

## Control Is Needed

THOSE LETTERS IN your March 1 issue are interesting and somewhat amusing, too, as regards our wheat allotment program and so-called controls.

First, the gentleman from over in McCone county seems to have forgotten something in drawing attention to that "slip of the law" in 1953 when we were permitted to "slap in" all our acres into wheat without penalty.

It did have a penalty for a lot of us who had been "trained" into following the principle of self-control, both for ourselves and our neighbors—we were patriotic. But the "wise birds" or free enterprisers jumped in, cashed in on those control-induced prices of that time, and, on top of the deal, vastly increased their wheat "history". At

the expense and disadvantage of their neighbors, they made a real cleanup that lasted for years after.

Secondly, that man figures that his area "lost" over \$15,000,000 in 1955 when the government "slapped" on the controls again. That looks just "terrible" for government controls. But we may ask, "who guaranteed those prices he quoted? Was it free enterprise? And, if we look a little closer, what did they make in that year of "freedom", of full production? I am not sure that those figures would show up so favorable.

So the government just had to take charge again. However poorly the program has worked ever since, it stopped one of the most disastrous depressions since the 30's.

The writer from Carter county puts up the scare of "government wheat

dumping" to force a favorable vote on the wheat referendum. This would, of course, wreck the whole farm program, as well as the economic situation of all the rest of our business world.

This would never be put into action by our government. Too much is dependent on our economy to risk such drastic measures to "force the farmers into line". It would not only threaten our country's basic industry but would "kick" others out of balance, if not cause international repercussions.

"Crop controls are against Nature" is advanced by a Sanders county writer. He intimates that it is un-Christian as well as against Ex-Post Facto law of the Constitution. That, of course, is getting rather deeply involved in law and theology and a multitude of other ramifications which would take more space to fill than Montana Farmer-Stockman

is willing to appropriate for this angle of the subject.

Government control is needed, in agriculture as well as so many other activities of our citizens. The intent of the laws is so often misconstrued. The human element is always to be reckoned with, and it is so often quite frail. But, we can't let things go "hog-wild".—Edgar I. Syverud, Sheridan county.

## Dictatorial Powers

I READ WITH considerable interest the wheat and feed grain program in your February 15 issue.

I have been in favor of bushel allotment for wheat for several years and, at least in the case of smaller operators, doing away with acreage controls, so that we could store wheat on the farm and have a reserve to fall back on, against the year or years when it is very dry and we have a crop failure such as 1961 was.

I certainly am not in favor of the program as a whole as it is set up by the secretary of agriculture, virtually giving him dictatorial powers over farmers of America.

Perhaps the secretary should have some leeway or freedom in declaring how much domestic wheat to raise, export wheat, feed wheat, etc. That is all I would be willing to concede him, except his authority to enforce the law.

On page 8, your editorial states that wheat could be stored to match up with certificates issued in the future. After reading the article or program four times, I fail to see how this could be accomplished, at least here in Garfield county where 15 bushels per acre or more is considered a bumper crop and only happens about once in ten years.

Those tight acreage controls listed in the program don't suggest to me that very many farmers would have much chance of storing wheat against the year of a crop failure.

On page 7 the article states: "Mr. Kennedy feels it's time for farmers who want price support to fish or cut bait," with nothing being said about the fact that during the elections we (the farmers) had no vote on acreage control, just price control. How could a farmer with a low wheat acreage vote himself out of price support without getting more acres?—Forrest Ferris, Garfield County.

## Must Have Controls

I BELIEVE WE have to have controls.

If a farmer were sick he would go to a doctor and the doctor would diagnose his case before giving medicine. But what made the farmer good and sick is the fact that we lost 18,000,000 head of work horses and took tractors and machinery for a substitute. We accepted refrigeration, which saves millions of dollars in food. Also the United States and every state in the Union have put out millions of dollars for wildlife in competition with our domestic animals. All this added up feeds millions of people and some to spare.

So I am a firm believer we have to have farm programs, with controls with teeth in them, with pounds and bushels instead of acreage control, with the farmer storing his own stuff and getting his loans through his local banks, with a government support of a full 100 per cent of parity.

I have been farming and ranching 50 years in Montana. — C. C. Wilson.



## More PROFIT from Elephant Brand Means Better Living

When you farm more efficiently, you operate more profitably and live more comfortably. With good management your land can provide a higher standard of living. Good management includes using Elephant Brand fertilizer. Extra profits from Elephant Brand can buy extra equipment to make your work easier and more efficient—a new truck or tractor, for instance.

With extra profits from Elephant Brand there is no need to make do with old equipment. Hundreds of farmers are enjoying the trouble-free operation of a new tractor thanks to extra profits from Elephant Brand. Everyone has a list of "things he'd like to have"—a new car—home improvements—a college education for his children. Elephant Brand offers a practical way to get them.

IT PAYS TO CHOOSE FROM THE ELEPHANT BRAND LINE

NITRAPRILLS (33.5-0-0)		16-20-0	11-48-0	AMMONIUM SULPHATE (21-0-0)	
13-39-0	16-48-0	23-23-0	24-20-0	27-14-0	
8-32-16	10-30-10	13-13-13	14-14-7	UREA (45-0-0)	

# Elephant Brand

water soluble **FERTILIZERS**

GET MORE FROM YOUR LAND WITH ELEPHANT BRAND

COMINCO PRODUCTS, INC., SPOKANE, WASHINGTON.  
EXCLUSIVE U.S. SALES AGENTS FOR ELEPHANT BRAND FERTILIZERS: BALFOUR, GUTHRIE & CO. LIMITED  
SAN FRANCISCO — LOS ANGELES — SEATTLE — PORTLAND — SPOKANE — MINNEAPOLIS

1413

