

From the Office of
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
140 Senate Office Building
Washington, D. C.
National 8-3120, Ext. 881

FOR RELEASE
Wednesday, March 25, 1953 - AM

Falling farm prices and declining farm income are "warnings that must be heeded, if we are going to avert the kind of collapse that has plunged us into past depressions," Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D.-Minn) declared last night in an address at the annual "Farmers' Night" program at Milan, sponsored by Milan's businessmen. "Agricultural strength is one of the fundamentals upon which the vitality of our whole economy rests," he declared. "We cannot risk permitting it to be undermined."

"Are we properly safeguarding agriculture's strength as an essential part of our national preparedness and security?" Senator Humphrey asked. "Or are we allowing it to slip away by forgetting the lessons of the past and returning once more to an era of wishful thinking rather than squarely facing the hard realities?"

Calling attention to current conditions in agriculture, Senator Humphrey cited figures showing the extent to which farm income is declining in relation to income of other segments of our economy.

"The purchasing power of farm-operator families is down by more than one-fourth since 1947, and will probably drop another 10 to 20 percent in 1953 if present price declines aren't stopped. Gross cash farm income in 1953 will be down about 10% from 1952, while cash farm operating expenses will be the highest in history."

"How long can agriculture ignore this clear evidence of economic erosion?" Senator Humphrey asked. "How long can agriculture go on producing for the benefit of the rest of our economy, if by that production the farmer drives his own returns below a fair level? How long can the rest of our economy remain strong, while the foundations of our agricultural economy is slowly washed away?"

Saying those are questions of deep concern to the entire country, not just to the farmers who happen to be the first to suffer the consequences, Senator Humphrey declared "It's a good time to be re-examining our agricultural policies to see where they can be improved and strengthened; but it certainly isn't any time to risk weakening what limited protection for agriculture already exists."

Out of many distressing lessons of the past, he said, the nation has learned much that cannot be ignored in charting the road ahead.

"Government action to assure a favorable economic climate for agriculture must be continued as a basic public policy, fully accepted as in the public's interest, and beyond the realm of political controversy."

"We must continue to encourage and protect the right of farmers to organize and act cooperatively for their mutual economic protection. . . . We must continue to seek adequate funds for farm-to-market roads, to ease the problem of food distribution for the sake of farmers and consumers alike. . . . We must make sure that adequate credit is kept available for farmers. . . . We must make sure electrification of rural America is continued, and adequate sources of power and means of power transmission are provided. . . . We must also continue to expand rather than slow down the tremendous progress farmers of Minnesota have made in conservation....

"Such programs for agriculture need strengthening and improving, not curtailment," Senator Humphrey said. "They have paid for themselves in benefit to the public manifold. But above all else, we must continue adequate price protection for agriculture, for prices and farm income are the keystone of farm survival."

The necessity for full farm price supports, Senator Humphrey said, "was accepted without reservation by both Presidential candidates in the last election, and America's farmers have a right to expect members of both political parties to respect those pledges in the Congress. Now, more than ever, American agriculture needs reassurance that those pledges will be kept."

Senator Humphrey outlined for his farm audience the price support bill which he recently introduced in the Senate, saying it would "adopt into law the very improvements in our price support legislation demanded by President Eisenhower during his campaign, the same improvements called for by our own Minnesota State Legislature in a resolution memorializing Congress to take such action at once as a means of bolstering the economic climate for agriculture."

He outlined suggestions which he has made to Secretary Benson for better methods of providing price support for perishables, saying:

"Let me make one thing clear. I think all of us want to see food used, not wasted. In asking mandatory support for perishable products, I am purposely not limiting the Secretary of Agriculture to any one method of support for such perishables. Instead, I am recommending that he consider the use of any or all of several alternatives that I believe can accomplish support to the farmers without penalizing consumers by withholding such products from useful, human consumption."

In discussing new outlets for farm products, Senator Humphrey also explained the proposed International Food Reserve which he and 21 other Senators are co-sponsoring, intended to absorb temporary market surpluses of food products and make them available wherever they are needed in the world to prevent famine and starvation.

Such action, he said, would "move forward toward the objectives of protecting our own economic security, while making a new contribution toward a world of plenty".

Extracts from Senator Humphrey's Address include:

"As the farmer willingly accepts his full share of responsibility in the defense effort, asking no special privileges but merely the tools he needs to do the job the Nation requires, he certainly retains the right to strive to hold the gains he has made in the last two decades. He is entitled to continue pushing forward, instead of allowing himself to be pushed back, as long as the progress he seeks for agriculture serves rather than interferes with the Nation's best interest.

"The basic nature of food and fiber and the land that produces them has long led us to accept the fact that a national interest existed in the well-being of agriculture, far beyond the well-being of the farmer himself."

* * * *

"But agriculture has made, and is still making, more than a material contribution to our economy, and to our national strength. It makes a moral contribution too.

"Ever since the founding of our Nation, people who owned and tilled their own soil have contributed a strong, stabilizing moral influence upon our national life. Such landowners are still a solid bulwark of democracy, a safeguard against the inroads of communism in our own land. Family farmers particularly represent the traditional American, democratic pattern. We cannot afford to let that pattern be weakened, nor wiped out.

* * * *

"In times of peace, we have learned we need the influence of a stable and prosperous agriculture for full employment and steady markets in industry, for the assurance of adequate food supplies for the nutritional health of our Nation, and for the moral backing of democracy's free enterprise system as opposed to collectivism in any form -- including monopoly.

"In times of national peril we need above all reliable assurance of abundant production adequate to meet military and civilian needs, however suddenly those needs may change. And to have that assurance means maintaining our agricultural economy in a strong enough position to be able to adjust and adapt itself quickly to any changing requirements the future may bring.

"In peace or war, therefore, the strength and stability of agriculture is an essential national asset.

"In critical times like the present, when we are neither fully at peace nor fully at war, it appears prudent to take careful stock of our agricultural situation, and make sure of its ability to meet whatever the future may bring.

* * * *

"New hands are at the helm of our government, by the choice of the American people. New minds are examining the (farm) policies of the past and the circumstances of the present, before charting the course ahead.

"It's always healthy to review where we have been going, and where we have been headed. But for the sake of the country's progress, such a review must be a constructive one, undertaken with an attitude of preserving what has proved good and workable out of the past, and improving wherever improvement is needed to make our public policies more effective in the future.

"That's what the American people have a right to expect, from any new Administration. That's what America's farmers have a right to expect. All of us want to go forward to a better, brighter future -- not retreat backward into the recesses of the past.

* * * *

"In view of the danger signs on the farmer's economic horizon, he deserves to know whether he can look down the road ahead with hope or with uncertainty. He needs and is entitled to a positive reassurance that his voice will not go unheard in the turmoil of changing administrations and changing policies in Washington today. Many of us in both parties are insisting that such assurance be provided, and without further delay. However, there are disturbing indications from some quarters in Washington today that give me grave concern -- and should give every farmer grave concern.

"There has appeared a hesitancy to act and a sharp conflict in farm philosophies that weakens the firm assurances President Eisenhower gave to the farmers of our state and other states during his campaign. This gives rise to uncertainty over the real course the new administration intends to pursue in regard to agriculture.

"Now I want to be just as fair as I can be. All of us know that it takes time for a new team to get organized, and get into action. Most of us in the minority party have endeavored to cooperate in every way possible to ease the transitions in the executive branch of our government with the least possible disturbance to our economy. We are still trying to cooperate, but I want to assure you I will never hesitate to speak out when the nation's welfare is at stake.

* * * *

"Our farm problems are not something new, confronting the new administration overnight and catching them unprepared. Our farm policies have been studied and debated openly for the past twenty-five years, by Democrats and Republicans alike. They have been supported by members of both parties. Republicans have had just as much time as Democrats to make up their minds about what they are for, and what they are against. Republicans have sat side by side with Democrats on our important agricultural committees in the Congress for the past twenty years, and have participated in all of the searching inquiries that have developed out decisions of the past.

"Farmers were not told by either of the political parties during the campaign that they were uncertain about agricultural policies, that they wanted more time to study problems. Now, however, there's a great deal of talk about needing time to think things over.

* * * *

"Perhaps I wouldn't be as disturbed about the folks in the Department of Agriculture taking more time to 'think things over', if I wasn't so disturbed about just who is helping them do that thinking.

"The middleman seems to have replaced the farmer as the key advisor in the Department of Agriculture these days. Meat buyers are invited in, for a discussion about whether cattle prices are falling too low. Big city bankers are called to Washington, to discuss whether or not farmers have enough credit available. Food dealers and processors are named to various advisory committees -- and fewer and fewer farmers.

"The Voice of Wall Street, it begins to appear, is replacing the Voice of Agriculture as the most influential in the one department of government charged with the responsibility of protecting agriculture.

"That's more than a figure of speech. I am sure you would share my concern if you had read the full-page editorial headed 'Bravo, Cousin Ezra', in Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly -- the trade journal for big financial interests -- calling for the end of price supports, and the laudatory editorials in the Wall Street Journal recently along the same vein.

* * * *

"Farmers know what President Eisenhower promised them at Kasson, and what he repeated elsewhere. They know what Secretary of Agriculture Benson is saying. They know the two views are in sharp conflict. The Secretary of Agriculture is undoubtedly a sincere, earnest, and deeply religious man. I have the highest respect for him personally. Nevertheless, his principles are obviously opposed to the campaign promises of President Eisenhower. Secretary Benson expounded his farm philosophy in an address at St. Paul recently, in which he declared that price supports should be regarded only as 'insurance against disaster'. Nobody has yet told me how broke a farmer has to be, or how many farmers must go broke, before it constitutes a disaster.

* * * *

"My concern is not partisan. Many of my colleagues in the Republican party who come from agricultural areas and really know agricultural problems have shown equal concern. Senator Young, a Republican, has openly expressed that concern on several occasions. I have great respect for both Republican agricultural committee chairmen in the Congress -- Senator Aiken and Congressman Hope. Both are real friends of the farmer. I wouldn't be so concerned today were it not for other influences at work contrary to agriculture's welfare, and if these other influences weren't being given such a close ear by the Department of Agriculture these days.

* * * *

"The American farm is the production plant that must meet the growing requirements for American consumers, and provide essential defense materials. Is this any time to start dismantling that plant, cutting down its productive capacity, by telling the farmer if he can't cope with the hazards of our complex economy he just better get out of business?

"That's just what these folks mean who talk so glibly about 'natural adjustments', 'free markets', and 'less government interference'.

"Nobody raised such howls about huge government outlays to expand our great industrial productive facilities to make sure we could meet the stepped-up demands of defense production. Nobody said we ought to let free markets take care of such expansion. Nobody said that we should let our industry risk its own investment, without any assurance of guaranteed profit in cost-plus contracts and tax benefits from the government.

"Why isn't there just as much a public stake in making sure our agriculture plant can meet its future demands?"

Mayor Dove
Mr Casler
Mr Borglund
Judge Hunt

THE ROAD AHEAD

By Senator Hubert H. Humphrey

4HR *Party*
An address at the annual "Farmers' Night"
program at Milan, Minnesota, on
Tuesday, March 24, 1953, at 8:00 P.M.

*copy
written
& calendar*

*Important
in Washington*

*Brunson
Farmer*

*My
opinions*

I'm glad to be with you tonight. Getting back among you,
and talking with you personally, always reaffirms my faith in
democracy. It strengthens my conviction that public service must
not only be regarded as an honor and a privilege, but rather as a
great opportunity and obligation to honestly and sincerely seek to
reflect the will and the desires of the American people.

We are living in one of the most critical periods in our
Nation's history, and in the world's history.

As long as communist aggression remains a threat, we must have
our military, industrial, agricultural, and economic strength
mobilized in full readiness for any eventuality. It is in the
light of the Nation's security, now and in the future, that I wish
to discuss agriculture's role tonight.

We are convinced that to be secure, we must be strong.

But preparedness means more than guns and planes.

To have military strength, we must have economic strength.

In fact, economic strength is basic to almost anything we want to do.

Agriculture, therefore, is a tremendously vital part of our nation's potential strength. For we've all certainly learned from harsh experience that we cannot long maintain a strong economy without strength and stability in agriculture.

That's why all of us must carefully watch the road ahead for agriculture--in the interest of the nation's security, not just for the farmers' welfare.

That's why preparedness must not mean sacrificing all progress toward improving our domestic economy. Rather than give any reason to turn our backs even temporarily on efforts to strengthen our entire economy and improve the stability of agriculture, the Nation's

call to preparedness should give us all new incentive to build even more rapidly toward a stronger, sturdier democracy that can and will withstand any challenge.

As the farmer willingly accepts his full share of responsibility in the defense effort, asking no special privileges but merely the tools he needs to do the job the Nation requires, he certainly retains the right to strive to hold the gains he has made in the last two decades. He is entitled to continue pushing forward, instead of allowing himself to be pushed back, as long as the progress he seeks for agriculture serves rather than interferes with the Nation's best interest.

The basic nature of food and fiber and the land that produces them has long led us to accept the fact that a national interest existed in the well-being of agriculture, far beyond the well-being of the farmer himself. Agriculture has been a basic factor in the

strength and progress since the very founding of our Nation. It has been farmers who carved our Nation out of the wilderness, and pushed its frontier westward.

Production of food and fiber came first, and industry followed. It has been the increasing efficiency of American farming that has enabled us to release more and more of our population into nonfarm jobs--making possible our great industrialized economy of today.

Let me illustrate that relation between the increasing productivity of our farms, and the availability of manpower for industry. A little more than a century ago, one farm worker, on the average, provided food and fiber for less than five persons. Now one farm worker provides, on the average, for 15 persons.

This process was greatly accelerated during the decade just ended. While the nonfarm population of our country grew by about 20 million persons, it is estimated the number of people on farms decreased by nearly three millions. Yet our farms have been

continuing to produce enough to feed all the rest of our people--
producing about 40 percent more than the 1935-39 average, and using
about the same number of acres to do it.

Such agricultural strength is one of the fundamentals upon
which the vitality of our whole economy rests. We cannot risk
permitting it to be undermined. Without raw materials from the
farms, much of our industry would be crippled; a large part of our
labor force would be idle.

In addition to providing much of the materials for industry,
agriculture provides much of the markets for industry. And as
progress in American agriculture has brought with it increasingly
higher levels for rural standards of living, it has brought a
parallel increase in demand for the products of American industry.

But agriculture has made and is still making more than a material
contribution to our economy, and to our national strength. It
makes a moral contribution too.

*Speech in
St Paul
to Mirror
Erny Hayes*

Ever since the founding of our Nation, people who owned and tilled their own soil have contributed a strong, stabilizing moral influence upon our national life. Such landowners are still a solid bulwark of democracy, a safeguard against the inroads of communism in our own land. Family farmers particularly represent the traditional American, democratic pattern. We cannot afford to let that pattern be weakened, ~~for~~ wiped out.

As important as these material and moral contributions of agriculture have been to the growth and progress of our Nation in the past, they are even more vital to the basic strength of our Nation in changing times like the present.

In times of peace, we have learned we need the influence of a stable and prosperous agriculture for full employment and steady markets in industry, for the assurance of adequate food supplies for the nutritional health of our Nation, and for the moral backing of

democracy's free enterprise system as opposed to collectivism in any form -- including monopoly.

In times of national peril we need above all reliable assurance of abundant production adequate to meet military and civilian needs, however suddenly those needs may change. And to have that assurance means maintaining our agricultural economy in a strong enough position to be able to adjust and adapt itself quickly to any changing requirements the future may bring.

In peace or war, therefore, the strength and stability of agriculture is an essential national asset.

In critical times like the present, when we are neither fully at peace nor fully at war, it appears prudent to take careful stock of our agricultural situation, and make sure of its ability to meet whatever the future may bring.

Where do we stand today?

What lies on the road ahead?

Are we properly safeguarding agriculture's strength as an essential part of our national preparedness and security? Or are we allowing it to slip away by forgetting the lessons of the past and returning once more to an era of wishful thinking rather than squarely facing the hard realities?

We need such searching questions.

Our current supplies of farm products are heavy. Our productive power is the greatest in history.

Farmers have answered the nation's call to produce in abundance to meet our increasing consumer demands, to fill our military needs, and to share with our allies.

But what is happening to the farmer?

The parity ratio has come down.

Farm income has declined in relation to the income of other segments of our economy. The farm people's share of national income in 1953 will be lower than any other year except 1932. In that depressed year, farmers' share of the national income was 5.5%. By 1946, that share had risen to 10.8% -- still far less per capita than the non-farm share. But for 1953, it is now officially estimated that the farmers' share of national income has gone to about 6%.

The purchasing power of farm operator families is down by more than one-fourth since 1947, and will probably drop another 10 to 20 percent in 1953 if present price declines aren't stopped.

Gross cash farm income in 1953 will be down about 10%
from 1952.

The trend in prices received has been generally downward
for the past two years, with the greatest drops taking place since
last November.

Farm prices on the average have dropped 15% since January,
1951. The decline has been 7% since last November 15. Yet prices
paid by farmers are up 5% since January of 1951. And present
estimates indicate 1953 cash farm operating expenses will be the
highest in history -- about \$23 billion.

Cost of fertilizer and lime went up by \$100 million from
1951 to 1952, and prices are still climbing. Cost of operating
motor equipment went up almost \$100 million and is still rising.
Farm mortgage interest will probably take \$100 million ^{more} in 1953 than
in 1951.

I cite these national trends to keep the record straight.
The facts are available for all to see. They are warnings that must
be heeded, if we are going to avert the kind of collapse that has

plunged us into past depressions.

How long can ^{government} agriculture ignore this clear evidence of ^{business} economic erosion?

How long can agriculture go on producing for the benefit of the rest of our economy, if by that production the farmer drives his own returns below a fair level?

How long can the rest of our economy remain strong, while the foundation of our agricultural economy is slowly washed away?

Those are some of the serious questions confronting us as we face the road ahead. They are questions of deep concern to the entire country, not just to the farmers who happen to be the first to suffer the consequences.

It's a good time to be re-examining our agricultural policies to see where they can be improved and strengthened; but it certainly isn't any time to risk weakening what limited protection for agriculture already exists.

The extent to which such price protection is going to be provided on the road ahead is one of the critical issues of public policy confronting our country today.

New hands are at the helm of our government, by the choice of the American people. New minds are examining the policies of the past and the circumstances of the present, before charting the course ahead.

It's always healthy to review where we have been ~~going~~, and where we ~~have~~ ^{are} headed. But for the sake of the country's progress, such a review must be a constructive one, undertaken with an attitude of preserving what has proved good and workable out of the past, and improving wherever improvement is needed to make our public policies more effective in the future.

That's what the American people have a right to expect, from any new administration. That's what America's farmers have a right to expect. All of us want to go forward to a better, brighter future -- not retreat backward into the recesses of the past.

Out of many distressing lessons of the past, we have learned much that cannot be ignored in charting the road ahead.

Government action to assure a favorable economic climate for agriculture must be continued as a basic public policy, fully accepted as in the public's interest, and beyond the realm of political controversy.

↳ We must continue to encourage and protect the right of

Coops

farmers to organize and act cooperatively for their mutual economic protection.

↳ We must continue to seek adequate funds for farm-to-market

Roads

roads, to ease the problem of food distribution for the sake of farmers and consumers alike.

↳ We must make sure that adequate credit, at low rate, ^{just} interest is kept available

Credit - Interest

for farmers, geared to the needs and the conditions in agriculture.

↳ We must make sure electrification of rural America is

continued, and adequate sources of power and means of power trans-

mission are provided. We must assure electrical energy within means

of the farmer to pay, to increase the efficiency of his operations and lighten the burdens of rural living.

We in Minnesota have good reason to know what electrification has meant to our agriculture. When the Rural Electrification Administration was established in 1935, only 6.8 percent of the farms in Minnesota had commercial or cooperative electric service. Now, 89.7 percent are served.

Our task ahead is to assure adequate sources of power for our great rural electric co-ops.

The last budget message to the Congress asked for a four-million-dollar appropriation to start building a 230,000-volt line to bring Missouri valley public power into western Minnesota. Along with it were requests for necessary funds to complete the work on four Missouri valley basin reservoirs being built in North and South Dakota by the Army Engineers, which will serve as the source of the electrical power to be transmitted to Minnesota if funds are approved for the new high voltage line.

Missouri Power

What the fate of that request will be, however, can't be known until the new administration completes its review of the budget and submits its own recommendations to the Congress.

The stake of Minnesota farmers in that decision, however, cannot be underestimated.

We must also continue to expand rather than slow down the tremendous progress farmers of Minnesota have made in conservation during the last 18 years, particularly under the guidance of the fifty locally-organized Soil Conservation Districts now covering about 18 million acres in all or parts of 49 counties. In these Districts, 17,177 farmers are carrying out detailed conservation plans, worked out jointly by the farmers and SCS technicians through facilities of the districts. We cannot ignore the further incentive given conservation in our state by the Agricultural Conservation Program, through which more than 95,000 farmers in 1951 -- the last year for which complete figures are available -- participated.

Such programs for agriculture need strengthening and improving, not curtailment. They have paid for themselves in benefit to the public manifold.

But above all else we must continue adequate price protection for agriculture, for prices and farm income are the keystone of farm survival.

The necessity for full farm price supports was accepted without reservation by both Presidential candidates in the last election, and America's farmers have a right to expect members of both political parties to respect those pledges in the Congress.

Now, more than ever, American agriculture needs reassurance that those pledges will be kept. In view of the danger signs on the farmer's economic horizon, he deserves to know whether he can look down the road ahead with hope or with uncertainty. He needs and is entitled to a positive reassurance that his voice will not go unheard in the turmoil of changing administrations and changing policies in Washington today.

Man of us in both parties are insisting that such assurance be provided, and without further delay. However, there are disturbing indications from some quarters in Washington today that give me grave concern--and should give every farmer grave concern.

There has appeared a hesitancy to act and a sharp conflict in farm philosophies that weakens the firm assurances President Eisenhower gave to the farmers of our state and other states during his campaign. This gives rise to uncertainty over the real course the new administration intends to pursue in regard to agriculture.

Now I want to be just as fair as I can be. All of us know that it takes time for a new team to get organized, and get into action. Most of us in the minority party have endeavored to cooperate in every way possible to ease the transitions in the Executive branch of our government with the least possible disturbance to our economy. We are still trying to cooperate, but I want to assure you I will never hesitate to speak out when the

nation's welfare is at stake.

Our farm problems are not something new, confronting the new administration overnight and catching them unprepared. Our farm policies have been studied and debated openly for the past twenty-five years, by Republicans and Democrats alike. They have been supported by members of both Parties. Republicans have had just as much time as Democrats to make up their minds about what they are for and what they are against. Republicans have sat side by side with Democrats on our important agricultural committees in the Congress for the past twenty years, and have participated in all of the searching inquiries that have developed our decisions of the past.

Farmers were not told by either of the political parties during the campaign that they were uncertain about agricultural policies, that they wanted more time to study the problems. Now, however, there's a great deal of talk about needing time to think things over.

Perhaps I wouldn't be as disturbed about the folks in the Department of Agriculture taking more time to "think things over", if I wasn't so disturbed about just who is helping them do that thinking.

The middleman seems to have replaced the farmer as the key advisor in the Department of Agriculture these days.

Meat buyers are invited in for a discussion about whether cattle prices are falling too low.

Big city bankers are called to Washington to discuss whether or not farmers have enough credit available.

Food dealers and processors are named to various advisory committees--and fewer and fewer farmers.

The Voice of Wall street, it begins to appear, is replacing the Voice of Agriculture as the most influential in the one department of government charged with the responsibility of protecting agriculture.

That's more than a figure of speech. I am sure you would share my concern if you had read the full-page editorial "Bravo, Cousin Ezra," in Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly-- the trade journal for big financial interests--calling for the end of price supports, and the laudatory editorials in the Wall Street Journal recently along the same vein.

Make no mistake about it. The financial journals now acclaiming new trends in our farm policies aren't very concerned about farmers; their interest lies with those who farm the farmers. And make no mistake about the fact that they are out to end ALL farm price supports.

"The theory that things on a farm would go 'pfft' if supports were removed is a myth that is not sustained by the facts", says Barrons.

And, adds the Wall Street Journal in a spurt of startling frankness:

"Make no mistake about it; this task will be fought by many farmers, and the Administration will need all the support it can get from wiser heads....But it is a task well begun now."

I'll let you decide for yourselves whether you need any so-called "wiser heads" from Wall Street deciding the fate of your farm programs.

I don't want to be too critical of a new regime just getting underway. I want to be fair, and constructive. But all of us must stay alert to the forces openly at work to destroy, rather than improve, the government's obligation to seek for American agriculture a fair share of the economic blessings afforded the rest of our economy.

Farmers know what President Eisenhower promised them at Kasson, and what he repeated elsewhere.

They now know what Secretary of Agriculture Benson is saying.

They know the two views are in sharp conflict.

The Secretary of Agriculture is undoubtedly a sincere, earnest, and deeply religious man. I have the highest respect for him personally. Nevertheless, his principles are obviously opposed to the campaign promises of President Eisenhower.

Secretary Benson expounded his farm philosophy in an address at St. Paul recently, in which he declared that price supports should be regarded only as "insurance against disaster". Nobody has yet told me how broke a farmer has to be, or how many farmers must go broke, before it constitutes a disaster.

My concern is not partisan. Many of my colleagues in the Republican Party who come from agricultural areas and really know agricultural problems have shown equal concern. Senator Young, a Republican, has openly expressed that concern on several occasions.

I have great respect for both Republican agricultural committee chairmen in the Congress--Senator Aiken and Congressman Hope.

Disagree with - to

~~But not friends of the farmer.~~ I wouldn't be so concerned today were it not for other influences at work contrary to agriculture's welfare, and if these other influences weren't being given such a close ear by the Department of Agriculture these days.

The American farmer is the production plant that must meet the growing requirements for American consumers, and provide essential defense materials. Is this any time to start dismantling that plant, cutting down its productive capacity, by telling the farmer if he can't cope with the hazards of our complex economy he just better get out of business?

That's just what these folks mean who talk so glibly about "natural adjustments", "free markets", and "less government interference".

Nobody raised such howls about huge government outlays to expand our great industrial productive facilities to make sure we could meet the stepped-up demands of defense production. Nobody said we ought to let free markets take care of such expansion. Nobody said we ought to let free markets take care of such expansion. Nobody said that we should let our industry risk its own investment, without any assurance of guaranteed profit in cost-plus contracts and tax benefits from the government.

Why isn't there just as much a public stake in making sure our agricultural plant can meet its future demands?

Farmers will be even more alarmed if they read the recent remarks in the Senate by Senator Bridges of New Hampshire, ~~P~~resident pro tempore of the Senate apparently setting the stage for turning back the clock to a survival-of-the-fittest, squeeze-

out-the-little-fellow farm philosophy. Such a course would be a direct repudiation of the President's pledge to the farmers of this country, and a dangerous tampering with the nation's future food supply.

For the sake of the nation, as well as for agriculture, we cannot let that happen. Regardless of partisan views, we must arrive at a wiser course.

It is because of that conviction that I have introduced legislation in the Senate intended to clarify the conflicting philosophies now in regard to agriculture, and to make good the repeated assurances of the leaders and platforms of both political parties that economic protection for agriculture would be continued.

In my opinion, it's time to establish economic protection for agriculture as a basic public policy, fully accepted as in the public's interest, beyond the realm of political controversy.

My bill would adopt into law the very improvements in our price support legislation demanded by President Eisenhower during

his campaign, the same improvements called for by your own Minnesota State Legislature in a resolution memorializing Congress to take such action at once as a means of bolstering the economic climate for agriculture.

My bill proposes that the farm price support level be at 90 to 100% of the parity fair return standard for all basic and other designated storable commodities--the same parity level asked for by President Eisenhower during his campaign.

~~My bill proposes that the farm price support level~~

My bill proposes to make mandatory the support of a number of commodities which are now subject to the discretion--or indiscretion--of the Secretary of Agriculture. The bill would add flaxseeds, soybeans, oats, rye, barley and grain sorghums to the list of commodities protected by mandatory 90-100% price supports.

I would also make mandatory the support of dairy products, cattle, hogs and poultry and eggs, at not less than 90% of parity.

I am further proposing to extend the period of firm, mandatory farm price supports through 1957, a year after the new Administration takes office, to eliminate future uncertainty.

I am asking that the present dual parity formula be continued for that same period, instead of requiring the so-called "new formula" to go into effect at the end of next year.

Let me make one thing clear. I think all of us want to see food used, not wasted. In asking mandatory support for perishable products, I am purposely not limiting the Secretary of Agriculture to any one method of support for such perishables. Instead, I am recommending that he consider the use of any or all of several alternatives that I believe can accomplish support to the farmers without penalizing consumers by withholding such products from useful, human consumption.

Here are some of the suggestions I have offered:

1. The use of compensatory payments, such as previously

included in the 1948 Agricultural Act authored by Senator Aiken,

and similar to those still successfully used in the Sugar Act.

I understand Secretary Benson has just recently testified in support of continuing the present Sugar Act that includes such payments, so perhaps he may decide they have merit for support of other commodities.

2. Expanding distribution of perishables through our school lunch program, charitable institutions, and military procurement.

3. New methods of more liberal credit for livestock producers that will encourage and permit more orderly marketing.

4. A domestic food allotment plan, similar to that previously proposed

by Senator Aiken for low-income families.

5. Development of international programs for making such food supplies available where they are most needed in the world.

6. Use of our abundant production to fight communism, by improving the diets of South Korean and other allied troops.

Through wise use of such methods, I am sure, the proven benefits of price support can be achieved for producers of these important perishables without penalizing the consumer and risking huge waste and heavy economic loss--a loss that in the past has often been far greater than the costs of these alternative methods would be.

It is to our interest as a nation, and it is in the interest of freedom and humanitarianism all over the world, that we begin to raise our sights and use some imagination toward developing new outlets so that our agricultural products can be effectively utilized and our agricultural economy protected.

There can be no real surplus of food or fiber, as long as there are people in the world who are hungry and not properly clothed. Millions in the world today are undernourished and underfed, and can use the health-giving strength and life which American farmers produce in their fields.

I have called upon the Secretary of Agriculture to turn as much of our present surplus food supplies as possible over to the non-profit organization CARE, which is willing to undertake its distribution overseas without cost to our government.

I have joined others in urging that we should ship more of our beef to Korea, where South Korean soldiers are suffering from serious malnutrition, with hunger reducing the effectiveness of their combat units.

I am vigorously supporting, along with 21 other senators from both political parties, the creation of an International Food Reserve through the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations. The purpose of such a reserve would be

to provide a means of absorbing temporary market surpluses of agricultural products from anywhere in the world, and make them available wherever they are most needed to prevent famine and starvation.

In addition to offering a new outlet for temporary surpluses of American agricultural products, creation of the International Food Reserve would be seizing the "cold war" initiative and asserting our leadership by bringing a positive, humanitarian force into the world's ideological struggle at a time when the whole world is tensely waiting to see who shall make the next move in the grim conflict between freedom and communism.

All of us must realize that as long as there are empty stomachs in the world, we'll have to keep our cartridge belts full. But all of us can also pray that in time full stomachs all over the world can replace the full cartridge belt as our greatest defender of democracy.

In the present world struggle, a million dollars for food might equal ten million dollars for ammunition.

All of us know how drastically our farm export market has been shrinking. Shortage of American dollars to buy American products when they are wanted and needed in many parts of the world is contributing heavily to our present decline in farm prices here at home.

Under our proposal for an International Food Reserve, however, use of various national currencies would be permitted for the purchase of agricultural products from the Reserve. Such funds, in turn, would be used through the cooperation of appropriate international lending, economic development and technical assistance programs for financing self-liquidating economic development programs within the country from which the funds originated.

In effect, under such a proposal, American food and fiber would be replacing American dollars as part of our contribution

toward economic strength in the free world.

Such a policy makes good sense for American farmers, and it makes good sense for our friends and allies in other lands.

It would strengthen our domestic price support programs by bridging the gap between domestic and international markets, opening up potential new outlets for American food and fiber throughout the world.

It offers us a way to make a positive contribution toward permanent peace, while at the same time protecting American agriculture.

No nation was ever more desirous of having peace and prosperity shared throughout the world, yet the instincts of self-preservation warn us that we must not ignore the welfare of our own people in the process of helping the world. All of us should welcome, therefore, such an opportunity to move forward toward the objectives of protecting our own economic security

while making a new contribution toward a world of plenty.

All of the potential outlets I have suggested offer new opportunities for agriculture, and new challenges for this administration to serve agriculture -- if it will.

But we need positive action, and we need it now. And we need vigorous leadership committed to strengthening American agriculture.

We need it for the nation's welfare, not the welfare of farmers alone.

We need it for the strength agriculture provides the rural community -- its schools, its churches, and its businesses.

Here in Milan, I am sure, businessmen of the community have recognized the necessity of a strong agriculture to a strong community, a strong state, and a strong nation. They have indicated their concern over agriculture's problems by the sponsorship of this "Farmers' Night" as a forum for discussion of the critical issues of public policy confronting us.

They know as we all know that democracy is on trial in the world today, and must prove its worth to the entire world if freedom is to survive.

And they know, too, that democracy must be made to work in the best interests of all the people, if we hope to rally all the people to its banner.

The freedom we cherish in our democracy is not a selfish freedom concerned alone with opportunity of individual gain. Liberty must mean more than mere license. Hand-in-hand with opportunity for individual initiative and advancement must go a selfless concern for the well-being of all.

I'm proud of the businessmen of Milan for exemplifying such a concern on this occasion. By their interest in their agricultural neighbors, they can help make democracy work for the best interest of everyone.

All of us must help make democracy work, to keep democracy strong. And all of us must help make our government fulfill properly the role it occupies in our democracy.

In a democracy, mankind's responsibilities for exemplifying the ideals of human justice become the responsibilities of government, serving as man's collective voice. We sometimes fail to appreciate fully, and to understand, the government's role in carrying forward the ideals of man.

In our government's concern for the well-being of its people, some profess to see a departure from traditional American principles, a drift toward the totalitarian concepts we all deplore.

However sincere they may be, they are mistaken.

They fail to see the significant difference between the people using their government to achieve the goals they desire, and a government that uses its people for whatever purpose a few may desire.

Rather than turning away, we are turning back ever-closer to the fundamental ideals of Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln when we use our government to promote the well-being of all the people, when we make sure our government is responsive to the wishes of the many rather than the influence of the few.

It is from the inspiration of Thomas Jefferson that we keep alive the spirit of humanity in our laws today.

It is from the inspiration of Abraham Lincoln that we have accepted the obligation of government to serve as the means for the people to accomplish together what they could not accomplish at all, or could not accomplish so well alone.

It is not the increased use of our government by the people for their own welfare that threatens departure from our fundamental concepts of democracy. Rather, the danger comes from those who would deprive the people of that right. Those who would make our government less responsive to the will of the

people would cast us adrift from the moorings of the real American way of life.

The right of the people to use their Government in the ways they think best to serve them, is fundamental to democracy.

It is democracy at work -- the American way.

We must keep it that way along the road ahead -- for agriculture as well as for the rest of the nation.



Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org