

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP

MONDAY THROUGH FRIDAY

Prepared by the Public Relations Department

FARMERS UNION GRAIN
TERMINAL ASSOCIATION
St. Paul 1, Minnesota

WNAX—Yankton, S. D.
9:50 p. m.

KDHL—Faribault, Minn.
12:45 p. m.

KOJM—Havre, Mont.
12:55 p. m.

KCJB—Minot, N. D.
12:15 p. m.

KWLM—Willmar, Minn.
12:15 p. m.

KWOA—Worthington, Minn.
12:15 p. m.

KMHL—Marshall, Minn.
12:15 p. m.

KSJB—Jamestown, N. D.
12:15 p. m.

KFYR—Bismarck, N. D.
1:00 p. m.

WDAY—Fargo, N. D.
1:00 p. m.

KMON—Great Falls, Mont.
12:55 p. m.

KIYI—Shelby, Mont.
12:55 p. m.

TUESDAY -- JUNE 17, 1958

ANNOUNCER: Today, as part of the wheat referendum information program, we bring you a transcribed message from a Senator who has been a leader in Congressional efforts to pass fair farm price legislation. He is Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota.

SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY: Unless two-thirds of the farmers who vote cast "Yes" ballots wheat growers will have even less income protection than they now have, and that's little enough. From the best compilations that I have seen, a "Yes" vote in the 1959 wheat referendum could benefit the average wheat farmer between \$8.00 and \$11.00 per acre. Now, that's the dollars-and-cents difference between passage and defeat of the referendum translated to the individual wheat producer. But a chain of events set up by the defeat of the referendum could make the margin a great deal wider. Disapproval of the 1959 quotas would give a strong argument for President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson to use in pushing their recommendation for the elimination of the mandatory 75 to 90% support prices on wheat, milk and other commodities that we now have.

This year, as last, the only solid assurance that wheat producers have for 1959 is that under existing law, approval of quotas will mean a market price held up by the 75% of parity price support loan. Disapproval of the quotas will mean the wheat price support loans at only 50% of parity price. And, even then, only for those producers who stay within their established acreage allotments. Now, that isn't a very happy choice. No one is satisfied with 75% of the lower modernized parity formula, but at least it certainly is better than risking 1959 wheat income on the chaotic conditions of the free market and the virtually unlimited production and marketing. The difference would likely be as much as 75 to 80¢ a bushel, meaning a return, literally to \$1.00 wheat in the year 1959. It would be too tragic to even contemplate, and much too tragic to let happen.

Now, we're still trying to write an improved farm program in Congress, despite Administration obstacles, obstruction and vetoes. Our efforts will be handicapped, however, if growers reject these marketing quotas in this referendum. Defeat of the wheat quotas would be widely interpreted in Washington as a vote against farm-income improvement and farm price-support programs, giving additional ammunition to the farm-program wreckers; and I want to tell you there's no shortage of those people. They will use it to continue the job at which they've already made considerable progress. It might not only blow up the existing wheat program entirely, but further worsen the entire corn and feed grain programs and endanger continuation of the milk and butterfat programs, thereby giving the Secretary of Agriculture a green light to do as he pleases and to wipe out virtually all farm income protection.

Now, that's what you're voting on on June 20, 1958. Now, to keep all this from happening, I do hope that wheat growers will vote "Yes,"--I repeat, vote "Yes" in the referendum on June 20, to prove that they are willing to accept market quotas in exchange for at least a firm price, if not a fair price.

ANNOUNCER: Thank you, Senator Humphrey of Minnesota. These referendum messages are a service by the thousands of farm families who built and who own GTA, THE CO-OP WAY.

NOTE: Reprints of this radio broadcast are available from FARMERS UNION
GRAIN TERMINAL ASSOCIATION, St. Paul 1, Minnesota



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