

July 8
1953

COPY

Quite frankly, I don't like the idea of restrictions and controls on a farmer's production -- I'd prefer to see a little more vision used toward opening up new markets and new outlets for our blessings of abundance.

But let's be practical: Under the law as it now exists, we're ~~do~~ going to lose any effective price support if farmers reject wheat marketing quotas in the present referendum. You know what that will mean.

Until we can sensibly provide farmers with decent prices for his entire output, we must have all the protection we can get under the existing laws.

For your own protection, for your price protection, I recommend that our wheat farmers vote "Yes" on the referendum. Approval of the referendum will at least mean assurance of keeping present price support levels until we can work out something better. Rejection, I'm afraid, would be the beginning of the end; it would be the signal for an all-out push to end price supports entirely.

Let's not take chances. Let's keep what limited protection we have now, by approving wheat marketing quotas.

Many of us are still vigorously pushing for expanded use of our wheat and other food supplies as part of our foreign aid program -- using them to feed the hungry of the world. We can fight Communism with food instead of bullets -- and help our own farmers at the same time. I've urged creation of an International Food Reserves; I've pushed for greater food distribution overseas through such organizations as CARE; I'm urging shipment of flour to West Berlin to make bread for the hungry food-rioters

COPY

in East Berlin, and I made the original demands for sending wheat to fight famine in Pakistan. Such uses point the way for greater, more useful disposal of our wheat supplies in the future -- but they do NOT lessen the need for price protection NOW.

We can't stand having wheat farmers tossed to the mercy of speculators; the economy of the great midwest couldn't stand such a blow, without heavy repercussions on everybody.

Prices have plunged far enough now -- too far. But they'll plunge much further, if farmers reject marketing quotas in disgust. It would just make the way easy for those who would undermine our farm price supports.

It's not politics -- it's bread and butter. We better save what we have in price protection for wheat by voting "Yes" in the referendum on marketing quotas. It will give some of us in Congress time to try and strengthen present farm programs. So far, we've had to spend too much time fighting efforts to undermine what we already have.

But the farmer's protests are beginning to be felt in Washington. Agriculture's welfare can't be long ignored.

The worst set-back agriculture could get, however, would be rejection of the marketing quotas. It would be the beginning of the end. Don't let it happen.

Vote "Yes" in the referendum, as a vote to keep price supports, keep price protection, and keep away a depression.

That's the sensible thing, the practical thing, for our farmers to do -- as much as we might like some better way out.



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