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"Early American success as a nation was based on agriculture -- and a particular agriculture which needed and used large numbers of farm laborers, and all of it imported foreign farm labor."

"In Oregon, you produced only 6,200 tons of pole green beans in 1935. In 1938, this production jumped to 13,800 tons. In the next 15 years this production increased about fivefold, to 71,400 tons. Last year your State produced 127,800 tons. This is like mining gold. This has meant millions of dollars in your pockets -- I mean for baby sitters, theater ushers, car washers, and department store clerks -- I don't mean just for farmers.

"How did this happen? It happened because farmers were willing to increase their plantings because they were reasonably assured that someone would be around at harvest time to do this job."

"... none of this research changes the fact that even mechanized agriculture is still highly seasonal and requires a highly mobile labor supply."

"When I speak of hand labor I mean labor with callouses and the stamina to work when the sun is so hot that city folk stay indoors, or when the ground is so muddy and the wind so constant as to cause city folks to huddle close to the sides of buildings and skip over sidewalk puddles during their few minutes exposure between the bus stop and work."

"Women and school kids are no real substitute for the hardened muscles and endurance of the real farm laborer whom I have been talking about, but a lot of good work can be done with such people.

"In the next few years, a larger than usual group of young people will be coming on the labor market. If industrial jobs are scarce, some of these people can be temporarily attracted to a brief stint of farm work. A few of our unemployed city people can be induced to help out temporarily.

"All of these sources will be welcome in a pinch. But all of us should recognize that these are not -- nor will they ever be -- migratory farm workers, the professionals in the field."

"You will hear much of the poor conditions, hard work and low earnings of 60¢ and 80¢ per hour. And all the while the real tough, seasoned migratory laborer will grin and say the job is not so bad and that he doesn't know about that 60¢ to 80¢ business. He has been making $15 to $20 per day on the same work."

"Each farmer who wants this year's labor to return next year must, this year, on his own farm, pay well, feed well, house well, and most important, get to know his men."

"There is a lot of experienced farm labor in this country. I mean real farm labor. While there is not enough of it -- and its numbers decrease every year with migration to cities -- it still is a very significant supply. Such labor, like good labor everywhere in any occupation, will find the best employers."
A CANNER LOOKS AT
THE FARM LABOR PROBLEM

G. C. Henry

Commissioner Cameron has assigned one hour as my part in your symposium on agricultural labor in Oregon. As the final part of your four sessions today, I am grateful to find that the things which I have to say do not duplicate too seriously the subject matter covered by your Governor, your representative from the Department of Labor in Washington, D. C., Mr. Potter, and your panel from Oregon State University.

I would like to divide the time assigned to me into four parts.

The first part I would like to devote to past farm labor problems and I will call this, "Where Have We Been These Many Years?"

Second, I will devote a few minutes to the subject where everyone is an expert, "Where Are We Now?"

Third, I will venture some thoughts on "Where Are We Going?"

Fourth, and last, I came prepared for questions on more specific matters so that you may have the last word.

In summary, my talk might be better entitled "How Ya Gonna Keep 'Em Down on the Farm After They've Seen Paree" -- a 1917 song title which describes the situation perfectly.

Now let's begin the first subject.

WHERE HAVE WE BEEN THESE MANY YEARS?

Let me start before our country was born. Spain was colonizing the New World for 100 years before the English got things going. In 1517, the natives of the West Indies were freed from slavery and replaced by Africans. So in 1517 did Spain take care of its New World agricultural labor problem by a program of imported foreign labor.

About 100 years later, the English Colonies in the New World also faced agricultural labor problems. What I am referring to are the problems of the royal land-grant colonists in Virginia who were farmers.

These, our earliest large-scale farmers, determining that there was not enough local labor willing and able to do the hard chores of raising cotton, tobacco, and sugar cane for molasses and rum, turned to an established foreign agricultural labor recruiting program.

They adopted the program which the earlier Spaniards had found so successful -- they imported back-country African natives.

Lest we leave the early New Engander out of it, you will remember that the Puritans who landed at Plymouth Rock were essentially skilled craftsmen and traders, and that it was the New England traders who hauled the products of Virginia plantations to England and returned to these New World land-grant farms with the treasured products of the old country.
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Our founding fathers needed such trade to survive in the manner to which they were accustomed. To expand such trade meant that they must expand their New World farming ventures. Such expansion required farm laborers, and our New England traders used their ships to bring increased numbers of imported foreign farm labor from Africa.

By the time of the Declaration of Independence and the later adoption of our new nation's Constitution declaring that all men were equal, practically all farm labor was imported slave labor except, of course, for the small family farm.

We in this country like to glamorize the hardy pioneer, the lone fur trapper, and the small farmer who hacked a family farm out of the wilderness, fighting Indians all the way. I wouldn't deny such treasured memories of our earliest history, but we should not overlook either that the expansion and wealth of our new nation were based on commercial ventures rooted in commercial agriculture far beyond the scope of the family farmer and individual fur trapper.

Early American success as a nation was based on agriculture -- and a particular agriculture which needed and used large numbers of farm laborers, and all of it imported foreign farm labor.

Now let's move rapidly through about 100 years. The East and the South continued to expand -- all based on farming, of course -- and all based on an unlimited supply of imported foreign farm labor.

The Midwest expansion during this period was not so dependent on a large labor supply. This plains country was wheat country and grain became the foundation of its economy.

As this new nation pushed West, however, the second great drama in our farm labor history began.

In the late 1700's and early 1800's the Spanish missionaries were rounding up the local West Coast Indians, attempting to convert such natives not only to a religion but also to a "better way of life." Life, that is, as agricultural laborers instead of nomadic food gatherers and hunters.

With the discovery of gold in California came a rush of people who, when the blush of gold fever subsided, turned to agriculture.

This was not wheat country and farm land needed to be developed, ditches dug, and levees built. Row and tree crops had to be planted, cultivated and harvested. Finding that there were too few who were willing and able to do these hard repetitive tasks, our early Western farmers turned to imported foreign farm labor.

Chinese coolies, Japanese peasants, Mexican Indians, Hindus, Filipinos, and the peasant class from scattered places over the globe -- these people willingly came to do the treasured work of performing our hardest, dirtiest farm labor tasks.

* * * *
At about this same time a third drama of foreign farm labor was taking place. Hawaii.

1872 was the turning point in Hawaii's history. It is this year when Hawaii first started to become a significant commercial producer of sugar.

The missionaries, followed by traders, were introducing this island paradise to the benefits of modern civilization. Benefits, of course, which are the result of hard work. Neither the missionaries, the traders, nor the local natives were much interested in the real dirty, hard jobs of producing sugar cane. So history repeats itself. The agricultural labor problem was solved with a program of imported foreign farm labor, and Hawaii is still solving its farm labor problem this way.

* * * *

To sum up our history: When this nation needed people to do the hard, repetitive tasks that make up much of farm work, we did not find such people among our own kind. We turned to the areas of the world where people could be found who would consider our hardest farm labor as desirable work -- a step up the ladder of human endeavor.

I think we will continue in this course. As the inevitable drift from agriculture continues, someone must perform the farm labor tasks. There is no historical evidence -- nor is there any evidence now -- of a movement of labor from the city back to the land.

Because I believe this nation -- as is the case in all industrialized nations -- is dependent on imported foreign farm labor for a significant part of its agriculture, it is worth pausing a moment to consider the consequences of such foreign labor importation.

* * * *

In the past 250-300 years, as we roamed the world in search of people who wanted the work we would not do, we obviously sought those people whose circumstances were less favorable than the hard life we had to offer.

Thus, we brought to this country the back-bush Negro, the peasant Japanese, the rural Filipino, and the coolie Chinese. When they arrived here they were at best maintained in a considerate and kindly manner -- the good Southern slave owner or the benevolent Hawaiian sugar planter are examples. At worst, such imported labor was abused and exploited; in the main, however, they were ignored and left to fend for themselves.

Even though our farmers provided adequate food and housing when such labor was employed, when these foreign laborers were turned loose on the community on their own meager resources they had a hard lot. Today, the evidences of this are still found in the ditch-bank shanties that occupy some of the unincorporated land near small towns. As such workers migrated to cities, they were totally unprepared to compete on our terms in our world, and such persons formed a part, at least, of our industrial slums which exist to this very day.
Even more important, we have not yet, after 200 years, solved the social problems resulting from the importation of the Negro farm laborer. California waited almost 100 years before permitting the descendents of the Oriental farm laborers to own land. Hawaii has faced and is facing real and significant problems arising from the fact that they imported farm labor from vastly different world cultures -- and these people must now adjust and live together in a democracy.

In review, the social problems arising from the importation of foreign farm labor are visible even after 100 to 200 years. Today's farmers are under considerable scrutiny and criticism for these scenes of poverty and social maladjustment which result from earlier importation. The farmer's need for such imported labor continues, but we should try diligently to see that such foreign labor is used only seasonally and is returned to its homeland at the end of each season's need.

In this connection the "bracero" law, P.L. 78 was appropriately based.

* * * *

It is rare that any problem is new or unique. If we search a little we can usually find that our problem has also been somebody else's concern. Here, we should turn to other industrial societies -- Europe, the sometimes model for our own development.

Who do you suppose does the seasonal farm labor work in Europe? For many years -- so far as my meager sources can tell -- Spain and Italy have provided the "braceros" for France, Germany and Switzerland, and perhaps other places too.

I have been told that Frenchmen don't harvest the grapes from which their famous wines are produced, nor do the Germans or Swiss dig the potatoes or harvest the seasonal crops. To confirm these stories I turned to our own Department of Labor and Department of Agriculture.

The facts they furnished seem to portray a history and a situation something like ours. Since World War II, for example, a million to a million and a half Italians and about 800,000 Spaniards have been working outside their own countries.

In 1962, France issued permits to 89,725 foreign workers for seasonal work in agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting. About 65,000 of these were Spanish, 20,000 Italian, and the balance African. Switzerland and Germany also appear, from the statistics furnished, to be large users of imported labor in their agriculture.

* * * *
To sum up "Where Have We Been All These Years," we can, I think, draw two conclusions:

1. We in this country must recognize that like industrial societies elsewhere, practically all of our hard, repetitive farm labor has been done by foreign, peasant labor -- and that most of such work today in our country is being done by those of the direct descendants of this imported labor who have remained on the land. As these remaining numbers die or migrate to cities, they must be replaced in kind -- and there is no migration from cities to the land, and there never has been.

2. We in this country must now be prepared to make significant social and economic adjustments because we brought to this country foreign, unskilled, common farm labor -- and permitted them to stay. Since we haven't concluded the process of adjusting to past importations of farm labor, we had best look to future programs like P.L. 78 which require such laborers to be returned home when they are no longer needed.

* * * *

WHERE ARE WE NOW?

The significant facts of our present situation hardly need reviewing before this audience. But to round out my trilogy, let me review them briefly.

The residue of our 200 to 300 years of foreign farm labor recruiting programs remains with us. Those descendants of early recruits who have not migrated to industrial centers are our present main source of farm labor. While some of these descendants of early recruits have dispersed to farming communities throughout the nation, the main groups remain in the traditional locations of their forefathers.

On the Eastern seaboard, the Southern Negro residing on marginal southern farms or in southern farm communities still performs the seasonal farm tasks near his home in the winter and now migrates northward in the late spring for similar work in Pennsylvania, Delaware, New Jersey, and points north. As these crops are harvested, he returns south to start the cycle over again. As his ranks are depleted by Negro migration to the cities, replacements have been found from Puerto Rico; and as further depletion takes place, Jamaica is providing further replacements.

No matter how bad times have been in the cities and no matter how long the city breadlines, there has been no identifiable move into this farm labor cycle from the cities.

For the rest of our nation -- outside of Hawaii -- the Mexican-American, the direct descendant of early farm labor recruiting, forms the backbone of this country's migrant seasonal labor force.
This group, for the most part, resides in Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, and California -- within 50 to 100 miles of the Mexican border, and close to relatives in Mexico. This group works the winter crops close to home and then leaves home in the spring to fan out northward along well-defined routes to similar farm labor jobs in such Midwest states as Michigan, Wisconsin and Indiana. These migrant routes cover Utah and Idaho in the Mountain States and California, Oregon and Washington on the Pacific slope.

As this historic seasonal labor supply has been depleted by migration to the cities, Mexico has filled the gap. Wetbacks have been a traditional source and will probably always make some contribution. More recently, the P.L. 78 program has been the major source of replacements for the steady depletion of the numbers of Mexican-Americans able and willing to do the heavy farm labor jobs. Even more important to this nation, however, the P.L. 78 program has provided the additional numbers of laborers to meet the expanding needs of a growing western agriculture.

In this connection, let me depart briefly for a side comment. And I want to direct this to the non-farmers in this audience. Mr. Duncan referred to green beans in his earlier talk.

In Oregon, you produced only 6,200 tons of pole green beans in 1935. In 1938, this production jumped to 13,800 tons. In the next 15 years this production increased about fivefold, to 71,400 tons. Last year your State produced 127,800 tons. This is like mining gold. This has meant millions of dollars in your pockets -- I mean for baby sitters, theater ushers, car washers, and department store clerks -- I don't mean just for farmers.

How did this happen? It happened because farmers were willing to increase their plantings because they were reasonably assured that someone would be around at harvest time to do this job.

As Mr. Duncan previously indicated, California, in a few short years (perhaps as few as 10 years), increased its production of tomatoes from 20-25% of this nation's supply to over 50% of the tomatoes consumed in this nation.

Would you, as a farmer, have doubled your plantings putting in your plants in the spring, if you had serious doubts whether labor would be available to harvest them the following fall?

This expansion in tomato production was a new gold rush for California, producing millions of dollars which found their way into every pocketbook in the State.

I know you know these things or you wouldn't be here. So let us return to our review of "Where Are We Now."

It is clear that we are at a point when we as citizens are confused about our farm labor history; confused also about the peculiar needs of farming in an industrial society. This takes us to the last part of my talk.
WHERE ARE WE GOING

My predictions are three:

1. In the long run, we will continue to use supplemental foreign agricultural labor and will adopt government programs to do this.

2. In the short run, we are going to suffer some loss before our present confusion is overcome.

3. We aren't going to fall to pieces.

Let me amplify these points.

First: "In the long run, we will continue to use supplemental foreign agricultural labor and will adopt programs to do this."

Bear with me while I tell you why I believe this -- a point of view which is so contrary to recent statements attributed to our own Department of Labor.

Some time was spent earlier in this meeting discussing the part mechanization will play in the farm labor picture. It is obvious that mechanization has played a significant role in the past and will continue to do so. Agricultural research will also play a significant role in developing crops which make mechanical harvesting possible. But, as you heard earlier, much of the future is still a gleam in some inventor's eye, and none of this research changes the fact that even mechanized agriculture is still highly seasonal and requires a highly mobile labor supply.

The hard-headed realist says that seasonal hand labor will be needed to feed an expanding population now and for some considerable time to come. And when I speak of hand labor I mean labor with callouses and the stamina to work when the sun is so hot that city folk stay indoors, or when the ground is so muddy and the wind so constant as to cause city folks to huddle close to the sides of buildings and skip over sidewalk puddles during their few minutes exposure between the bus stop and work.

Let me tell you why I think this type of labor will be needed.

About 100 years ago, Hawaii, if it was to grow to anything but a mid-Pacific filling station, needed trading goods. Agriculture provided the answer. The volcanic soil of Hawaii and its distance from markets dictated one crop -- sugar. Pineapple came later when canning offered a means of preservation.

But sugar required labor. Too little local labor was available that was willing and able to do the hard, repetitive farming jobs required. A foreign labor recruiting program was instituted under government supervision and Oriental peasant labor was brought in. This was about 100 years ago.
Time went by. This labor produced families and children. These American born were eligible for and received schooling. The schools of the time were exceedingly primitive and little was made of them -- but it was a beginning. This first generation progeny of our foreign farm labor recruits grew up to follow in the footsteps of their parents -- work in the sugar cane.

Time went by. A second generation became a reality and went to school about 15 or 20 years after their parents. These were better schools -- not much better, but enough. The barest minority of such children broke the pattern of their existence and became workers in non-farm jobs. More pidgin English was spoken and the native Oriental customs found less usage. Most of this second generation, however, continued in the pattern of life as they knew it -- work in the sugar cane.

Time went by, and a third generation is in American schools. These schools are now 30 years removed from the primitive beginnings. These pupils receive an education somewhat comparable to that provided your grandparents in the poorest farming areas of this country. We begin now to hear the familiar refrain, "I want my children to have the advantages that I never had."

Now begins the time when in the best of American tradition, families sacrifice to obtain for their children a better education, a "better" place in the world.

Please note what I said, "a better place." In Hawaii, just as in Texas or in Alabama, this means a place away from the sugar plantation, away from agricultural labor.

Now we see in Hawaii the fourth and then the fifth and then the sixth generation descendants of our foreign farm laborers in school and moving gradually away from agricultural labor. New activities and skills supplement old traditions. Migration to town takes place.

But Hawaii must have trading goods, or it starves. Especially it is the college educated descendant of the coolie immigrant canecutter who recognizes this. So new foreign labor recruiting programs are devised. The last one, in 1946, found our Territorial Government of Hawaii arranging a program under which 6,000 laborers with their families were imported from the rural areas of the Philippines to Hawaii for farm labor tasks in sugar and pineapple.

The cycle now repeats itself, but at a faster pace. Now we have better schools, TV, radio and newspapers to promote the "better," that is, the non-agricultural way of life.

Today in Hawaii the average age of our workers in the pineapple fields is climbing year by year. There are no young field hands -- only older ones.
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Will Hawaii live on tourists and army depots? I think not. Having started down the road of agricultural industry years ago, Hawaii can't stop. To survive, it needs trading goods now more than ever. So you in this audience will see before another 10 or 20 years a new Hawaiian foreign labor recruitment program. Hawaii must do this or starve. There is no migration back to the land even in paradise.

Let us now look at the lesson Hawaii teaches us.

Parents are not ambitious for their children to grow up to be cane cutters or asparagus harvesters. We want "something better" for our children. You don't want your boy to grow up to be a tomato picker.

Schools are not training, nor are they oriented to train young people to aspire to harvest labor jobs -- to pick pears or harvest string beans. Schools are consciously teaching our youngsters to strive for something better.

Government is not preparing its citizens for farm labor. As a matter of fact, its policies lead in the opposite direction.

If former President Kennedy's and President Johnson's programs for upgrading our labor force are even a little bit successful --

If our programs to prevent school dropouts mean anything --

If the current programs to meet automation with greater leisure make any headway --

Then these are programs to insure the fact that some future day there will be no labor to harvest our crops.

Sure, everyone thinks that it's fine for our young people to have real work experience, but our parents, our schools, and our government don't want our children to aspire to become harvest hands.

The current effort to get our unemployed to do farm work is a temporary solution at best. Even if this were possible, when these people die or find work with the new training our government provides, where do farm laborers come from?

Very few of us want to do the real hard farm work. At this point in time we seem confused about whether we want anyone else to do this work either. When we discover where farm labor comes from, we will find that they are the product of a tougher training program than we provide: foreign peasant labor sources.
Lest you farmers in the audience are misled, our future foreign supplemental labor programs will require more of you than the programs of the past. Americans who do not want to do farm work don't want anyone to work under conditions that they have been led to believe exist. The fact that these conditions don't exist is beside the point. If someone must do farm labor work, our city folks are going to see to it that it is performed under as good conditions as possible. I expect that new foreign labor programs will require much more rigid standards for wages, housing, feeding and working conditions.

You farmers -- and this includes me -- have a responsibility to see that such standards are not imposed at a pace which puts us out of business. No useful purpose is served by this. But increased restrictions are, in my opinion, going to be part of any new foreign farm labor recruiting programs.

The real beneficiary will be the American conscience.

The second part of this closing portion of my talk says, "In the short run, we are going to suffer some losses before our present confusion is overcome."

I truly believe that some farmers and some farm communities are going to take a licking while we wait for the city folks and our representatives in Washington, D.C. to make the tough decision whether they want to eat well or eliminate supplemental foreign farm labor. Nevertheless, there is much that we can do.

First, the issue is in part political. Foreign labor involves our immigration laws. These are national laws and do not involve state participation. No farmer and no state is going to be permitted willy-nilly to go to Mexico or any other place and bring in farm labor just because it is needed. Thus, all of us must be prepared to spend a lot of time on this problem in Washington, D.C.

In this connection, something is being done right now. As was proven conclusively last year in the political debates on P.L. 78, no single farm group nor any single farm state carries the punch to do the required political job in Washington, D.C. There are just too many voices which drown out the farmer's plea. California tried alone -- as did Texas. More recently, Florida farmers and their state officials tried to be heard, but with no more success. Other state and commodity groups have a similar lack of success.

Since no single state or farmer group has been able to do much, an effort is now under way to combine forces. A new organization, the National Council of Agricultural Employers, is being formed on this very day in Washington, D.C. Headed by Mr. J. B. Kirklin of the Trans-Pecos Cotton Association in Texas, farmer representatives from all areas, packer-shipper representatives, farm supplier representatives from all farming states are meeting today in Washington, D.C. to form this new organization. The Grange, the Farm Bureau, and various commodity groups are all represented.
This move got under way several months ago, and I wish this new venture every success. My company has thrown its support behind this move and we believe every farmer, farm organization, farm community, and state dependent upon farming should do likewise.

All problems are not solved in Washington, D.C., of course, even though I believe this one will not truly be solved without supplemental farm labor. While our politicians in Washington and our city folk are being reluctantly dragged to the conclusion that the unemployed coal miner in eastern Pennsylvania is not really a candidate for a six-week job picking string beans in the Willamette Valley, you farmers, your local farm organizations, and most important you people, the local representatives of our employment service, must carry the ball.

You people did the job during the last war and the same job can be done again. In every farm community there are people who will respond to emergency appeals. Women and school kids are no real substitute for the hardened muscles and endurance of the real farm laborer whom I have been talking about, but a lot of good work can be done with such people.

In the next few years, a larger than usual group of young people will be coming on the labor market. If industrial jobs are scarce, some of these people can be temporarily attracted to a brief stint of farm work. A few of our unemployed city people can be induced to help out temporarily.

All of these sources will be welcome in a pinch. But all of us should recognize that these are not -- nor will they ever be -- migratory farm workers, the professionals in the field.

The use of these new sources of substitute help will raise all sorts of problems. The greatest of these will be the uninformed city folk -- newspapers, unions, church workers, welfare investigators -- who will descend upon you. You will hear much of the poor conditions, hard work and low earnings of 60¢ and 80¢ per hour.

And all the while the real tough, seasoned migratory laborer will grin and say the job is not so bad and that he doesn't know about that 60¢ to 80¢ business. He has been making $15 to $20 per day on the same work.

My last point in the closing part of this talk is, "We aren't going to fall to pieces."

While some farmers and farm communities are going to be hurt, I do not believe the traditional migratory pattern of our seasonal labor will change very much in the next year even if P.L. 78 dies without replacement. Laborers who have been satisfied to come to Oregon this year are not going to leave you next year for places unknown. While I know that this is little comfort for the individual grower who loses his crop, the picture for Oregon is certainly not as bad as for your neighbor state to the south.
If a Washington, D.C. induced labor shortage continues to develop, then gradually during the next few years migratory patterns will change. And you farmers in Oregon will have to make sure that the migratory patterns do not change adversely. This is not done by fancy programs or wheeling and dealing. It means that each farmer who wants this year's labor to return next year must, this year, on his own farm, pay well, feed well, house well, and most importantly get to know his men.

If you have a poor reputation in the labor market, it is a little late to establish a good one if P.L. 78 goes out the window this year -- but you can try. You Oregon farmers are fortunate that you have depended little on P.L. 78. You have had to remain competitive in a free labor market. The California bracero user must relearn a whole lot of old customs. He will in time, and as he does you will be affected. But I do not expect so rapid a transition as to have much effect on 1965 migratory patterns.

There is a lot of experienced farm labor in this country. I mean real farm labor. While there is not enough of it -- and its numbers decrease every year with migration to cities -- it still is a very significant supply. Such labor, like good labor everywhere in any occupation, will find the best employers.

In conclusion:

First - This nation has always depended on foreign sources for its seasonal farm labor supply. I would guess that 99% of our American Negroes and perhaps over 75 to 80% of the American-Orientals and Mexican-Americans we see in our cities today are the direct descendants of our farm labor importation programs of the past.

We are still dependent upon the fourth to tenth generation descend- ants of our original recruits for our present domestic farm labor supply.

Second - It is unlikely that in the long run this practice will change very much. Our parents want something better for their children than a life as farm harvest labor, and school and government programs practically insure that domestic farm harvest labor will not be available -- and when found, it will be upgraded.

Third - The present citizen, concentrated in the cities, deplores the conditions he thinks exist on the land. That his beliefs are not facts is not material. The city folk control our immigration policies by the size of their vote. They don't want farm work; they don't want their children to be farm laborers. When we finally convince them that real farm laborers are not the college boy with soft hands and a six weeks' vacation or the housewife fully equipped with two chap sticks, then they -- the city folk -- will finally and reluctantly agree to foreign labor for farm work under conditions much more restrictive than we have seen so far.
Fourth - While the process of resolving this confusion is going on, the farmer and the farm community must fend for themselves. It can do so temporarily by reactivating all of the old war-time emergency programs. Depending on the locality, this will call for all-out cooperation of all local agencies -- the U.S.E.S., the farmer associations, and local volunteer groups.

Fifth - Last, but not least, let us give a moment of appreciation and admiration for the many farmers and thousands of farm laborers who won't know what all this fuss is about. Such farmers are those who always have secured their own labor, valued their help, knew them personally, and treated them accordingly. Such laborers are the skilled hands who have no personal experience with $1.05 or $1.10 per hour. A man like that knows where he is going to work this summer and next summer too. And he will make his $15 or more per day until he decides to return to his home for the winter crops and a warmer winter climate.

We owe much to these independent farmers and these independent, experienced farm hands. They will do a lot of farming while the rest of us just talk about it.

Thank you for listening.