Humphrey proposes commission
on agricultural policy

CHICAGO Dec. 10.--Senator Hubert H Humphrey (D Minn) today (Tuesday) called for the establishment of a National Commission on Agricultural Policy and Rural Life.

Humphrey speaking before the annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation here said such a commission is needed "to examine past agricultural policies, their adequacy, their effectiveness and their relevancy to present day circumstances."

"It also will be the purpose of the Commission to look ahead taking into consideration the technological revolution in agriculture, the shift in population in America from the rural areas to the cities, what types of programs the government should engage in relating to the price of agricultural products, marketing, distribution, and agricultural credit."

The Senate Majority Whip said he will introduce legislation to establish the Commission soon.

Humphrey noted that the Department of Agriculture in its recent Outlook Sessions attributed a five per cent reduction in the 1964 net farm income to the impending wheat situation.

Because of this, he urged that the Farm Bureau "study carefully" a wheat bill he introduced earlier this year. He said such a "drastic reduction" in farm income could eliminate the economic gains which could come from new tax legislation.

The Humphrey voluntary wheat bill provides for payments so that on one half of their normal production cooperating farmers would receive $2 a bushel for their wheat. On the other half cooperating farmers would receive an export payment of 25 cents a bushel.

Humphrey also spoke of the need for a blue ribbon bipartisan commission to analyze and make recommendations for our future food and fiber reserve requirements. He introduced a joint resolution in the Senate this year which would establish such a commission.

(More)
"We must have food reserves for market stability, weather uncertainty, population increases, international commitments to our friends and allies, and international tensions and uncertainties," Humphrey said. He added that "reserves must be differentiated from surpluses."

Humphrey, who served eight years on the Senate Committee on Agricultural and Forestry, said one area of government activity "which is causing me some concern" is the Commodity Credit Corporation.

He said the CCC is getting too large, has too many assets, too many personnel, and too many far-flung operations.

While pointing out that the CCC has a very important and significant role to play, Humphrey declared that it was established to "supplement farm income to aid the farm producer, to supplement the normal channels of trade, and not to supplant the normal channels of trade."

He said the CCC needs to be carefully examined "because at times I have had disturbing evidence that the mandate of the Commodity Credit Corporation charter has not always been followed."

Humphrey paid tribute to the American farmer for his contribution "to the well-being of this country and the rest of the world," and to farm organizations for their active participation in policy.

He praised the Food for Peace Program saying that "when the history of the twentieth century is written, the development and the expansion of the Food for Peace Program will be looked upon as one of the most constructive steps ever undertaken by any nation."

Humphrey also said that the new ways should be found to increase our agricultural exports even more. He declared that the opportunity to expand our farm exports is excellent if "we bargain hard and from strength."
AGRICULTURE -- THE BRIGHT TORCH FOR LIBERTY

I am pleased to be able to bring to you greetings from the President of the United States. Let me read to you his letter to Mr. Shuman.

(Read Shuman letter.)

I am deeply grateful for this opportunity to meet with you and to take part in the 1963 annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation. This annual meeting has developed into a major force with widespread influences on American life. I know I will benefit from the exchange of viewpoints.

In this great nation agricultural policy is developed
and implemented, not only by the President, the Department of Agriculture and the Congress, but by the people, spearheaded by organizations such as yours.

I do not have to sell the idea to you that broad participation by farm organizations in policy is not only satisfying to the democratic impulse, but absolutely essential if we are to do what history commands us to do—which is to build free institutions and then work to build a workable system of world peace.

No group in the country has understood this more clearly than the farm organizations. No segment of our society has done more to translate that understanding into action. This is not flattery, but fact.

However, after the discussion, after the presentation of all the views supported by facts, after the unbiased
objective and the biased non-objective presentations, after
the selfish and unselfish analyses, there is a point at
which Congress should act constructively to meet the real
needs of our farm people—all of them.

All too often, however, when a member of one party
introduces a piece of legislation affecting agriculture,
there is an automatic negative reaction by the opposite
political party. All too often there has been an automatic
adverse reaction by one farm organization when another farm
organization makes certain recommendations. All too often
the net result of this automatic conditioned reflex is that
farmers are hurt by failure to get any action to meet a
particular situation. Divide and conquer was and is a
useful technique by negativists. But cooperation working
together is the essence of affirmative action.
It is time all the American people took note of the contribution the American farmer has made, not only to the well-being of this country, but to the rest of the world. We have taken the daily modern miracle called agriculture in stride, and too often consider it commonplace.

We need to study and know better the contributions of agriculture to the growth of our economy. We need to study and know better the extent of the dependence of the rest of our economy on the gallant eight per cent of our population who take the risks of drought and flood and hail and early frost and insects and markets. We need to study and know just how we can improve the lot of this numerically and proportionately shrinking group in a constructive bipartisan spirit. We need to do these things, if for no other reason than as a simple matter of justice.
to do these things because there are many others primarily dependent on the production of this great basic force in our society.

We are in the midst of a technological revolution in agriculture that not only is irreversible but is rapidly accelerating with jet age speed. The American consumer is now enjoying his food at the lowest cost in terms of human effort expended of any people in the world. Not only does he have the world's richest diet but he has the world's most nutritious varied diet.

At the same time as agricultural production has been increasing, employment in the agricultural labor force has declined rather sharply. This has meant that sufficient workers to account for one-fourth of the growth in civilian non-agricultural employment have been released farm workers.
We are now at a point where it takes less than seven million
farm operators and workers
to produce our food and fiber for 190 million
Americans, our commercial exports, our Food for Peace, and
our reserves.

While the quantity and quality of U.S. food consumption
has been upgraded, we also have seen to a sharp increase in
exports of food and fiber. We now are exporting about $6
billion worth of food and fiber annually. Over $4 billion
of this will be sales for hard currency. Thus, this agri-
cultural abundance is greatly aiding our balance of payments
situation.

The rapidly advancing agricultural technology affords
a primary opportunity to help the developing nations to
help themselves, to help build a political, economic, and
social structure suited to their aspirations and oriented
toward freedom. This will provide strength to the free world in its struggle with the forces of totalitarianism.

As we examine our food potential, we find tremendous opportunities in this global struggle for men's hearts and minds.

Therefore, we need programs that meet the present needs of people, that recognize the breakthrough in agricultural technology and that are designed to meet these world-wide opportunities.

We, alone, of all the world are truly blessed to use food and fiber in this endeavor.

Such a program is envisaged by legislation known as the Agricultural Trade and Development Act—known all over the world as P.L. 480.

In 1954, the American Farm Bureau Federation took the lead in developing this legislation. Under this—
Food for Peace program—food has become a significant form of foreign economic assistance. I am tremendously impressed by the single overriding fact that without our farmers' productive capabilities, the entire U.S. foreign assistance program would be much less effective.

Many good people have an over-cautious or critical attitude toward programs designed to move increased amounts of American farm products overseas. This has been reflected in skeptical attitudes toward Public Law 480, the chief legislative means of moving agricultural abundance to consumers who might otherwise have had to do without. But the experiences of the recent years certainly should have removed this apprehension. The insurance that these special export programs move additional quantities of farm products, beyond what is being absorbed by the normal commercial
channels today, distinguished Public Law 480 from other export programs. The Food for Peace Program, which has been considered by some to be the province of idealists, might better be considered as subject matter for hardheaded realists. It is unfortunate that the connotation of surplus disposal has been applied by some to a law which has the basic objective of meeting the needs of friends.

Doesn't it make economic sense for the U.S. and other exporting countries to share abundance with the millions who are in need of food, rather than store it in bins? Or, reduce production? It seems to me that it well behooves us to use every possible tool we have for the preservation of peace. This tool is a unique one--made in America.

I am proud to state that the program that has come to be called Food for Peace has had the continued strong support from the leadership of both major political parties.
Many of those who once felt it would be desirable to "phase out" the program now see the need for extending and even enlarging it.

I believe that when the history of the twentieth century is written, the development and the expansion of the Food for Peace Program will be looked upon as one of the most constructive steps ever undertaken by our nation. At the same time we must recognize that in the absence of our farmers' abundant productivity this could not have been possible.

Wheat has played the largest commodity role in the Food for Peace Program. Since July 1, 1954, exports under P.L. 480 have been made amounting to almost 3 billion bushels of wheat. This represents 63 per cent of our total wheat
exports during this period. It would be well to stop for a moment and think about the internal explosion which would have occurred in U.S. agriculture if these markets had not been available.

It should also be noted that some 70 per cent of United States agricultural exports are commercial for dollars. In a sense, these constitute Food for Peace at its best—mutually beneficial, multilateral trade using the efficiency of commercial trade channels.

The soundest and simplest way to maintain our balance of payments would be to utilize to a maximum the productive efficiency of our farmers by finding ways to increase our agricultural exports even more. The American farmer has a tremendous interest in the policies that are developed in the European Economic Community, because these discussions will have an important bearing on what may happen to farm...
exports to the Common Market. It is essential that our government do all that it can to make sure that American farm exports are not handicapped by a European Economic Community agricultural policy. The opportunity to expand our farm exports is possible only if we bargain hard and from strength. President Johnson has been given authority by Congress to negotiate for the opening of greater trade opportunities through the Trade Expansion Act. We must do all we can to see that this authority is intelligently used to gain tariff and other concessions in favor of our agricultural exports. I make this promise to you. I will use every ounce of my strength in this constructive endeavor.

However, if we are to maximize our exports, not only to the Common Market area, but to other areas of the world,
we must offer the best quality at competitive prices. There is no substitute for price and quality when it comes to competing for commercial markets abroad.

Your officers and members played an active and effective part in putting the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 on our statute books—-and they are taking a keen and continuing interest in its implementation. As you know, the Act equips the President with a formidable armory of negotiating powers.

The objective of the United States is to roll back and, if possible, to roll back the trend toward higher levels of agricultural protectionism. The United States has declared, plainly and repeatedly, that it cannot conclude another round of trade agreements unless its major agricultural export commodities are included in a significant way.

To put it in simple language, these negotiations must
deliver the goods for our farms as well as our factories, or we will not sign on the dotted line.

But I am confident of our ultimate success. Every country has a stake in solving the problems of agricultural trade— and not only the food-exporting nations. No country, however prosperous, can indefinitely afford to keep valuable human and material resources locked up in obsolete and inefficient forms of agriculture. And access to reasonably-priced, efficiently-produced food and fiber is, for the industrial nations, an essential factor in maintaining vigorous economic growth without inflation.

The American Farm Bureau Federation is to be congratulated for its strong efforts in maximizing exports of agricultural commodities. Your Rotterdam office is serving as a focal point for the promotion essential to increased
utilization and consumption abroad of agricultural commodities. Your "programs of expanded markets and commerce" is a highly commendable undertaking. I congratulate you.

While we continue to concentrate on finding new markets for our agricultural commodities, we must not lose sight of what is happening here at home as agricultural programs and policies are carried out.

There is one area of government activity which is causing me some concern and this is the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Commodity Credit Corporation was established, and I quote, "for the purpose of stabilizing, supporting, and protecting farm income and prices, of assisting in the maintenance of balanced and adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, products thereof, foods, feeds, and fibers, and of facilitating the orderly distribution of agricultural commodities." Unquote.
It may be that the Commodity Credit Corporation is getting too large, has too many assets, too many personnel, and too many far-flung operations. At least, it needs to be carefully examined. It has a very important and significant role to play and I do not want my remarks to be interpreted as indicating I am opposed to the Commodity Credit Corporation, for I do not know what the American farmer would do without it. But the Commodity Credit Corporation was established to supplement farm income, to aid the farm producer, to supplement the normal channels of trade, and not to supplant the normal channels of trade. At times I have had disturbing evidence that the mandate of the Commodity Credit Corporation charter has not always been followed.

The Commodity Credit Corporation was not organized to do the business of the co-operatives. It was not set up to do the business of the grain trade and the merchants-
in food and fiber. It was set up to help, not to take over.

It was established to make the market place more orderly, not more disorderly. It was set up to help improve the price structure for the farm producer, not to lower it. It was established to promote orderly marketing not to engage in dumping. It is the responsibility of the Congress to see that the Commodity Credit Corporation operates within the framework under which it was designed.

Also, as we look ahead, I feel that new wheat legislation is essential. The U.S.D.A. in its recent Outlook Sessions attributed a five per cent reduction in the 1964 net farm income to the impending wheat situation. Because of this, I have asked myself just how to be of maximum assistance to the 1.8 million wheat growers and other farmers and ranchers of this nation.
I know that thousands of farm people voted against the certificate plan on the assumption that what they deemed to do better legislation would be forthcoming. Legislation proposed by the American Farm Bureau Federation was introduced by many conscientious Congressmen. Other equally conscientious Congressman also introduced legislation. I consider myself in the latter category.

My wheat proposal has many of the features of the American Farm Bureau Federation bill. It is voluntary. So is yours. It eliminates marketing quotas. So does yours. It provides for resales by CCC at not less than 115 per cent of support. So does yours. It provides for offsetting CCC out of condition sales by open market purchases. So does yours. It has an objective to reduce stocks. So does yours. It will increase the use of wheat for feed.
So does yours.

I know that the basic concern on the part of your leadership is the fact that my proposal involves payments so that on one-half the normal production cooperating farmers would receive $2 per bushel. On the other half cooperating farmers would receive an export payment of 25 cents per bushel on the normal production. I recognize the reasons for the concern of the American Farm Bureau Federation. My proposal does not provide for any limitation on payments so that there is no ceiling on opportunity.

With respect to costs the amount would definitely be limited to the normal yield on the planted acreage. I believe that after careful study you will find that the proposed bill meets most, if not all, the criteria of a good bill.

For it was only after months of study, argument, dis-
cussion and consideration that I introduced this bill. I recognized the diverse interests. I attempted to be realistic. I urge you to study this bill carefully.

In addressing this important body, I must pinpoint a portion of my present overall philosophy. I have now become convinced that the time is at hand to free our farmers from their daily concern over the long-term implications of expanding regulations and controls. There are better ways than mandatory programs for some of our commodities. We should try to encourage shifts in production into those commodities for which expanding needs are foreseen--such as soybeans. We need a blue ribbon bipartisan commission to analyze and make recommendations as to our future reserve requirements.
We must have food reserves and food strength on the farm. We must have food reserves for market stability, weather uncertainty, population increases, international commitments to our friends, and allies, and international tensions and uncertainties. Furthermore, reserves must be differentiated from surpluses. We must never forget that food is power.

In the very near future I also shall recommend to the President and the Congress the establishment of a national commission on agricultural policy and rural life. This commission should be composed of public officials in the executive branch of government, but also leading economists, agricultural leaders, representatives of financial institutions and the business community.
The purpose of the commission will be to examine into past agricultural policies, their adequacy, their effectiveness, and their relevancy to present day circumstances. It will also be the purpose of the Commission to look ahead, taking into consideration the technological revolution in agriculture, the shift in population in America from the rural areas to the cities, what types of programs the government should engage in relating to the price of agricultural products, marketing, distribution, and agricultural credit.

Rural America is changing. As a matter of fact, all of America is changing. We need to take a long look to the future, taking into consideration the vast increase in population that will come to our country in the next
twenty-five years, the urbanization of American life, the movement from rural areas of the young people, and all that this means in terms of the social, economic, and political conditions in what are traditionally known as the rural areas.

This generation of farmers knows that the winds of change are blowing. There is the leadership in our great farm organizations, with the assistance of your elected officials, to help foresee and shape the forces generated.

This is the continuing challenge to leadership—to accommodate to an orderly change in our domestic society and the rest of this planet. This can be done by a new spirit of cooperation among farm organizations. The voice that would speak from that rostrum would be a roar.

An outstanding example of cooperation among farm
organizations is the St. Louis Grain Corporation. Partners in this corporation, which owns a two and one-half million bushel capacity grain elevator on the Mississippi River in St. Louis, are the Illinois Grain Corporation, a Farm Bureau affiliate; the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, and the Missouri Farmers Association. This operation demonstrates that regardless of differences in ideology, farmers can get together to cooperate in handling marketing problems.

Can we not here highly resolve to lay away all pettiness—all futile bickering, and all partisanship for the sake of partisanship. Can you not pick up a new torch marked effective cooperation between farm organizations. It will burn brighter and light a broader highway to freedom and prosperity for our farm people.
Indeed, the watchword of your organization is service, and this is the watchword of any worthwhile organization in the field of farming, or any field. Can we not now decide that service to farmers is service to the people? Can we not now resolve to seriously attempt to gain the universal recognition of the farmers' continuing role of doing more for more people than any other segment of our population? This has been the history of American agriculture. This is its future.

This nation in 1789 was largely an agrarian society and the basic beliefs and stability of a rural people have been immortalized in our Constitution, which has withstood so well the shocks and tests of 175 years. Out of the well-spring of the land we still draw our strength. I pledge to you that I will continue to remind all Americans
of the debt that we owe American agriculture.
SENATOR HUMPHREY:

Thank you very much, Mr. Schuman. Before I go much further, I hope that those who are managing these house lights will give me an opportunity to see this wonderful audience, because I'm not a performer; I'm, I suppose, you'd call me, a politician, and I gain my sustenance from contact with people. Mr. Schuman, you've honored me by inviting me to your convention. I am indeed, very honored and privileged and I come here to pay you my respects, to speak to you as a fellow American, and to thank you for your good citizenship, your leadership and your dedication to this great country of ours. I was pleased to have been greeted this morning by the President of the Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation, Mr. Clarence Meyers, who met me at the airport with Jack Lynn. This was an unexpected honor, and I want Mr. Meyers to know that I am ever grateful, and then, just a few moments ago, I had the opportunity of quickly shaking hands with, and saying "hello" to Mrs. Ballum, who is from Goodhue County in Minnesota, who is the Chairman of our State Women's Committee of the Federation. So, to my fellow Minnesotans who are here, a warm greeting. I'm honored that you have permitted me to share this platform and to speak to this great farm organization. I am pleased to see an old compatriot, I shouldn't say old, because
he's really a young man, and compatriot in the Governmental circles. Mr. Roger Fleming. Mr. Fleming also greeted me with a warm welcome, and he handed me a copy of a speech and he said, "Now Senator, there may be a paragraph or two in here that isn't just like yours" and I indicated to Mr. Fleming that it could be that in mine there might be a paragraph or two that was slightly different as well, but we've learned how to disagree on occasion without being disagreeable, and we don't happen to think that in a great United States such as ours, where we seek to have unity, that we have to have unanimity. We can have different points of view and still have common objectives, and yet I would imagine that when we shake this all down, I'm not as far or we're not as far apart as the printed word might indicate. So, let me just say in the beginning, a note of thanks in these days that are rather sad for all of us—a time that we lost a leader, a great leader; a time when many of us who have been close to that man find ourselves still operating under great sorrow and difficulty. Out of this sorrow, out of this tragedy, I believe has come a greater sense of understanding and tolerance in our country; some soul searching as to our objectives and our manners; and I also believe that out of all of this incredible tragedy and sorrow has come a greater appreciation of the role of the United States of America in the affairs of this
entire world. Free people everywhere, and indeed, people who are not privileged to live under institutions of freedom, have sorrowed with us; their tears have been as ours; and their worries and their fears as ours. But thank God, and I say that in all reverence, that our founding fathers created a system of government where power can be transferred without violence and disorder, where succession to authority is guaranteed and is provided, and I'm happy to say to this great assembly today, that the Government is in good hands; that a strong man is at the helm; that the institutions of free government and representative government still operate; and that, despite our losses, and it was a great loss — that we are yet strong. We are committed to the objectives of world peace under law, and we are committed to private, personal and individual freedom and liberty.

Greetings from President

Now I want to bring you greetings of a very distinguished citizen, one who has recently changed his residence and moved only a week ago into a new home. It is dated December 6, White House, Washington, and it reads:

Dear Mr. Schuman: And, I shall present this letter to Mr. Schuman after having read its contents. "Dear Mr. Schuman: Please express my greetings to the officers and members of the American Farm Bureau Federation on the 45th Annual Convention of your organization, our nation's largest
national association of farmers and ranchers. If our
democratic society is to thrive, it has a basic underlying
need for free expression by its people. Those citizens
whose roots are in the soil, have a special responsibility
to participate in policy discussions and to make recommendations
to their government. They are the source of the finest
agriculture in all the world. We need to search for better
ways, ever responsive to changing conditions, to enable our
farmers and ranchers to share more fully in the bounty which
they helped create. In this endeavor, how can we use the
pricing mechanism of the free market with more vitality
than presently? In this endeavor, how can we better coordinate
the role of government with the area of the private sector,
including farmers' own institutions in the marketing of farm
products? In this endeavor, how can our efficiency in pro-
ducing and marketing be reflected in fair and open competition
in the world markets? In this endeavor, what should we do
to assure ourselves of adequate reserves? These are the
questions that must be answered as you meet to study the
issues and facts underlying them. I will look forward with
interest to your recommendations. Sincerely, Lyndon B.
Johnson."

Ladies and gentlemen, I consider it an honor to
be able to read that message and present it to your /President
because I think it indicates a new spirit of understanding. I think it indicates to you, and I am sure it will to your officers, that there is a desire, and a willingness to work together and to cooperate, and I call to your attention one word in particular or one phrase - to search to find - and I only paraphrase now - find ways to do a better job, to find ways to make our market system work better, to find ways, if you please, to be able to more effectively compete in world markets. We're going to work together for that.

Now I've had many disagreements over my days in public life with individuals and officers of this organization. I have never held this organization in any other attitude except one of respect, because it represents some of the finest people in all of the world, but I want to say that I believe that it is our duty, when we have points of view, to honestly express them and not to try to cover them up, because it's only out of this refiner spire of the competition of ideas that we find the better idea, the best way, at least, that we can devise to improve our situation. I don't have to sell the idea to you, that broad participation by farm organizations in national policy is not only satisfying to the democratic impulse, but absolutely essential. If we are to do what history commands us to do, which is to build free institutions and then work to build a workable
system of world peace, these are our objectives, my fellow Americans, far beyond agriculture or far beyond business or labor but to build free institutions that can enrich the lives of humankind, and above all, to find a way to pursue the path of peace—peace that has a workable system of guaranteeing that noble hope. No group in this country has understood these objectives more clearly than farm people or farm organizations, and no segment of our society has done more to translate that understanding into action.

And this isn't flattery; it's a fact and one that ought to be understood. Now after discussion and after presentation of all the views with facts after the unbiased and objective presentation and the biased non-objective presentations, after selfish or unselfish analyses, there is a point at which those of us in Congress are must act, or should act constructively to meet the real needs of our farm people—all of them. I think confession is good for the soul. I believe that those of us in public life ought to honestly state to you that we don't know all the answers that we should search for those answers. I have had to learn a great deal and unlearn a great deal, and whenever I get to the point where I quit learning, then I think I shouldn't serve the people any longer. What a man needs today more than anything else, is to recognize the great flow of information which is available—the new challenges which
we face every day, and be big enough, at least in heart and mind, to acknowledge his own limitations, and to be wise enough to seek the counsel of others who may have something to offer. I shall try to do that in my years of public responsibility. Now, all too often, we've seen this situation wherein a member of one party introduces a piece of legislation, in this instance affecting agriculture, and finds there is an automatic negative reaction by the opposite political party. All too often, there has been an automatic adverse reaction when one farm organization took one position and another farm organization would take an opposite position on those recommendations. All too often, the net result of this automatic condition reflex is that the farmers are hurt, the nation is hurt by failure to get the action that is required to meet a particular situation. Divide and conquer is an old and sometimes useful technique by those who want to do nothing, but cooperation, not coercion, cooperation working together is the essence of affirmative action and cooperation requires a degree of tolerance, my fellow Americans. It requires that you don't feel that you're omnipotent, that you have all wisdom, and a monopoly on virtue. Few people have it. I think it is time that all the American people, particularly in these great metropolitan centers, took note of the contribution that American agriculture has made to
this nation and not only to this nation, but to the rest of the world as well. We have taken this American miracle of agriculture for granted, and we often consider it commonplace. We need to study, and we need to know better the contributions of agriculture to the growth of our economy. We need to study and to know better the extent of the dependence of the rest of this economy on the gallant 8% of our population who take the risks of drough and flood, hail and early frost, insects and markets and all the uncertainties of the market place. We need to study and we need to know how we can improve the lot of this numerically and proportionately shrinking group, in a constructive bipartisan spirit. We need to do these things, if for no other reason, than the matter of simple justice, and we need to do these things because there are many others primarily dependent upon the production of this great basic force of food and fiber in our society. Technological Revolution.

Right now we are in the midst of a great technological revolution in agriculture, in fact, in every aspect of society, that is not only irreversible but is accelerating at jet-age speed. The American consumer is now enjoying food at the lowest cost in terms of human effort expended.
of any people in the world. Yes, not only does the American consumer have the world's richest diet, but the consumer has the world's most nutritious and Berry diet. And let me say for the record, for the people of this great city of Chicago, and for any other part of America, the American consumer of food receives his food or receives the family bread basket or food basket at a smaller percentage of earned income than any other consumer in the world. The best bargain today in the world is the food basket for the American family, and the American farmer has made that possible. And I wouldn't want to forget to pay my respects due to our great system of processing and distribution, to the food—the quality of our food—the quantity of our food—the manner in which it is distributed and marketed and handled—is a tribute to this entire industry, to this entire area of our economy. No finer products to be found—no more wholesome—no more well guarded in terms of public health. Now, at the same time as agriculture production has been increasing, which is a common fact, employment in the agriculture labor force has declined sharply. We are now at a point where it takes less than 7 million farm operators and workers to produce our food and fiber for 190 million Americans to satisfy our commercial exports,
our food for peace program, our reserves, and still have some left over. And ladies and gentlemen, let the record be clear! If the go-ahead sign were ever given to American agriculture to produce to its utmost, the volume of production would almost be beyond human calculation. We know how to do the job, and in this world, where most people are rural, and they are where most of the people live close to the soil and work day and night to eke out an existence from the soil. The miracle of American agricultural efficiency is something that staggers the imagination and leads the imprint of American leadership without question in every area of this globe. So, we can be proud of this record and in that sense of pride, I think justice again requires that we do something to be more fair in the returns to those who have created the record.

Now, while the quantity and quality of U.S. food consumption has been upgraded, we've also seen a sharp increase in the exports of food and fiber. We are very conscious of exports these days in world markets, and we need to be because America can out-produce and over-produce for its own domestic needs. We are now exporting at the rate of about 6 billion dollars a year of food and fiber. Over 4 billion of this will be for cash commercial
sales, hard currency. Thus our agricultural abundance is greatly aiding our balance-of-payments problem and greatly aiding our position as a great commercial nation in this new world. The rapidly advancing agricultural technology affords a primary opportunity to help the developing nations to help themselves, and I want rural people in particular, members of this great organization, to know, that our agricultural economy is doing an amazing job in terms of building a better world, helping to build a political, economic and social structure suited to their aspirations and oriented towards freedom. This will provide strength to the free world. This great agricultural abundance will provide strength to the free world in the struggle with the forces of totalitarianism. Now as we examine, then, our food potential, we find tremendous opportunities in this global struggle for men's hearts and minds. What Senator Humphrey is trying to do this morning and may be not too well, is to show the affirmative aspects of our agricultural economy. We have had so many negative voices, we've had so many people that preached only negativism. I want to point out here this morning, that a new day is upon us, and new approaches must be found to solving some of these problems, and in a real sense what we need to understand is that agriculture is in the forefront of the struggle for a better world.
it's not a burden, it is not what's holding America back. It is what's putting America ahead.

I've seen some of the factories behind the Iron Curtain and some of my colleagues have seen there the achievements in the field of atomic science. We know of Sputnik, we know of the Astronauts and the Cosmonauts, but I want to say that despite all the genius of Soviet technology and industry, they've never been able to operate a family farm. Collectivism negates human aspiration, collectivism is an anathema to individual liberty, and this nation of ours must never follow any course — any kind of course — that leads to collectivism. We must follow only one course that leads to individualism. Therefore, in our responsibilities as a world leader, we need — and to meet the needs of people — we need programs that recognize the breakthrough in agricultural technology and that are designed to meet these world-wide opportunities that I have mentioned.

Now such a program is outlined in part, and I remind you, only in part, in the Agricultural Trade Adjustment Act, known all over the world as Public Law 480. In 1954, the American Farm Bureau Federation took the lead in developing this legislation. I was on the committee in agriculture when that happened and had something to do as one member of that committee, along with one that I want to
mention here this morning the late and beloved and departed Senator Andy Sheppel of Kansas, who really did a tremendous job in this particular area on Public Law 480. He ought to be remembered for that. You know, I get kind of discouraged at times — people come and people go — they've given their life to their country and after they're gone, all too often, people forget them. I don't want to forget them. I don't care what their party politics may be. When a man has done a good job, he deserves to be remembered and I want the Farm Bureau Federation as well as other organizations to remember old Andy Sheppel from Kansas, he did a good job for you.

Now this program has more recently become known as the Food-For-Peace Program, and food has become a very significant form of foreign economic assistance. I'm tremendously impressed by the single overriding fact that without the farmers' productive capabilities, the entire United States foreign assistance program would be much less effective than it is today. In fact, Food-For-Peace in many areas of the world, is the most effective, and may I add, the most popular and the most worthwhile food program. I should think you people would be very happy today as we approach the Christmas season, to know that the food and the fiber of American farms has saved the lives of millions
of people, to know that there are a hundred million boys and girls this morning, throughout the world, outside of the United States, that are receiving school lunches, food for their body, a body created in the image of his Maker. There happens to be a bit of the spiritual involved in all of this, at a time when so many people are talking about the destruction of mankind, I would think that rural families, farm producers, the families, the husband and the wife, the mother and the father and the children, would in a sense be reverently grateful and, indeed, happy that they have been able to save lives. What greater force for good is there than to enrich life, to save life, to do good, and to be just?

Now many good people have an over-cautious attitude or critical attitude, towards programs designed to move increased amounts of American food products overseas. I can understand some of their apprehension. This has been reflected in skeptical attitudes towards Public Law 480, the chief legislative means of moving our agricultural abundance to consumers who might otherwise have to do without it. But the experience of the recent years certainly should make or certainly should remove much of this apprehension. The insurance that these special export programs move in addition to additional quantities of farm products, beyond what is being
absorbed by the normal commercial channels today, distinguishes Public Law 480 from other export programs. The Food-for-Peace program which has been considered by some to be the province of idealists, might better be considered as the subject matter for hard-headed realists. It is unfortunate that the connotation of surplus disposal has been applied by some to a law which has the basic objective of meeting the needs of friends. I don't mind being called an idealist. I've had many people condemn me in public life as a do-gooder. Well, I'd rather be a do-gooder than a do-badder, and I'd rather be known for trying to do good than trying to do nothing. And I say without fear of any historical contradiction, a man that hasn't been an idealist never amounted to a hill of beans. You have to be an idealist in order to ever come close to being a realist, because it's the realists, those who start out as being the hard, practical realists, who end up doing nothing. It's people who look ahead to the kind of a world they want, the kind of a family they want, the kind of a farm they want, the kind of a state and community they want — these are the idealists, and they are the genuine realists too. George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, they didn't know that there would be an America like we have today, or one that we had 25 years ago, but they were dreamers and
they were idealists, they didn't know, they were not sure that power could be passed from one President to another without violence but they dreamed they had ideals and they turned out to be the realists. So, I'm generally pretty happy if I can have the right kind of enemies and the right kind of critics. What worries me is when I get the wrong kind, so I like to be known as one who seeks who is a do-gooder. Then, too, might I say, doesn't it make economic sense for the United States and other exporting countries, as well as moral sense, to share abundance, God-given abundance with the millions who are in need of food, rather than to store it in bins or be forced to accept stern controls to reduce production? It seems to me that it well behooves us to use every possible tool that we can create for the preservation of peace. Blessed are the Peace-makers, and I believe it. I know of no more noble ambition or pursuit than to sacrifice for peace, and I don't think that makes you a pacifist or coward. The bravest man that ever walked this earth was the Son of God and the Apostle of Peace, and he sought peace. "Let my Peace be with you!" Therefore, this food and fiber tool that we speak of is a unique one for peace. It is made in America, and as an American I'm proud of the fact that not only have we the science and technology to unleash the
power of the atom, which can be used for good or for evil, but also. I am very proud of the fact that we have the science, and the technology, the know-how and the ability to release the power of the earth to food and fiber, food to feed the hungry, fiber to cloth the naked; food to heal the sick. I'm proud to state that the program that I've spoken of, and which has come to be called Food-for-Peace is bipartisan. It has the support of the leadership of both parties, and of all segments in the Congress, and it ought to have, and I hope that you'll insist that it be maintained on that basis. By the way, there's plenty of room in any political program for people that want to do good, and there's always a lot of room in any program that's a success. It's when you fail that you seem to be rather lonely. Success has a mighty big carriage, so climb on. I believe that when the history of the 20th Century is written, the development of the Food-for-Peace program will be looked upon as one of the most constructive steps ever taken by any nation, and we ought to be thinking not of how to stop it, but how to improve it; and we ought to rid ourselves of this idea of surplus disposal as if human beings were built-in disposal units. We ought to be thinking of the blessing that is ours and in humility and
and gratitude for a beneficent Divine providence, and an
effective, economic and political system find ways and means
of better using this great resource of food and fiber.

Now let me say a word or two about wheat. Many
people think we raise an awful lot of wheat in Minnesota.
The truth is, we don't. We raise a little, but we have a
much more varied and diversified farm economy than just the
wheat economy. But wheat is bread. In fact, I think it's
fair to say that we've arrived at the time in human history
when literally we can banish hunger from the face of the
earth, and I don't mind telling this audience that I'd
rather have America known as the nation that healed the sick,
fed the hungry, taught the illiterate, and helped the blind
and the weak, than to have it known as having the most powerful
military establishment the world has ever created, and I'm
not so foolish as not to know that we need defense, but I
think there's something else besides arms that are needed
as well. Now wheat has played the largest commodity role
in this Food-for-Peace Program, and I noted as I checked for
this message, that we have exported under Public Law 480
since July, 1954 about 3 billion bushels under PL-480 which
represents about 63% total of wheat exports during this period.
I think it would be well to stop for a moment and to think
about the economic chaos or explosion which would have occurred in U. S. agriculture, if these markets had not been available. Just ponder that for a while. But it should also be noted that over 70% of the United States agricultural exports are commercial, normal commercial exports, and we've built many new markets by the use of Food-for-Peace. In a sense, these commercial exports constitute Food for Peace at its best, a mutually beneficial, multilateral trade using the efficiency of commercial trade channels. The soundest and the simplest way to maintain our balance of payments would be to utilize to the maximum the productive efficiency of our farmers by finding ways to increase our agricultural exports even more. The American farmer has a tremendous stake and a tremendous interest in the policies that are being developed in the European Economic Community because these discussions will have an important bearing on what may happen to the exports of American farms to the Common Market. It is essential, therefore, that our Government make sure that American farm exports are in no way handicapped by European Economic Community agricultural policy. The opportunity to expand our farm exports is possible only if we bargain hard and from strength. The President has been given the authority by the Congress to negotiate for opening of greater trade
opportunities through the Trade Expansion Act, and I can assure you this morning, let me repeat that, I can assure you this morning that this authority given to the President, will be used, and it will be used to gain tariff and other concessions in favor of our agricultural exports.

And, I might add, that I can make this personal promise to you. I'll do whatever I can individually, to back up that Presidential determination. Now, if we're going to maximize our exports, and that's a matter of interest to this organization and to our country, the Common Market and the other areas of the world, I think we must offer, as I have said, the best quality at competitive prices. There is no substitute for price and quality when it comes to competing for commercial markets abroad. Therefore, every policy that we pursue must be to try to strengthen what we call the operation of the market, the market price, and I want my position clear: I don't believe in Government programs to supersede the operation of our normal markets.

I believe that Government programs should be designed not to supplant but to supplement, not to take over, as I shall emphasize here today, but to assist, not to move in as a competitive force, but to make competition better and to make it more effective for the farm producer and for the nation. Now, your officers, and thank goodness this organization has played and played a very important role in getting
the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 passed, and your officers and your members are taking a keen and continuing interest in its implementation. The Act equips the President with a formidable armory of negotiating powers. Now the objective of the United States is to halt and if possible, to roll back the trend towards more agricultural protectionism in these markets. The United States has declared plainly and repeatedly, and it has done this through the President, it has done this through Secretary Freeman, through the Secretary of State, that it cannot conclude another round of trade agreements unless its major agricultural export commodities are included in a fair and significant way. To put it in simple language, these negotiations must benefit our farms as well as our factories or we're not going to sign on the dotted line. Now that ought to be understood.

I'm confident of our ultimate success. No country however prosperous can indefinitely afford to keep valuable human and material resources locked up in obsolete and inefficient forms of agriculture, and as we push for better trade agreements, we actually help our European friends who are today the victims of their own self-imposed obsolescence. We must, therefore, make sure that we have access to reasonably priced, efficiently produced food and
fiber. For this for industrial nations, an essential factor in maintaining vigorous, economic growth and national strength. Now the American Farm Bureau is to be congratulated for its strong efforts in maximizing exports of agricultural commodities. Your Rotterdam office, Mr. Schuman, is serving as a focal point for the promotion that's so essential to increase utilization and consumption abroad of agricultural commodities, and your programs of expanded markets and commerce is a highly commendable undertaking, and we are aware of it, those of us in Government, and are grateful for it. Now while we continue to concentrate on finding new farm markets abroad, we must not lose sight of what's happening here at home as agricultural programs are designed and policies are carried out. There is one area of Government activity which is causing me no little concern — or to put it directly, great concern, and this is the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Commodity Credit Corporation was established and I quote from its charter: "For the purpose of stabilizing, supporting and protecting farm income and prices, of assisting in the maintenance, balanced and adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, products thereof, foods, feeds and fibers, and of facilitating the orderly distribution of agricultural commodities." Now it may be true, and I think there is reason to believe it's true,
that the Commodity Credit Corporation is getting too large, has too many assets, too many personnel, and too many far-flung operations. At least, this Senator believes that it needs to be carefully re-examined. It has an important and significant role to play, that I know, and I do not want my remarks to be interpreted as indicating that I am opposed to the Commodity Credit Corporation, for I do not know what the American farmer would do without it or would have done in the past without it. But the Commodity Credit Corporation was established with limited responsibilities. It was established to supplement farm income, not depress it. It was established to put a floor under prices, not a ceiling. It was established to aid the farm producer, to supplement the normal channels of trade and not to supplant them. And let me add, it was also established to cooperate with farmer-built, farmer-owned, and farmer-operated organizations.

At times I've had disturbing evidence that the mandate of the Commodity Credit Corporation charter has not always been followed. There's a tendency to want to make it a going business concern, and that isn't what it was established for. The Commodity Credit Corporation was not organized to do business, to do the business of the grain trade or of the cooperatives. It was not set up to do the business of the grain merchants in food and fiber; it was set up to help and
not to take over. It was established to make the market place more orderly, not more disorderly. It was setup to help improve the price structure for the farm producer and not to lower it. It was established to promote orderly marketing and not to engage in dumping. It is the responsibility of the Congress to see that the Commodity Credit Corporation operates within the framework under which it was designed. and I, here today, give you my pledge, that it will be my purpose through whatever means that I have, to see to it that the purposes of the Commodity Credit Corporation are adhered to strictly, and that it shall operate within the framework of the law that designed it and established it, and not to wander in other fields.

By the way, I know that there is sometimes a little bit of discussion and dialogue between the farm organizations — I have been informed of that, but I also know that there is a warm regard for example, in our state, between the President of the Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation and the President of the Minnesota Farmers Union. These men are gentlemen and they talk to each other, they respect each other and they have many common objectives. I also know that
that's the case in terms of national organizations. For example, I picked up a paper in Minneapolis last night and St. Paul, that I said I was going to bring down here to this meeting. Now, I suppose this shows that I'm not much of a politician but I'll take a chance anyway. You can throw me out. I'm almost at the end of the speech. While I was in St. Paul last night, attending another meeting, I was given a copy of the Farmers Union Herald, and I have here where it says, "Stature condemns CCC interference in grain business," and I want to give this to Mr. Suhuman so he can read this while I'm speaking.

Well, you see, there are men that belong to different but groups and head different organizations, that have some common objectives, and I didn't take any coaching from either one of them on this subject. I was raising the dickens with the Commodity Credit Corporation and some of its operations. I said some of them a long time ago. Senator George Aiken and Senator Humphrey. I Senior Aiken, Republican of Vermont, Senator Humphrey, so-called New Deal, Fair Deal, Democrat of Minnesota - now New Frontier. Which recently Red, placed upon it, have at times seen eye-to-eye on vital issues. That great Republican Senator who is a true friend of agriculture, and he is, and Senator Humphrey, who is rather a neophyte, a
a few years ago, we both took the floor of the Senate some years ago to say pretty much the same thing that Senator Humphrey said here today. I don't consider my remarks original, I just consider them well worth saying.

Now, let's look ahead a little while. Now here's where I'm going to start getting into trouble. But I've always gotten into a certain amount of it, my mother used to always say that if I just confined my trouble-making into about one-fourth of my activities, I might survive. There have been times that I stretched that, but with mother's love and prayers and some good luck, I've been able to get by so far, so I will take another whirl at it right now.

I want to look ahead to new wheat legislation and I want to say that I think new wheat legislation is essential. Now you just bear with me; I don't ask you to agree with me, I just ask you to think with me. That isn't a retreat — that's just sort of laying down the ground rules. Now, the Department of Agriculture in its recent outlook sessions, that's a publication, contributed a 5% reduction in 1964 net farm income to the impending wheat situation, and I'm worried about that. I want to say that I told the President in a friendly conversation just last week, that the tax bill would not do very much good if farm income dropped — that you can lose much of the effect of a tax program that is designed to stimulate the economy if you have a farm...
program that holds it back. So we've got to take a look at all sides - every area. Now, because I'm concerned about this economic possibility of a drop in income, I've asked myself just how to be of maximum assistance to the onemillion-eight-hundred-thousand wheat growers and other farmers engaged in wheat production. I know that thousands of farm people voted against the Certificate Plan on the assumption that what they deemed to do, better legislation would be forthcoming. Now I don't travel under false colors. I voted for that plan. I spoke for it in the Senate. When I take on a job, I'm the majority whip of the United States Senate. I work for my President. I have a party responsibility as well as a Senatorial responsibility, and I don't think that a man ought to take on these jobs unless he's going to be true and loyal. I don't think the people who work for you, and that work for Mr. Schuman, ought to be for any other program except what you people endorse here in resolution. That's their job. And when they deviate from the resolutions and when they deviate from what you want, they ought to get another job. And when I took on the job of being majority whip, in the United States Senate, I am faithful to my boss and faithful to my leader and faithful to the party program as it is presented to the Congress unless I serve notice that I can't go with it, and I didn't serve that notice, so when the votes came
in, we took a licking, and I have had a few of those. By the way, I'd like to let you in on a secret. Victory is much sweeter. Now there has been legislation introduced, legislation was proposed by the Farm Bureau Federation, and that was introduced by many conscientious Congressmen. Yes, you ought to clap for that, and other equally conscientious Congressmen have introduced other legislation, and now I consider myself in the latter category, and you can clap for that, too.

Now, my wheat proposal, which I am sure you are going to support, has many of the features of the American Farm Bureau Federation bill. I don't intend to tell you all of the differences, but I intend to tell you of the similarities. First, my bill is voluntary; so was yours, it eliminates marketing quotas; so does yours. It provides for resales by the CCC at not less than 115% of support price; so does yours. It provides for offsetting CCC out-of-condition sales; and believe me, that's a big phrase, by open-market purchases; so does yours. It has the objective to reduce stock; so does yours; it will increase the use of wheat for feed; so does yours. Now I know that's a pretty good index of similarities. I know that the basic concern on the part of your leadership is the fact that my proposal involves some payments so that one-half of the normal production
cooperating farmers would receive approximately $2.00 per bushel. On the other half, cooperating farmers would receive an export payment of 25¢ per bushel on normal production. I recognize the reasons for the concern of the American Farm Bureau Federation. My proposal does not provide for any limitation on payments, so there is no ceiling on opportunity.

Now, with respect to cost, the amount would be definitely limited to the normal yield and the planted acreage. I believe that after careful study and a little friendly consideration, you will find that the Humphrey proposed bill meets most, if not all, the criteria of a good bill, and I'm going to see Mr. Schuman about this privately, and see if I can't give him the "treatment" as we say.

Now it was only after months of study, and by the way, I consulted some of your people, and we had much help - a good deal of help from you - a good deal of argument - much discussion and consideration that I introduce this bill. Remember, I was one of the Democrats that introduced a bill when it was being said in Congress that the Administration wasn't going to present any Wheat Bill. Well, let me assure you this Administration is not going to let the wheat farmer down and no Administration should or would dare do so, and as a spokesman for this Administration, I can't tell you what kind of legislation will be passed but
it will receive the thoughtful consideration and guidance of your organization as well as others, and we're not going to let American farmers "go down the drain." Now you can put that down now.

I recognize that is a diversity of interests and I have attempted to be realistic, and all I came here to do today is to urge you to please study the bill, forget who sponsored it; just look at its substance. I'm going to take a look at your proposals, and I'm not going to have a dog-in-the-manger attitude either. I'm going to be fair about it. Now in addressing this important body, I must pinpoint a portion of my present overall philosophy.

I have now become convinced that the time is at hand to free our farmers from their daily concern over the long-term implications of expanding regulations and controls.
I believe I told Jack Lynn on the way coming in here that I hoped I never got so bull-headed or stubborn that I wouldn't try to learn. That's what a man lives for. And as I said earlier today, I think there are better ways than mandatory programs for some of our commodities. I think we ought to try to encourage, as I said before, the greatest use of the market place.

We should try to encourage shifts in production into those commodities for which there are expanding needs, present or foreseen. That is what I mean by shifting the use of the land into commodities in which there is no oversupply. Farmers just don't like to leave land unused and being paid for.

By the way, I think I gather that you are kind of down on commissions. It just shows how I was out of step. You'll just have to bear with me. By the way, I want you to know that I have told your officers that the office of the majority whip of the U.S. Senate is open to these officers, and there is a friendly welcome mat out. They are in there trying to educate me. I didn't realize they took the invitation so seriously. I didn't tell them to live there. Now, you might be on guard. I might change them a bit. I want to forewarn you.

I happen to believe that we need a blue ribbon bipartisan commission to analyze and make recommendations as to our future food reserve requirements. I am getting a little tired of hearing about surpluses and nobody knowing how to define it. I haven't heard anybody say...
we have a surplus of ammunition or atom bombs, but we've got a lot of them. We don't know quite where to put them. And yet I remember the greatest general of all said, and I quote, "an army fights on its stomach," and he didn't mean crawling on the ground. He meant food.

When I came back two years ago from Berlin, when there was a crisis in 1961, I reported to the President that I didn't think there would be trouble over Berlin because there was a food shortage in East Germany and Eastern Europe, and nations do not attack when they do not have the food and fiber to sustain troops in the field.

Food reserves are important to the army, the navy, the Marine Corps. One of these days we are going to get the media—newspapers, television, radio, magazines—to start being concerned. You can't have a powerful nation and powerful allies and have nothing to eat and you can't always be sure of your allies and you can never be sure of the weather. Therefore, a nation that takes on worldwide responsibility against a worldwide communist menace better have supplies of fiber and food materials capable to fulfill worldwide leadership responsibility.

We Need Food Reserves

I think we must have food reserves. We must have food reserves for market stability, for weather uncertainty, for population increases, for international commitments to our friends and allies, and to meet international tensions and uncertainties. Furthermore, reserves must be differentiated from surpluses. Reserves should be sealed off from the market, and we must never forget that food is power.
So Senator Humphrey says, "Let's quit arguing in Congress now about whether we ought to have X million tons of cereals or pounds of vegetable oils. Let's find out--put the best minds we have to working on this and come up with a program."

We know for example that we have come up with a program for a certain number of missiles. We just don't produce missiles when we feel like it. We have a program on the number of missiles we are going to use, based on the fact that we know we would lose so many missiles on the first strike. We don't just go around saying, "If you've got some time, produce some missiles." We order them. We plan them.

I don't think it would be a bad idea if a general or two got to figuring out how our population will live or how we will fulfill the commitments of worldwide leadership.

Now how about our dealing with the Soviet Union? The most peace-producing, the real peace-producing force today is the abundance of our food and fiber. No one dares move against us because of it.

Mr. Khrushchev was... commenting recently in the Communist Party press in Russia on the necessity for more food, not on the necessity for more missiles. He's got a lot of them. He even had enough to share not long ago. He has a lot of troops, too. He has more manpower. I think I have made my point.

Now I come into this second venture into trouble land.
Shuman is charitable and good, and he is going to let me mention it right now. I don't expect that there will be overwhelming approval of these suggestions, but if your officers still come to see me, I will work on them.

**Government Needs Reorganization**

In the very near future I will make another recommendation to the Congress. You may want to ponder this recommendation a little bit because it may have more meaning to it than just what these words indicate. I fully realize that the farm organizations are capable of making objective analysis of problems relating to agriculture. I know you folks know more about farming than the U.S. Congress knows. I know this, but I also know, as I said this morning, manufacturers, farm organizations, women's clubs, all recommended years ago that something needed to be done at the governmental level to promote reorganization of the executive branch of government.

There were resolutions passed until we didn't have a place to file them, and then one day in Congress we introduced legislation to establish the Hoover Commission on the reorganization of the executive branch of the government, and just the other day another old gentleman, that former President, Herbert Hoover, said to Lyndon Johnson, President of the United States, that he admired, among other things, the work that Lyndon Johnson had accomplished as Leader of the U.S. Senate in the fulfillment of the objectives of the Hoover Commission Report.

What I am trying to say, it took a Commission on it, with the legal form of a legislative proposal and an executive order, a public
law to become effective. I don't think we have done everything on
the Hoover Commission recommendations. One of the proudest
possessions in my office is a citation from the Citizens Committee
of the Hoover Commission, expressing gratitude to Senator Humphrey
for his work in this.

I am going to recommend to the President and to the Congress
the establishment of a national commission on agricultural policy
and rural life. Now this commission isn't just going to be made
up of Congress. It would be composed of some public officials in
the executive branch of government, but also of leading economists,
agricultural leaders, representatives of financial institutions
and the consumer. We need to get a good look at where we have been
and where we are going.

The purpose of this commission will be to examine into past
agricultural policies, their adequacy or inadequacy, their effectiveness
or ineffectiveness and their relevancy to the present situation.
It will also be the purpose of the commission, under any proposal,
to look ahead, to go into consideration of the technological revolution
in agriculture, the shift in farm population from the rural areas
to the cities--this is a tremendous factor today--and what types
of programs the government should engage in relating to the price
of agricultural products, in marketing, distribution and agricultural
credit.

I am not seeking to build a Frankenstein of government. I am
seeking to release the power of agriculture, and as I said here
earlier, to have government help supplement, not take over.

Rural America is changing. As a matter of fact, all of America is changing. We need to take a long look to the future. I took such a look two days ago when I looked at the Bureau of Census projections. My fellow Americans, rural America is going to be in serious trouble with Congress with few representatives, because there isn't any population left in rural America of any major proportion relating to the total population. Your representation in the future will be in the Senate. There will be ten million people between Boston and Washington, D.C. in one megalopolis. Areas of the South or Middlewest will lose representation to areas of the Northwest, and particularly the big cities like Los Angeles, San Francisco, Seattle. Those cities will grow and double their representation in Congress. By 1980 less than 5 percent of the population of the United States will live in rural areas.

I think we'd better take a good look ahead instead of going around putting band aids on old sores. This generation of farmers knows that the winds of change are blowing. There is the leadership in our great farm organizations, with the assistance of your elected officials, to help shape these forces. This is a continuing challenge to your leadership to accommodate to an orderly change in our domestic society. This can be done by a new spirit of cooperation among farm organizations. We don't afford guerrilla warfare at home or in Viet Nam. I want to warn my farm friends.
We'd better find some common denominators, common objectives, common means, because there are going to be all too many people in public life that have had no rural experience, no rural orientation. We've quit being born in log cabins. We are not getting many candidates saying, "I was born on the farm." But they will know about farms what they have read in books. That's a poor substitute for being out in the fields or pasture.

An outstanding example of the cooperation of which I speak among farm organizations is taking place, and it is a sign of the times. It is the St. Louis Grain Corporation. Partners in this corporation, which owns a 2½ million bushel capacity grain elevator on the Mississippi River in St. Louis are the following: The Illinois Grain Corporation, a Farm Bureau affiliate; the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association; and the Missouri Farmers Association of the state of Missouri—three divergent organizations that had enough good business sense to know that you've got to eat and live as well as argue, and they got together. I happen to think the leaders of these organizations have that ability. This operation demonstrates it. Farmers can get together to cooperate in handling their marketing problems. And I want to say that farmers know how to handle marketing problems about as well as anything if they will just get together and work on them and throw away all pettiness and partisanship.
I am not just saying this to you, I am going to say it to another organization tonight in St. Paul. I don't have two speeches. I have one speech to give to two organizations. I am going to use this for replay at the Farmers Union GTA.

Can you not pick up a new torch, marked effective cooperation between farm organizations? It will burn brighter and light a broader highway to freedom and prosperity for our farm people.

Service is the Watchword

The watchword of this organization is service, and this is the watchword of any worthwhile organization. Can we not now decide that service to farmers is service to all people? Can we not now resolve to seriously attempt to gain the universal recognition of the farmer's continuing role of doing more for more people than any other segment of our population? This has been the history of American agriculture. This is its future.

This nation in 1789 was largely an agrarian society and the basic beliefs and stability of a rural people have been immortalized in our Constitution, which has withstood so well the shocks and tests of 175 years. Out of the wellspring of the land we still draw our strength. I pledge to you that I will continue to remind all Americans of the debt that we owe American Agriculture.

I want to thank the American Farm Bureau Federation for listening to me so long this morning. You are a generous and gracious and considerate audience. I hope the time has been well spent at least for