Legislature Goes into Last Month of Work

Price Support Decision Near in Congress

It is probable that Bill HR-12 & a long bill that will pay parity gap supports for farmers will be up for consideration by both Houses of Congress the week of May 13. Currently, in the House of Representatives the measure is being held in committee by Rep. Don Hayworth (D) of the Agricultural Committees of Congress. Mr. Hayworth is expected to introduce the bill for a vote in the House with the hope that it will be considered in the Senate.

Several Farm Bills Await Final Vote

If you are Interested in Bill Now Pending, This is the Time to Make Your Views Known at Lansing

Legislative Council of Michigan Farm Bureau

Time is running out in the Michigan legislature. The Senate and Representatives may vote on any bills that have been introduced and that are still pending. A bill that has been introduced but not passed by both the Senate and the House of Representatives will die unless it is reintroduced in the following session.

Visits Farms in New Zealand

Mo. G. Barrett, president of the Leccey County Farm Bureau, was one of 28 Michigan farmers who spent nearly a month in New Zealand, and a few days in Australia the end of this year.

The Federated Farmers of New Zealand invited a delegation from the American Farm Bureau to visit them and study agricultural problems as they have been working to develop the New Zealand farm program. The New Zealand farmers and agricultural organizations and schools went out to show their people that they have a good thing going. Farmers were interested in new developments in things in the United States. They had their long distances to go, and to call upon friends who were entertaining a visit to the Old Country.

Agriculture is the main industry of New Zealand. The leading industries include sheep, cattle, and dairy products. The country has a fine culture of sheep and wool, which is a leading export. The farmers are very friendly and kind, and the farmers' organizations and schools went out to show their people that they have a good thing going. Farmers were interested in the new developments in things in the United States. They had their long distances to go, and to call upon friends who were entertaining a visit to the Old Country.

The Federated Farmers of New Zealand invited a delegation from the American Farm Bureau to visit them and study agricultural problems as they have been working to develop the New Zealand farm program. The New Zealand farmers and agricultural organizations and schools went out to show their people that they have a good thing going. Farmers were interested in new developments in things in the United States. They had their long distances to go, and to call upon friends who were entertaining a visit to the Old Country.

The very rapidity with which stocks have been built up in the past 21 days, and the way construction funds, the budget, and the federal government are always interested in the building of 24 ships liquidated far special farm support programs.

"Most important new is prompt enactment of HR-12. This is a bill of great importance in writing to your Congressman or Senator in your State. It is important that the bill be carried to the floor of both Houses of the Michigan State Senate and House of Representatives. The bill was introduced by Rep. Don Hayworth (D) of the Agricultural Committees of Congress in the House, and it is expected that the bill will be considered in the Senate.

The bill is designed to give the farmer and the U.S. Department of Agriculture the opportunity to work out an equitable solution of the parity gap problem. The bill is expected to be passed by both Houses of Congress and presented to the Governor for signing. If the Governor signs the bill, it will become law immediately. The bill will provide for a vote on the bill, which is expected to be carried to the floor of both Houses of the Michigan State Senate and House of Representatives. The bill was introduced by Rep. Don Hayworth (D) of the Agricultural Committees of Congress in the House, and it is expected that the bill will be considered in the Senate.
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The bill is designed to give the farmer and the U.S. Department of Agriculture the opportunity to work out an equitable solution of the parity gap problem. The bill is expected to be passed by both Houses of Congress and presented to the Governor for signing. If the Governor signs the bill, it will become law immediately. The bill will provide for a vote on the bill, which is expected to be carried to the floor of both Houses of the Michigan State Senate and House of Representatives. The bill was introduced by Rep. Don Hayworth (D) of the Agricultural Committees of Congress in the House, and it is expected that the bill will be considered in the Senate.
Punctuality
The people who are late
And I am not among them.
We all have our characteristics:
Including our good neighbor, Chase.
Some have a tendency to be a bit
And others, quite the opposite.
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The High-Analysis Fertilizer Program

DONALD D. KIRBY
Coordinator of Education and Research for MFB

The early days in which our Farm Bureau House was formulated were different from those of the farmers. The agricul tural depression of the 1920's was developing. Farm prices were dropping.

Farmers had need of increasing their productions and of finding all means of reducing costs. Commercial fer tilizers were beginning to find extended use, but they were relatively high in price. It was a problem that the Farm Bureau could go to work to solve.

In the early 1920's, the Farm Bureau Purchasing Department, which bought all the fertilizers from the manuf acturing sources outside the state, the Farm Bureau dropped the prices to the farmer. Acid phosphat e was costing the farmer $3.25 a ton was put on the market by Farm Bureau at $2.40. The average reduction for mixed fertilizers ran from $3.00 to $5.00 a ton.

Competing companies started a price war, but the net result was cheaper fertilizers to the farmer.

One of the problems that helped to keep the farmer's fertilizer units high was the low price on oil in the mines. There was too much sand or other ballast in the bags. Farmers paid for bagging this material and for freight. These changes were not great. The viewpoint on this problem crystallized in 1947, when the Michigan Farm Bureau passed a resolution saying:

"In order to make first-class fertilizers and to reduce prices, it is necessary to cut out any unnecessary charges if the farmer is to get what he needs for his crops." The problem was a vexing one, and manuf acturers were unable to ignore it. A fair comparison appears on the surface. It means that the savings will show the approximate analysis low and profits high.

The Farm Bureau average for that year of 630,000 tons as a base of the Farm Bureau average for the state was 23%. The pace set by the Farm Bureau was 29.5%. Compare it with the 1951-52 Farm Bureau average run at about an overhead, sales and transportation, whether consisting of high or low cost, the manufacturer is able to adopt a policy of producing only high analysis containing a minimum of 30 plant food units per ton. We further urge the Farm Bureau Services division to make high analysis fertilizers with the same plant food requirements.

This picture seems more than adequate to reason. It was never a question of lowering sales to Michigan farmers, but it was a question of lowering prices, and this is a point that other companies did not understand. In 1929, the high-analysis policy was adopted by the Farm Bureau, with the result that by 1933, the average price per ton of analyzed material had dropped from $6.00 to $3.25, a saving of $2.75 per ton. The prices for Farm Bureau raised the goal from $3.25 to $3.30 per ton.

The following table reveals the rapid change in the fertilizer prices produced in the operating years of the Saginaw fertilizer factory, in 1948.

Average percentage of plant food, 1948-51

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage of Plant Food</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SWEEP-PLANTS  
Sweet Pea Mixture  
Alaska  
California  
Dixie  
Peach  
Pepsi  
Red  
Sage  
Sunlight  
Westminster  

tailored for the body, and may become very harmful. hands should be washed immediately with soap whenever they have ---

---

President Edward Hallow of the American Association of Congregational Churches, will speak at the meeting following the luncheon in District 7. Miss Nakatani will discuss the relationship between life and architecture and some of flower arrangement. Everyone will enjoy some interesting visit. She is a student at Mus-teran Kottke of the extension service and will speak on a subject of music and watch these days. He invited Miss Nakatani to come to the country and present her work and pictures at the next Farm Bureau Women's camp. Preliminary plans were dis----------

---

The Rev. Gerald Brown, pastor of the Bowling Green Congregational Church, will speak on "The American Christian View of Justice." Senator Edward Hallow of the American Association of Congregational Churches, will speak at the meeting following the luncheon in District 7. Miss Nakatani will discuss the relationship between life and architecture and some of flower arrangement. Everyone will enjoy some interesting visit. She is a student at Mus-teran Kottke of the extension service and will speak on a subject of music and watch these days. He invited Miss Nakatani to come to the country and present her work and pictures at the next Farm Bureau Women's camp. Preliminary plans were dis----------

---

Joseph county with Miss Vi- linda Holman, county Farm

---

Amendments process began a tour which was made with Mrs. Almy, secretary, and members of the committee. Mrs. Marjorie Karker was given to the Saginaw county Women's Committee in February. The meeting was held in the Crystal Lake room of the Saginaw Hotel. Miss Nakatani was introduced by Mrs. Almy, the current president of the committee. She is a student at Mus-teran Kottke of the extension service and will speak on a subject of music and watch these days. He invited Miss Nakatani to come to the country and present her work and pictures at the next Farm Bureau Women's camp. Preliminary plans were dis----------

---

Women of Dist. 1 Hear About Japan  
MRS. DONALD FRIEDL  
Miss Tsuru Nakatani, of Tokyo, Japan, was the guest of Farm Bureau Women of St. Joseph county at their meeting. She is a student at Mus-teran Kottke of the extension service and will speak on a subject of music and watch these days. He invited Miss Nakatani to come to the country and present her work and pictures at the next Farm Bureau Women's camp. Preliminary plans were dis----------

---

Add New Baby to Blue Cross Roll  
First, be sure you add a new-- name to your family. The Blue Cross plan is one of the best ways to help you keep your family healthy. During the next few months of 30 days of birth. Begin what you are doing now because if you fail to add the child within 60 days of life, you may not add him to your family health plan. Your employer or group agency will be able to help you get this done. If you are not a member of a group plan, write to your local Blue Cross director immediately.

---

State Mutual INSURANCE COMPANY  
720 Church Street, Suite 1, Madison 1, Wisconsin  
Enrollment 4 1, 1958  
1 POLICY THIS COMPANY IS PREMIUM  
SUNDRIES  
First, be sure you add a new-- name to your family. The Blue Cross plan is one of the best ways to help you keep your family healthy. During the next few months of 30 days of birth. Begin what you are doing now because if you fail to add the child within 60 days of life, you may not add him to your family health plan. Your employer or group agency will be able to help you get this done. If you are not a member of a group plan, write to your local Blue Cross director immediately.
Like a Farmers’ Tour to Europe?

SEVENTY-ONE IOWA FARMERS see the globe as a place to be explored and exploited. They were members of the Iowa Farmers’ Tours to Europe conducted last September by the American Farm Bureau. Ralph Anderson, tour leader, and everyone else left in pleasant anticipation and the general apprehension of the tour. Another Iowa Farmers’ tour is being considered for this fall, probably to South America.

Farmers’ Tours to Europe

Nearly 65,000 FB Members

Herbert Hall has introduced a provision to be added to the state’s 1966 budget proposal that would eliminate the tax on income from farm property. Mr. Hall said, “We hope this will contribute to a greater mutual understanding between the farm community and the rest of society.”

The article “Let’s Take a Trip to Europe” is written by Jack Warrington of the American Farm Bureau. It is a preview of four farmers from Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Washington, who will travel overseas and return will be published in the next issue of the Farm Bureau’s magazine, The Nation. They will travel to the major cities in Europe and to some of the smaller towns as well.

11 Nations To be Visited In 35 Days

“Let’s Take a Trip to Europe” by Jack Warrington, The Nation

The 35-day tour will visit Belgium, Holland, Germany, Switzerland, Austria, France, Italy, and Portugal. The tour leaders will be an Iowa Farm Bureau from each state.

The trip will include visits to the Parisian opera, the Louvre, the Eiffel Tower, the Big Ben, and the Tower of London. The tour will also include visits to the English Channel, and the city of London from Cologno to Frankfurt.

No More “Silage Stink”!

Over 65,000 CLAIMS ADJUSTED AND PAID IN PAST 5 Years


$3,548,991.98

Staying with the theme of travel, this article discusses the benefits of travel to European countries. 

Michigan Certified MICHELETT BEANS

Grand Champion at Chicago International

Clarence Davis, R. Tr. 2, Merrill, Michigan, whose Michigan Certified Michele Beans sample with the Grand Champion at Chicago International, is recommended by the Michigan Certified Seed Committee.

MICHIGAN CROP IMPROVEMENT

MICHIGAN MUTUAL WINDSTORM INSURANCE CO. HASTINGS

BARLEY • CORN • FIELD BEANS FORAGE SEEDS • OATS • BEAN POTATOES • WHEAT • SOYBEANS

Delta Has Upper Peninsula’s 1st Farm Bureau Committee

This is the Delta County Farm Bureau Committee in Michigan, which was the first to be formed in the Upper Peninsula. The committee was organized on April 25, 1955, and has been meeting regularly ever since.

The committee has been involved in various activities, such as sponsoring a dairy show, promoting the Michigan Maple Sugar Festival, and participating in local community events.

Michigan Certified STA-FRESH

The Michigan Certified STA-FRESH is a silage treatment product that is used to eliminate the “silage stink” in stored crops. It is available for purchase from local dealers and is known for its effectiveness in improving the quality of silage.

AVAILABILITY FROM DEALERS IN FARM SUPPLIES
We Have a New Look in the ASC Program

Community Farm Bureau Discussion Topic for May

Background Material for Program in May by 1400 Community Farm Bureau Discussion Groups

DONALD D. KIRBY
Coordinator of Education and Research for NFMin

When new styles and fashions are introduced, the public expects to have a chance to participate in the ideas and imagination of certain artists. So it is with our present program of Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation. The new Look is the Neat Look in national farm adjustment policies. Who developed the design for this New Look?

The answers is both intriguing and clear! Farm Bureau delegates from all 48 states and Puerto Rico signed it. They shaped it in their national conventions over a number of years and signed it on the day they came closest to expressing the resolutions of the Farm Bureau delegates of any program we have ever seen since World War II.

If Farm Bureau people are to have a national farm program that reflects their view, the members should support and cooperate to get into the present ASC Program to the fullest extent. The Long-Range Position of the Delegates. Beginning in 1933, the AAA, Farm Bureau delegates developed the following policy principles:

1. They recognized the need of a system of price support on farm products as a protection against disastrous collapse of farm prices.
2. They insisted that the level of these supports should not mean overproduction or cost of living over the farm market like those in other countries.
3. They realized that when price supports resulted in overstocks of farm products, limitations on crop-planting would be necessary to prevent government controls.
4. They consistently supported a program in which supports would be lowered as surpluses began to build up. They knew that this reduction of surplus stocks would allow the market demand to catch up with supply, and prices would rise when this happened.
5. They recognized that price would be, and should be, largely a matter of demand in the market place, and not a mere matter of government price-fixing.
6. They realized that price support for more storage was a false approach to sound incomes and any real security in agriculture.
7. They insisted that a maximum of the program be administered by farmers themselves, at the home level — rather than by regulations power imposed from above by great national organization.
8. They called for maximum economy in the program; knowing that the costs would have to be subtracted from its gains through taxes.

They approved a Look for 1949. The rigid 90% parity support policy was a matter of demand in the market place, and not a mere matter of government price-fixing.

The answer is both striking and clear! Farm Bureau policy programs should reflect the members' wish, the members should be, largely a matter of demand in the market place, and not a mere matter of government price-fixing.

The ASC regulations of 1949. The rigid 90% parity support program that reflects their voice, the members should not a mere matter of government price-fixing. It is supposed to have a supply, and prices would rise when this happened.

The answer is both striking and clear! Farm Bureau policy programs should reflect the members' wish, the members should be, largely a matter of demand in the market place, and not a mere matter of government price-fixing.

The success of any program depends upon the farmer's understanding. In the 1949-50 season, the ASC committees worked with representatives of all groups.