

April 18, 1973

produce.

SENATOR KEYES: Yes, it basically is that, but you have to cut down in order to get it. You used to have to cut down 25% but now you getting to cut down 10% and get the same amount. So that they can increase production and you, definitely, are going to need this 30¢ a bushel this fall, if we have a surplus and a big crop like we are because corn will go down to...I can only get about 15¢ a bushel more than I could a year ago, so corn will go down.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, Senator Keyes, I am quarreling with the need for it. I am for everybody who needs welfare receiving it but I like us to use the proper terminology for what we are dealing with. Regardless of how you phrase it, people are being paid by the government for not working, for not producing, so when it goes up into the thousands of dollars for a landowner to get money for what he is not doing, for the work which he is not doing, for what he is not producing, then the word subsidy is used. When it comes to people who are hungry and don't have land to trade in, it's called welfare and it has a very bad name. Now, I am going to support this welfare payment for farmers but I want it understood that I am supporting it on that bases. I understand that this is a social welfare program for farmers that without additional assistance from the government in terms of money for work not done. In spite of all of the talk about the work ethic in this body, in spite of Senator Snyder saying poor people ought to go to work on jobs that don't exist, I am going to support the welfare bill for the farmers.

PRESIDENT: Any further discussion, now, of the Resolution? Senator Schmit, did you wish to be heard, again, on the Resolution here?

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I don't know how Senator Keyes was designated as being the respondent to Senator Chambers but I do appreciate his attempt to explain this program to Senator Chambers. I want to reiterate at this time that I do support the Resolution and I support it for the reasons not mentioned exactly by Senator Chambers. I commend him for his support for those programs which are beneficial to agriculture but I want to point out what Senator Keyes has said here that it is the definite aim of the program is to hold down the prices of agricultural products so that the consumer has the benefit of low cost foods and I can't emphasize that too strongly. It has been successful for thirty years in the past. We have seen it. It has worked effectively and it has worked to the detriment of agriculture and now we see the federal government coming to the front and attempting to exercise the same kind of control in the area of livestock, and so, therefore, I want to again emphasize my support of the Resolution. That I think that it is very important that we have knowledgeable people, such as made the trip to Washington last time, express our point of view and express our positive attitude on the part of agriculture. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Once again, is there any further discussion

(End of Belt #2)