges		
New England:			West Central—Continued		
Maine.....	37,238	426	South Dakota.....	360	21
Vermont.....	12,105	191	Nebraska.....	1,701	37
New Hampshire.....	18,504	259	Kansas.....	26,213	220
Massachusetts.....	28,245	302	Montana.....	1,486	29
Connecticut.....	27,158	186	Wyoming.....	1,064	31
Rhode Island.....	5,071	55	Colorado.....	7,487	144
Total.....	128,321	1,419	Total.....	52,549	816
Middle Atlantic:			Southeast:		
New York.....	78,866	1,110	North Carolina.....	11,031	194
New Jersey.....	11,823	131	South Carolina.....	4,056	79
Pennsylvania (except western).....	46,184	618	Florida.....	1,461	35
Delaware.....	1,816	29	Tennessee.....	435	25
Maryland.....	2,008	47	Virginia.....	1,139	30
District of Columbia.....	200	1	Total.....	18,122	363
Total.....	140,897	1,936	Southwest:		
East Central:			Arkansas.....	641	20
Michigan.....	11,262	310	Oklahoma.....	1,096	38
Ohio.....	106,414	1,126	Texas.....	1,883	28
West Virginia.....	1,322	27	Total.....	3,620	86
Indiana.....	3,447	68	Pacific:		
Western Pennsylvania.....	23,092	309	Washington.....	55,941	522
Total.....	145,537	1,840	Idaho.....	9,409	168
West Central:			Nevada.....	87	1
Illinois.....	6,674	160	Oregon.....	26,062	360
Wisconsin.....	1,663	34	California.....	40,122	363
Minnesota.....	1,720	56	Total.....	131,621	724
Iowa.....	1,993	48	Grand total.....		
Missouri.....	2,188	36	620,668 7,184		

Note: In addition, the Grange has an unknown number of members who are classified as honorary members, mostly those who have a long membership record, from whom no dues are requested. These probably number in 6 figures.

Mr. GRAHAM. In terms of Federal spending, we have some concept of the budget in terms of agriculture. But, as we testified before the House Ways and Means Committee, we do not set ourselves up as experts in the total budget of the U.S. Government. I do not think there are many people who are. We have areas in which we do have some expertise.

Frankly, we think that the cuts in agriculture at the present time have gone to the bone, and taken out some of the bone. There are substantial problems that we cannot answer at this budget level. One of them has to do with the proper funding of the Packers and Stockyards Act which, at least, guarantees some honesty in the marketplace. This, we think, ought to be increased, so at this point we do not see where you can cut more.

Frankly, I think that we have got some problems in doing any substantial cutting anywhere else. This has been a pretty rugged budget cutting session in the last 2 or 3 years.

If we are not going to eliminate military cuts, I do not conceive of how it is possible to equate cuts with tax increases.

If we would start from a year ago we might do that, or 2 years ago. But if we were to cut half of \$23 to \$29 billion we would practically dismantle a substantial amount of the Federal Government, if we do it outside of Defense.