

FOR RELEASE ON DELIVERY:  
Saturday,  
September 19, 1959

STATEMENT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY

by

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.)

"Terraceville 1959"  
Dawson, Minnesota

Saturday, September 19, 1959

I am delighted to be with you here today at Terraceville. I value this opportunity to be face to face with my good friends in Minnesota who are giving of their time and their energy to help make a dream come true -- a dream of green fertile fields, of clean lakes and ponds abounding with fish, and of forest lands providing a refuge for game and bird-life and pleasure for us all.

I want to pay a well-merited tribute to the Minnesota Soil Conservation District Association for their sponsorship of this annual conservation field day and plowing match. This is becoming more than a state field day; it is approaching the status of a national institution.

It is fitting that I review some of the accomplishments of the Minnesota Soil Conservation Districts -- not because you here are unfamiliar with them, but because you are making a record which is a matter of pride to me personally as a resident of this state. It is good to be proud of your home state and your home-folks, as I am.

Originally, the objective of soil conservation was to vanquish the threat of erosion to our lands. Now that objective has broadened to the concept of using each acre of agricultural land within its capability and treating it in accordance with its needs for protection and improvement.

The organization of soil conservation districts is continuing to progress here in Minnesota. We now have 81 soil conservation districts, an increase of 21 during the past six years. They cover 77 percent of the land in the State. More than 40,000 Minnesota farmers are district cooperators.

I take this occasion to pay tribute to the soil conservation district supervisors who are responsible for these programs. Day and night you are the men who are on the front lines in the fight against soil erosion, drought, land damage, and floods. You serve your community without pay. You represent the finest tradition of self-government.

I wish to pay tribute, too, to the farmers who are practicing conservation on their land. More than 225,000 acres of Minnesota farm land is being farmed on the contour. Nearly 700,000 acres are strip cropped. Nearly 6,000 farm ponds have been built. Nearly 400,000 acres of pastures have been improved. About 1,500 miles of terraces have been built. Trees have been planted on more than 50,000 acres. Nearly 100,000 acres have been improved for wildlife.

The latest report on progress made by the Minnesota State Soil Conservation Committee tells the Minnesota conservation story.

One of the striking impressions I received from this report is the high degree of cooperation among farmers, town folks, and the various state and federal agencies in advancing your soil conservation district programs. Your teamwork is getting results.

You are making effective use of the conservation tools supplied to you by the Federal government. I have reference to the technicians of the Soil Conservation Service, to cost-sharing through the Agricultural Conservation Program, to the educational work of the Extension Service, to the small upstream watershed projects, and to the many other conservation tools which are offered.

One significant development here in Minnesota has been the increasing support of the State Government to your soil conservation district programs under the leadership of Governor Orville Freeman and our State Legislature.

In 1955 the State Legislature made a new appropriation of \$100,000 per year to speed up conservation planning in soil conservation districts. Since 1955 the State Legislature has continued and increased this support. We should be proud of the fact that Minnesota ranks fifth high in the nation in state

/more/

appropriations for soil conservation districts.

I think we owe a round of applause to Governor Freeman and the State Legislature.

And while we are at it, I think we should have a round of applause for your soil conservation district leaders. I refer to such dedicated men as Milton Maxwell, Cy Crawford, Bill Bennett, Alf Larson, and a host of others.

Yes, we have made remarkable and praise-worthy progress in soil and water conservation, both in Minnesota and the nation, but in spite of advances we have not yet progressed to the point of adequate control of soil erosion and water waste.

Actually only a third of the nation's agricultural land today is adequately safeguarded. The nation continues to contend with heavy erosion damage. Soil washing or blowing make further crop production impractical on badly eroding land under present conditions at the rate of 400,000 acres annually. Productiveness of some 120 million acres is being seriously endangered.

Nearly one-fourth of the people in the nation now face problems of water shortage, poor water, or both. The rate of water use predicted for 1975 is twice what it was in 1955.

It is apparent that we cannot rest on our laurels in conservation work. Instead, we must intensify our efforts to achieve better management and use of the nation's water supply.

Soil and water conservation are essential to the building of the nation's reserve agricultural productive capacity to meet both anticipated and unforeseen future needs.

Soil and water conservation are as important ingredients of modern farming as improved machinery, hybrid seeds, hybrid poultry, hybrid hogs, adapted fertilizers, and skilled management.

Soil and water conservation are vital to the efficiency of American agriculture. Unfortunately, farmers themselves have not profited income-wise from this high efficiency. You do not need me to describe for you the farm income decline in recent years. Nor do I need to remind you of the relentless attack on farm programs. The very concept of a national farm program has been made the whipping boy of the national periodical press and commentators.

This brings me to the subject of major farm policy.

In these past several years -- in fact, since a day in 1952 when an audience much like this, on an occasion similar to this, thought they heard a promise of better times for farmers from an illustrious speaker -- since that day farmers have seen some amazing changes in federal farm policy, and also, I am afraid, they have seen a growing misunderstanding between city people and farm people, even between farmers themselves as prices of various commodities fell out of balance.

The public has been led to believe that farmers receive enormous subsidies as annual gifts from the federal taxpayer. This kind of mis-statement is making it more and more difficult to get any improving farm legislation passed by Congress.

What is the basis for this widely believed fallacy?

It comes from the annual budget appropriation for agriculture and agricultural resources. For fiscal 1960, agriculture was the third largest item in the budget, coming after defense and interest on the national debt. It approximates \$6 billion.

But much of this budget does not go to the farmer at all.

Part of this \$6 billion goes for loans which will be paid. For example, a half billion dollars goes into funds to be loaned by the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farmers Home Administration. The repayment history on these loans is excellent.

Some money goes for research. Some goes for service that benefits consumers far more than farmers, for example, the school lunch and school milk programs which are actually investment in the health of our children -- America's future.

Expenditures for the forest service, meat inspection service, soil conservation program, and many other USDA services benefit the whole nation, they are protection for consumers. This money is not spent for farmers.

Not even all expenditures for price support can be considered farm subsidies. Commodity Credit Corporation recovers around 65 to 70% of the investment when commodities are sold. When surplus commodities are donated to the needy on welfare lists and to the unemployed, and to the victims of disaster, the expenditures are clearly in the national interest.

Government-owned commodities sold overseas for soft currencies make a tremendous contribution toward building for peace.

If we could bring into reality a true food-for-peace program, as I and a large number of my Senate colleagues have urged, the rewards would be of inestimable value. Certainly such use of food should not be charged up as a hand-out to farmers.

Farm price support programs cost too much. Farmers agree with consumers on this point.

But farmers know too well that the programs have been mismanaged and distorted.

Farmers know, too, that these huge stocks of surplus government-owned agricultural products show something more than mismanagement. They reveal the immensity of our national agricultural productive capacity. They reveal the size and complexity of the problems faced by farmers.

We now realize that before we in Congress can enact any effective new farm legislation, we need to make clear what our purposes and objectives are.

All legislative history behind the development of our farm programs confirms that our objective and purpose has been to assure the American people of a continued abundance of food and fiber; to offer America's farmers an opportunity to achieve economic equality with other segments of our economy; and to preserve and protect America's traditional pattern of family-owned, family-operated farms as the type of agriculture best adapted to our democratic way of life.

In more recent years, a new objective has been added -- the use of our agricultural abundance as a useful and effective humanitarian arm of better international relations.

Repeatedly, the Congress of the United States has restated its intent to uphold these objectives, in one way or another.

But these objectives are being challenged. We have heard our blessing of abundance criticized as a curse.

Now, for the first time in the history of our nation, a cancer of doubt has arisen in the public consciousness as to the merit of our family farming system -- the most efficient agricultural production system in the world.

The swift rise of vertical integration provides the mechanism whereby big concentrated business and financial interests can extend their domination over agriculture.

This will leave the farm family on the farm. But it will take away its economic independence. The farmer will be told what to grow and where to sell, and the absentee-corporation farm director will control what the farmer gets for his efforts.

This ominous forecast for American agriculture holds a powerful, fascinating allure for all too many people in our country today.

Its allure has been heightened immeasurably by the discouraging, demoralizing shambles that the Republican Administration has made of our farm programs.

There are millions and millions of citizens in our population who are far removed from the soil. Their number is increasing year by year.

Domination of agriculture by centralized corporate power appeals to many of them as an easy way out of the farm problem. And it appeals even more strongly to those who simply do not care what happens to farm people.

Rather than stumble and drift along blindly because of a vacuum of sound farm policy leadership from the present Administration, farm people and city people alike need to do some soul searching, and to make some honest appraisal of what we really want -- and the alternatives we face.

Perhaps I can be helpful in that direction today, by outlining to you my own guidelines for the development of a new and better farm program.

We need an agricultural stabilization program far less costly to the American taxpayers than the present inexcusable mess -- yet one that is far more effective in its protection of family farmers and their contribution to the American economy.

We need an agricultural stabilization program that permits agriculture to keep pace with the rest of our expanding economy in terms of income, yet one that does not make the farmer dependent on the government for that income.

We need a program that recognizes the need for farmers to help themselves through cooperative action for bargaining power and for whatever production adjustments may be necessary to make the best use of our human, soil, and water resources.

We need a program tailored to the vast technological changes, yet one that does not sacrifice the human and social values of our traditional American pattern of family owner-operated farms.

We need a program that recognizes the farmer's stewardship responsibility for conserving productivity of our land for the sake of future generations, yet recognizes too that the entire nation shares that same responsibility.

We need a program that really does something about surpluses -- making use of what we have, and adjusting production to keep from building up more beyond the level of possible need.

Above all, we need a national food policy closely meshed with our farm policy, so that we can better gear our productive resources to the needs of humanity at home and abroad -- instead of producing for government storage bins.

With these guide-lines in mind, I took a step that could lead to such a program by introducing the Family Farm Program Development Act last month.

This proposed legislation requires that as a first step toward accomplishing a truly effective farm program, a determination of the real need for farm products -- overseas as well as at home -- should be made. How much food is needed by the developing countries of the world? What kinds? How much of the need can be supplied by our country through normal channels of trade? How much of the need should be supplied by other means -- by donation in case of famine or disaster, or by grant or loan to friendly governments struggling with grave economic problems as their people seek a better way of life?

How much food do we really need here at home? How much is required for uses other than those supplied by the market -- for our school children, for the needy, the unemployed, the handicapped, the aged, the dependent children?

Only when we have determined the true needs for food and fiber, will we be in a position to make long-range plans for land use, for broader soil and water conservation programs, for an intelligent program of production adjustments that will serve our total interests.

The Family Farm Program Development Act requires that such long range plans be made.

This proposal calls upon farmers directly for the first time to work with the Secretary of Agriculture in formulating a program adapted to the unique needs of each commodity. Whenever a commodity is in price trouble due to surplus supply, the Secretary will meet with elected farmer-committees to work out a stabilization program. The resulting program will then be presented to all of the producers of that commodity in a referendum. If the growers vote yes, if they say they want this program, then and only then will it come to Congress. If Congress finds that the program is in the public interest -- that it is fair to farmers and to consumer alike -- then it will become law without further action. The Congress will have 60 days in which to make up its mind, and if the proposal is not disapproved by resolution, the law goes into effect.

For the guidance of the Secretary and individual commodity groups, the bill establishes a new fair price standard geared to current economic conditions, not frozen to periods of the past. A fair price is defined as that price which will yield returns on capital and labor, on representative family farms, comparable to nonfarm earnings, based on facts and figures collected by the Department of Agriculture.

This proposal is a blueprint for both immediate and long-term constructive action.

Far from regimentation, such a program offers the real freedom farmers need -- freedom from poverty, freedom from economic domination, and freedom of choice as to the alternatives they prefer in seeking to avoid the hardship of the wildly fluctuating free markets over which they now have no control.

And the very heart of this proposal is soil and water conservation in the interests of both the present and the future, an insurance program for the well-being of our grandchildren and their grandchildren.

It is my sincere hope that everyone here will think about the guide-lines and proposals I have outlined here.

If we put our heads and our hands together, there are no problems too difficult to solve.

Roy Johnsons Chron

001630 Sept. 19, 1959

Barney Allen  
Gen. Allen  
Gov. Zimmerman  
St. Gov. Robinson

Oscar T. Bretonson <sup>tam</sup>

mk

Western  
Min

I am delighted to be with you here today at Terraceville.

I value this opportunity to be ~~with you~~ with my good friends

in Minnesota who are giving of their time and ~~in~~ energy to

help make a dream come true -- a dream of green <sup>productive</sup> fertile fields, of

and clean lakes and ponds abounding with fish, /of forest lands ~~protected~~

providing a refuge for game and bird-life and pleasure for <sup>wholesome</sup> ~~all~~ of us.

I want to pay a well-merited tribute to the Minnesota Soil

Conservation District Association for <sup>its</sup> ~~the~~ sponsorship of this

annual conservation field day and plowing match. This is becoming

more than a state field day; it is approaching the status of a

national institution.

Let me ~~It is fitting that I~~ review some of the accomplishments of

the Minnesota Soil Conservation Districts -- not because you ~~are~~ are

unfamiliar with them, but because you are making a record which is a

matter of pride to me personally as a resident <sup>of</sup> ~~of~~ this state. ~~(S)~~

~~Good to be proud of your home state and your home folks, as I am.~~

001631

Originally, the objective of soil conservation was to <sup>sole</sup> eliminate ~~vanquish~~ the threat of erosion to our lands. Now that objective has broadened to the concept of using each acre of agricultural land within its capability and treating it in accordance with its needs for protection and improvement.

The organization of soil conservation districts is continuing to <sup>grow</sup> ~~grow~~ here in Minnesota. We now have 81 soil conservation districts, an increase of 21 during the past six years. They cover 77 percent of the land in the State. More than 40,000 Minnesota farmers are district cooperators.

*and now a word of thanks*  
~~I take this occasion to pay tribute~~ to the soil conservation district supervisors who are responsible for these programs. ~~They are~~

~~right~~ you are the men who are on the front lines in the fight against soil erosion, drought, land damage, and floods. You serve your community

without pay. You represent the finest tradition of self-government *and self sacrifice.*  
*and now a word of thanks*  
~~I wish to pay tribute, too,~~ to the farmers who are practicing

conservation on their land. More than 225,000 acres of Minnesota farm

land <sup>are</sup> ~~is~~ being farmed on the contour. Nearly 700,000 acres ~~is~~ <sup>are</sup> strip cropped. Nearly 6,000 farm ponds have been built. Nearly 400,000 acres of pastures have been improved. About 1,500 miles of terraces have been built. Trees have been planted on more than 50,000 acres.

Nearly 100,000 acres have been improved for wildlife. *- what a record of achievement!*

~~The latest report on progress made by the Minnesota State Soil Conservation Committee tells the Minnesota conservation story~~

~~One of the striking impressions I received from this report~~  
~~is the high~~ <sup>Teamwork</sup> ~~of~~ cooperation among farmers, town folks, and

the various state and federal agencies in advancing your soil conservation district programs. ~~and teamwork~~ is getting results.

You are making effective use of the conservation tools supplied to you by the Federal government. I have reference to the technicians of the Soil Conservation Service, to cost-sharing through the Agricultural Conservation Program, to the educational work of the Extension Service, to the small upstream watershed projects, and to the many other conservation tools which are offered.

One significant development here in Minnesota has been the increasing support of the State Government to your soil conservation district programs under the leadership of Governor Orville Freeman and our State Legislature.

State

In 1955 the State Legislature ~~made a provision for~~ <sup>appropriated</sup> \$100,000 per year to speed up conservation planning in soil conservation districts. Since 1955 the State Legislature has continued and increased ~~this support~~. We should be proud of the fact that Minnesota ranks fifth high in the nation in state appropriations for soil conservation districts.

~~I think we owe a round of applause to Governor Freeman and the State Legislature.~~

And while we are at it I think we should have a round of applause for your soil conservation district leaders. I refer to such dedicated men as Milton Maxwell, Cy Crawford, Bill Bennett, Alf Larson, and a host of others.

~~Yes, we have made remarkable and praise-worthy progress in soil and water conservation, both in Minnesota and the nation, but in spite of advances we have not yet progressed to the point of adequate~~

But with all of our <sup>5</sup> progress in the

control of soil erosion and water waste

001634  
Actually only a third of the nation's agricultural land  
adequately  
today is safeguarded.

~~The nation continues to contend with heavy  
erosion damage. Soil washing or blowing makes further crop production~~

~~impractical on badly eroding land under present conditions. The~~

~~rate of 100,000 acres annually.~~ Productiveness of some 120 million

acres is being seriously endangered.

Nearly one-fourth of ~~the people~~ <sup>our population</sup> now faces  
and, yet,  
problems of water shortage, poor water, or both. The rate of water

use predicted for 1975 is twice what it was in 1955.

It is apparent that we can not rest on our laurels in  
conservation work. Instead, we must intensify our efforts to achieve  
better management and use of the nation's <sup>land and</sup> water supply.

Soil and water conservation are essential to the building  
of the nation's reserve agricultural productive capacity to meet both  
anticipated and unforeseen future needs.

Soil and water conservation are as important ingredients of  
modern farming as improved machinery, hybrid seeds, ~~and~~ poultry, ~~and~~

001635

Soil + water conservation  
are essential to  
national security

hogs, adapted fertilizers, and skilled management.

and Soil and water conservation are vital to the efficiency of

American agriculture. <sup>But;</sup> Unfortunately, farmers themselves have not

profited income-wise from this high efficiency. You do not need me to

describe for you the farm income decline in recent years. Nor do I

need to remind you of the relentless attack on farm programs.

and the concept of a national farm program.

~~concept of a national farm program has been made the whipping boy of~~

~~the national periodical, press and commentators.~~

This brings me to the subject of major farm policy.

In these past several years -- in fact, since a day in <sup>September</sup> 1952

when an audience much like this, on an occasion similar to this, ~~thought~~

~~they~~ heard a promise of better times for farmers from an illustrious

speaker -- <sup>our</sup> ~~since that day~~ farmers have seen some amazing changes in

federal farm policy, <sup>and</sup> ~~and also~~, I am afraid, they have seen a growing

misunderstanding between city people and farm people, even between farmers

<sup>+ farm organizations.</sup>

themselves as prices of various commodities fell out of balance. <sup>Yes, our</sup>

farmers have seen ~~and~~ their prices fall, as other prices went up.

001636

The public has been led to believe that farmers receive  
 "enormous subsidies as annual gifts from the federal taxpayer. This  
 kind of mis-statement is making it more and more difficult to get any  
*desirable effective*  
~~improving~~ farm legislation passed by Congress.

What is the basis for this widely believed fallacy?

It comes from the annual budget appropriation for agriculture  
 and agricultural resources. For *this year* ~~fiscal 1960~~, agriculture was the third  
 largest item in the budget, coming after defense and interest on the  
national debt. It approximates \$6 billion.

But much of this budget does not go to the farmer at all.

Part of this \$6 billion goes for loans which will be paid *with interest*

For example, a half billion dollars goes into funds to be loaned by  
 the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farmers Home Administration.

The repayment history on these loans is excellent.

Some money goes for research. Some goes for service that  
 benefits consumers far more than farmers, for example, the school lunch  
and school milk programs which are actually investments in the health

of our children -- America's future.

Expenditures for the forest service, meat inspection service, the soil conservation program, and many other ~~and~~ services benefit the

whole nation, they are protection for consumers. <sup>Citizens,</sup> ~~This money is not~~ <sup>not subsidies</sup>

<sup>for Farmers.</sup> ~~for farmers~~ ~~and not subsidies.~~

and ~~not~~ <sup>programs</sup> all expenditures for price support can be considered

<sup>the</sup> farm subsidies. Commodity Credit Corporation recovers around 65 to 70%

of the investment when commodities are sold. <sup>and</sup> When surplus commodities

are donated to the needy on welfare lists and to the unemployed, and

to the victims of disaster, the expenditures are clearly in the national

interest.

<sup>Shanto</sup> Government-owned commodities sold over-seas for soft currencies make a tremendous contribution toward building for peace.

If we could bring into reality a true food-for-peace program, as I and a large number of my Senate colleagues have urged, the rewards would be ~~great~~ <sup>great</sup> ~~and~~ Certainly such use of food should not

be charged up as a hand-out to farmers. — yet it is, in the

public press & public mind!

001838

Farm price support programs <sup>do</sup> cost too much. Farmers agree

with consumers on this point.

But farmers know <sup>all</sup> too well that the programs have been mismanaged

misguided, and misused.

huge stocks of

Farmers know, too, that ~~the existence of~~ these surplus govern-  
ment-owned ~~or~~ agricultural products <sup>reveal</sup> something more than mismanage-

ment. They reveal the immensity of our national agricultural productive

capacity. They reveal the size and complexity of the problems faced

by farmers.

We now realize that before we in Congress can enact any  
effective new farm legislation, we need to make clear ~~our~~ our purposes  
and objectives.

All legislative history behind the development of <sup>our</sup> farm programs  
confirms that our objective and purpose has been to assure the American  
people of a continued abundance of food and fiber; to offer America's  
farmers an opportunity to achieve economic equality with other segments  
of our economy; and to preserve and protect America's traditional pattern

of family-owned, family-operated farms as the type of agriculture best adapted to our democratic way of life.

In more recent years, a new objective has been added ~~---~~  
 the use of our agricultural abundance as a useful and effective  
 humanitarian arm of better international relations. *Amn - For Policy!*

Repeatedly, the Congress of the United States has ~~stated~~ *Stated*  
 its ~~intent~~ *determination* to uphold these objectives, ~~in one way or another.~~

*today*  
 But these objectives are being challenged. We have heard  
 our ~~blessings~~ of abundance criticized as a curse.

Now, for the first time in the history of our nation, a cancer  
 of doubt has arisen in the public consciousness as to the merit of  
 our family farming system -- the most efficient agricultural production  
 system in the world. *(ask m k)*

The swift rise of vertical integration provides the mechanism  
 whereby big ~~concentrated~~ business and financial interests can extend  
 their domination over agriculture.

*Oh yes, corporation farming* 11

001840

~~The~~ will leave the farm family on the farm. But it will  
take away its economic independence. The farmer will be told what

to grow and where to sell, and the absentee-corporation farm director  
will control what the farmer gets for his efforts.

↳ This ominous forecast for American agriculture holds a  
powerful, fascinating <sup>attraction</sup> ~~allure~~ for all too many people in our country  
today.

↳ Its <sup>attraction</sup> ~~allure~~ has been heightened ~~by~~ by the discouraging,  
demoralizing shambles that the ~~Republican~~ Administration has made of  
our farm programs.

↳ There are millions and millions of citizens in our population  
who are far removed from the soil. Their number is increasing year by  
year.

↳ Domination of agriculture by centralized corporate power  
appeals to many of them as an easy way out of the farm problem. And  
it appeals even more strongly to those who simply do not ~~care what~~ <sup>understand</sup>

the problems that confront our farmers.

Rather than ~~stumble and drift~~ along blindly because of a vacuum of sound farm policy leadership from the present Administration, farm people and city people alike need to do some soul searching, and to make some honest appraisal of what we really want -- and the alternatives we face.

Perhaps I can be helpful in that direction today, by outlining to you my own guidelines for the development of a new and better farm program.

We need an agricultural stabilization program far less costly to the American taxpayers than the present inexcusable mess -- yet one that is far more effective in its <sup>contribution to</sup> ~~production of~~ family farmers and their contribution to the American economy.

We need an agricultural stabilization program that permits agriculture to keep pace with the rest of our expanding economy in terms of income, yet one that does not make the farmer dependent on the government for that income - *or the hired man*

*of corporate and financial absentee-ownership.*

001642

L We need a program that recognizes the need for farmers to help themselves through cooperative action for bargaining power and for whatever production adjustments may be necessary to make the best use of our human, soil, and water resources. ~~B~~

L We need a program tailored to the vast technological changes yet one that does not sacrifice the human and social values of our traditional American pattern of ~~family~~ family owner-operated farms.

L We need a program that recognizes the farmer's stewardship responsibility for conserving <sup>the</sup> productivity of our land for the sake of future generations, yet recognizes too that the entire nation shares in that same responsibility. — *Conservation is everyone's business.*

L We need a program that really does something about surpluses -- making use of what we have, and adjusting production to keep from ~~building~~

*adding* more beyond the level of possible need.

L Above all, we need a national food <sup>and fiber</sup> policy, ~~which meshes~~ with ~~our farm~~ policy, (so that we can better gear our productive resources to the needs of humanity at home and abroad -- instead of producing

for government storage bins.

With these guide-lines in mind, ~~and a very long~~ <sup>after many months</sup>  
~~of study and consultation~~ <sup>introduced</sup>  
~~lead to such a program by introducing~~ the Family Farm Program Development

Act last month. ~~It is a fact that it~~ <sup>Hope you will study it!</sup>

This proposed legislation requires that as a first step toward accomplishing a truly effective farm program, a determination of the real need for farm products --- over-seas as well as at home -- should be ~~determined~~ <sup>made</sup>. How much food is needed by the developing countries of the world? What kinds? How much of ~~the~~ <sup>this</sup> need can be supplied by our country through normal channels of trade? How much of the need should by supplied by other means -- by donation in case of famine or disaster, or by grant or loan to friendly governments struggling with grave economic problems as their people seek a better way of life?

How much food do we really need here at Home? How much is required for uses other than those supplied by the market -- for our school children, for the needy, the unemployed, the handicapped, the aged, the dependent children?

~~Afterwards~~

and

Only when we have determined the true needs for food and fiber,

will we be in a position to make long-range plans for land use, for

broader soil and water conservation programs, for an intelligent program

of production adjustments that will serve our total interests.

The Family Farm Program Development Act requires that such long range plans be made.

This proposal calls upon farmers directly for the first time to work with the Secretary of Agriculture in formulating a program adapted to the unique needs of each commodity. Whenever a commodity is in price trouble due to surplus supply, the Secretary will meet with elected farmer-committees to work out a stabilization program. The resulting program will then be presented to all of the producers of that commodity in a referendum. If the growers vote yes, if they say they want this program, then and only then will it come to Congress. If Congress finds that the program is in the public interest -- that it is fair to farmers and to consumer alike -- then it will become law without

further action. The Congress will have 60 days in which to make up its mind, and if the proposal is not disapproved by resolution, the law goes into effect.

For the guidance of the Secretary and individual commodity groups, the bill establishes a new fair price standard geared to current economic conditions, not frozen to periods of the past. A fair price is defined as that price which will yield returns on capital and labor, on representative family farms, comparable to nonfarm earnings, based on facts and figures collected by the Department of Agriculture.

This proposal is a blueprint for both immediate and long-term constructive action.

Far from regimentation, such a program offers the real freedom farmers need -- freedom from poverty, freedom from economic domination, and freedom of choice as to the alternatives they prefer in seeking to avoid the hardship of the wildly fluctuating free markets over which they now have no control.

001646

And the very heart of this proposal is soil and water conservation  
 in the interests of both the present and the future, an insurance program  
 for the well-being of our grandchildren and their grandchildren.

~~It is my sincere hope that everyone here will think about~~  
~~the guidelines and proposals I have outlined here.~~

If we put our heads and our hands together, there are no problems  
 too difficult to solve. America needs a long-

term Food & Fiber policy as an  
important part of our National  
Security Program - Food for  
Freedom - Food for Peace -  
Food for progress - !!

Mr K has challenged us. - Let's Respond.  
disarm  
exchanges



# 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](http://www.mnhs.org)