

velopment. Land improvement in the watershed to reduce erosion and sedimentation is also a part of the program".

The Oahe project when fully developed will be a multiple purpose project and while, being mainly for irrigation will also include watershed development.

The water could greatly improve agricultural productivity of our region. It also would increase volume of business in towns within or near the Oahe area and improve industrial and municipal water supplies—all contributing to improved community facilities.

Irrigation usually means more stability; ups and downs of income and production are less frequent and drastic than when communities are dependent upon the variability of dryland farming.

If we are not at war in Viet Nam, we are at war to combat the ravages of hunger. Food can be a more powerful weapon than guns in determining the future course of mankind. Quoting from George McGovern's May Newsletter "It is costing us \$300,000 to kill each enemy soldier." This would feed a lot of people.

LA VERNE SWENSON,

WOLSEY, S. DAK.

Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCGOVERN: My name is Sam Nettinga. I live west of Wolsey, S. Dak. I am a farmer, having lived in this immediate area since I was four years old. I have seen the years pass—good and bad, wet and dry—and I want to say that it is much easier for a farmer to fight the elements of nature than it is for him to battle the elements of man. Prices have broken more farmers than nature has.

My question is this: Are we right to spend millions to develop this irrigation district and at the same time spend millions to take good land out of production? Down through the years the American farmers have been able (with some irrigation in certain areas) to produce more than the markets would bear, creating what some called a burdensome surplus. I'm wondering just what we are trying to accomplish—developing irrigation in one area and taking good land out of production in another. Seems as though our debt limit could be lowered if we would stop spending in these contradictory ways.

It looks to me that the individual farmers are being asked to develop this irrigation district, pay the bills, and then the corporations with their big acreages will just step in and reap the harvest. We know for a fact that a corporation has bought large tracts of land in that area and it seems to me that we are just developing the area for them when it is the family-type farmers that should be getting a benefit from it. I'm against these big corporations in Agriculture. It has been proved over and over again that it is the family-type farmer who is the most efficient and who adds most to the economy of an area.

There should be a law—and I think there is one—that would limit the acreage a person or company can put under irrigation. Let's put teeth into this law and see that it is enforced.

The Good Lord has given this land to us to use to provide food for the people. Let us not see just a few hogs take all they can get from the ground just to make themselves rich while the majority are forced into near slavery, thus forcing many more people into the large cities. We learn what this all means in the 5th chapter of Isaiah. Idleness is the root of evil.

Sincerely,

SAM NETTINGA.

Senator MCGOVERN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of the South Dakota Council of Churches, we wish to commend the Senate Committee for making possible the Senate Sub-Committee Hearing on the Oahe Irrigation Project at Redfield, South Dakota, where you three distinguished gentlemen met with the local people and the community leaders who would find it impossible to go to Washington to attend the full Senate Committee Hearing on this project.

We wish to put ourselves on record as being in favor of this project because of the economic, moral, social, and spiritual benefits which will result from it and to urge your favorable consideration and support of this project.