FARM SPEECH

In this great Pee Dee section of South Carolina I want to talk with you about agriculture. We have made and are making great strides in bringing new industries to South Carolina. This is going to mean expanded markets for our farm products and a better balanced economy for the good of all. But we must keep in mind always that agriculture remains the backbone of our economy and only by profitable farming can we enjoy a prosperous South Carolina.

Before I outline to you the farm program and policies I will advocate as United States Senator, I want to discuss with you for a few minutes the record of my opponent in the United States Senate. He has been doing a lot of talking/trying to convince the farmers that he has properly represented them in the Senate but when I present to you his record today, you will realize that he has not been the farmer's friend.

One of the accomplishments he talks about/is getting cotton acreage restored for South Carolina farmers. Every farmer in this State knows/that if he had been on the job looking after the interests of South Carolina agriculture/he would not have permitted the legislation to pass cutting cotton acreage six million acres/without some provision protecting South Carolina growers.

After the law had been passed, the cotton growers of the South began to complain. My opponent knew he had a campaign coming up this summer and he was in a bad shape. Finally, a law was passed in 1950 correcting the injustices of the Act passed in 1949.

To hear my opponent talk/one would think he had saved South Carolina agriculture by helping pass a bill/amending an act of Congress which would never have had to be amended/if my
opponent had done in 1949 what he now claims to have done in 1950.

In other words, after he permitted the horse to be stolen, he proceeded to recover the horse, or at least a part of it.

This is the first time I have ever known a Senator asking farmers to support him because he has corrected injustices which if he had been on the job would have never occurred.

My opponent brags about getting peanut growers 2,000 additional acreage in peanuts, but he does not tell the farmers that an amendment was written into the law changing the basis of acreage allotments which says acreage for any grower cannot be any larger than he planted in 1947. In other words, if a farmer did not grow any peanuts in 1947, or was still in the army, he is left out. Who ever heard of basing an acreage allotment on a one-year planting.

My opponent did a lot of talking about the 1949 cottonseed price support program. If he had known anything about farming he would have known it was farce. It was rigged up to benefit western farmers because it had a moisture content clause which limited its benefits to cotton seed with less than 11 percent moisture. The farmers of South Carolina know that very little of our cottonseed is as low as 11 percent in moisture. My opponent claims he spearheaded the cotton seed program and told the farmers at Clemson last year that the program was going to save South Carolina farmers over six million dollars.

I wired our members of Congress and the Production Marketing Administration and told them the program was rigged against South Carolina farmers. Finally, in October the necessary adjustments were made but that was too late. Our farmers had already sold their seed for $40 a ton and now they are paying $75 a ton for meal and $25 a ton for hulls.
Here again my opponent was not on the job when the interests of South Carolina farmers were discriminated against in Washington.

My opponent comes from the greatest peach growing County in the world. Yet he has not turned his hand to help the peach growers of South Carolina, although they have had two disastrous years.

My opponent sat up and watched the government pour millions and millions of dollars into price support program for potatoes but he did nothing for the peach growers of South Carolina. A year ago I spoke in Greer and urged that crop insurance program be worked out for our peach growers against the hazards of weather. Had my opponent been on the job the peach growers of this State this year would have been protected in part at least from their failure this year.

I could go on citing other instances which prove that in Washington my opponent has been asleep at the switch in protecting the interests of South Carolina farmers but now he is going over South Carolina trying to fool them into believing that he is their friend.

When he talks about his friendship for the farmers why does he not tell them why he is the candidate of the CIO Political Action Committee in this race. He should tell them if he was concerned about the farmer when he went against practically every other Southern Senator, with the exception of Pepper of Florida, and voted against the Taft-Hartley law and to sustain the Truman veto.

Our farmers know what the CIO Political Action Committee and the National Association for Advancement of Colored
People are trying to do, break down our segregation laws and mix the races. The farmers of our State, who in many instances live out in isolated areas, know first hand our racial problems, and how necessary it is to prevent a mixing of the races in this State.

Our farmers will not forget that my opponent deserted the Democratic party of South Carolina in order to follow off after Truman, the CIO Political Action Committee, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and the other organizations which supported Truman.

One of the outstanding farm leaders in South Carolina wrote me the other week and said:

"I hope that when July 11 rolls around, that our farm folks will remember that Senator Johnston goes along with Mr. Truman, who is no friend of the South Carolina farmer."

That statement comes from a real South Carolina farm leader. But a different statement is coming from a so called farm paper which is published in Montgomery, Alabama, and is being circulated in this State to help my opponent.

I refer to the "Southern Farmer" and here it is with the junior South Carolina picture in it and a full page glorifying him.

Let me tell you about this sheet. It is run by a man named Aubrey Williams. He was with the late Harry Hopkins in WPA and belonged to that group of parlor reds who seek to move this nation into socialism. A few years ago he sold Marshall Field, who threw his millions around promoting newspapers that preached anti-segregation and Truman civil rights, that the way to put over their program was to develop a Southern farm paper dedicated to their left wing movement.
This "Southern Farmer" which is being circulated in this State was established for no other purpose than to promote anti-segregation doctrine among the negro farmers of our State and to fool our white farmers into supporting the Truman program and sending to Washington men who could be used by the left wingers.

If my opponent is looking for that kind of support, he can have it. I don't want it.

And here is the climax. I now hold before you another issue of the "Southern Farmer", which was circulated in Florida just as it is now being circulated in South Carolina. But that issue does not carry the picture of my opponent. It carries the picture of his voting companion, Claude Pepper, and here it is.

Well, the farmers and the white people of Florida took care of Claude Pepper in Florida and next July they are going to take care of Olin Johnston.

Now let me tell you about the things I stand for and how I will serve the farmers of South Carolina as their United States Senator after January 3.

First of all, let me remind you that I was born in agriculture on my father's farm, graduated from Clemson College, and taught agriculture in McCormick, Saluda, and Edgefield counties.

As a member of the State Senate, I studied farm problems and passed several bills for the benefit of agriculture in this state. In promoting our poultry program in the counties where I taught agriculture, I saw that our farmers were being taken advantage of in the marketing of their eggs. Inferior cold storage eggs were being shipped in here to compete with our fresh farm grown eggs. The cold storage eggs were not properly classified and I introduced and secured passage an egg classification bill which became the model for other states.
I have long realized that the farmer's greatest asset was his soil and every possible measure should be taken to conserve it. I introduced the bill creating soil conservation districts in South Carolina. I helped write and sponsored the bill setting up the first rural electrification authority in South Carolina.

During my administration as Governor, I have worked hard to promote a better agriculture in South Carolina. I have cooperated with Clemson College in promoting soil conservation, year-round pastures, and development of livestock programs to bolster farm income.

Here are some of our other accomplishments:

Initiated system of State Farm Markets to enable farmers to enjoy better markets for diversified production and a higher and better balanced income. The largest wholesale market near Columbia is now under construction and others will follow.

Provision made for an improved livestock sanitation program.

Foundation seed organization created to distribute higher grade seeds to farmers.

Study of fresh water resources inaugurated, looking toward adequate conservation and avoidance of water shortages such as now prevail in certain sections of the country.

Forest resources resurveyed and measures taken to protect and promote this valuable resource in South Carolina, including extension of forest fire control to state-wide basis, increasing planting of seedlings from 2 million to 35 million in 1946, and an expanded forest conservation educational program.
Promotion of rural electrification and paving of 4,100 miles of farm-to-market roads.

Now let me set forth my views and the policies I will follow on agriculture as a member of the United States Senate:

Since early in the nineteenth century, the federal government has recognized the importance of farm problems by enacting law after law dealing with agriculture. There is no question as to the right and the duty of the federal government to enact legislation to assure equality for our farming population.

The root of our farm problem dates back to the development of the protective tariff system under which our farmers were forced to buy in a protected market and sell in an unprotected market. It was to correct this disparity that the "parity concept of fair exchange value" implemented by support prices was worked out by the Congress.

There are those who follow the Truman line in South Carolina who would have the farmer believe that those who advocate states rights and oppose further centralization of power in Washington cannot consistently support a national farm program. This is just so much hog-wash.

No one in his right mind is opposed to the federal government performing those functions of government which are clearly within the jurisdiction of the central government. As one who since early manhood has advocated a liberal philosophy of government I shall as your United States Senator support and work to strengthen the programs which have been inaugurated for the benefit of those who labor, whether on the farm or in the factory, in the village or in the city.
The federal government has a duty and obligation to operate in fields involving such national problems as agriculture, developing the nation's resources, and other matters clearly within the powers granted to the federal government by the states. These functions of the federal government I shall support and work to make more effective for the good of the people.

The federal government, on the other hand, has no right, moral or constitutional, to come into South Carolina and take over the police powers of the state, control our elections, usurp the functions of our courts, and break down our segregation laws and govern affairs which are strictly internal. I shall as United States Senator/right to preserve these rights of the states for the good of the people.

Having made myself clear on what I consider the proper and improper functions of the federal government, I now want to state my views on agriculture.

I favor the continuation and further development of the federal farm program/carrying out the basic principles of the 1938 Agricultural Adjustment Act. Our permanent farm program must be built around soil conservation and water use/with price supports and adjustments to prevent market gluts. Our farmers must be assured of a stabilized income and in turn our farmers will cooperate in conserving their soil and adjusting production to consumer needs.

Insofar as possible, the farmers should operate their farm programs on a basis that would encourage needed adjustments on a voluntary basis. In order to make these adjustments, it is often necessary to have acreage allotments and marketing quotas or marketing agreements. The key to this situation rests with the farmers themselves and they must continue to have the right
and privilege to say for themselves how such programs shall operate. I shall do all in my power to stop the trend toward centralizing the power in Washington and to bring it back to the over 3,000 county committees, where it rested under the Roosevelt farm program. We must put an end to bureaucrats in Washington trying to dictate legislation rather than enforcing what the Congress enacts, and as Senator I propose to do just that.

The program of support prices for six basic crops -- cotton, tobacco, rice, wheat, corn and peanuts -- may be extended to other crops on a sound basis only when producers are willing to formulate and put into operation an adjustment program which will justify support prices without entailing large and unreasonable expenditures of public funds. The potato program is a fair example of failure to induce voluntary action by growers to make needed production adjustments. Our tobacco program is a fine example of a well-managed adjustment program voted by our growers themselves.

Within the framework of these principles we can perfect a sound and workable farm program and I shall strive to attain that end.

I shall support the continued development of our rural electrification program until every farm home is lighted, and I shall work to extend badly needed telephone service to our rural areas.

I shall work to develop a sound crop insurance program to cover all basic crops, including our peach crop, to protect our farmers against the hazards of weather and insects or diseases.
In conclusion I want to make it clear that as a State's Rights Democrat I shall oppose the ever-growing trend toward socialism through complete government domination and regimentation. For this reason I shall oppose with all my power the Brannan farm plan because it is just that and nothing more or less.

The basic principle the Brannan plan embodies is a federal subsidy to farmers to bring their income up to what is called a "fair income standard." Farmers want a fair price in the market place and we must never permit our American agriculture to become dependent on federal subsidy controlled by bureaucrats in Washington. I have shown in expressing my views on a federal subsidy for public schools that the Supreme Court has held that what the federal government subsidizes has the right to control. I shall never favor any plan which destroys the fundamental freedom of the American farmer and places him under the domination of a bureaucrat in Washington.