

REMARKS OF
CONGRESSMAN BOB DOLE
THE KANSAS FARM BUREAU
COMMODITY CONFERENCE
ROCK SPRINGS RANCH
AUGUST 13, 1965

THE INVISIBLE HAND -- IN FARM LEGISLATION

I HAVE DECIDED TO CARRY OUT THE GENERAL THEME OF THIS KANSAS FARM BUREAU COMMODITY CONFERENCE BY DISCUSSING "THE INVISIBLE HAND -- IN FARM LEGISLATION." ALTHOUGH THIS TITLE MAKES THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS SOUND SOMEWHAT MYSTERIOUS, I FEEL IT IS TRUE THAT IN FARM LEGISLATION, AS IN ALL OTHER CONGRESSIONAL LEGISLATION, THERE ARE FORCES AND INFLUENCES AT WORK WHICH MAY NOT ALWAYS BE APPARENT TO THE CASUAL OBSERVER.

THESE FORCES, HOWEVER, ARE ONLY VERY RARELY INVISIBLE TO THOSE OF US IN CONGRESS OR TO THOSE WHOSE OCCUPATIONS BRING THEM INTO IMMEDIATE CONTACT WITH THE CONGRESS.

THERE ARE, IN FACT, A NUMBER OF "INVISIBLE HANDS" AT WORK ALL THE TIME. THESE MAY RANGE FROM THE HAND OF THE PRESIDENT HIMSELF WHO HAS ON OCCASION BEEN KNOWN TO USE IT TO TWIST THE HUMAN APPENDAGES TO WHICH HANDS ARE NORMALLY ATTACHED, TO THE OVERT AND COVERT ACTIVITY OF LOBBYISTS, SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS, AND EVEN OTHER MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESS.

CERTAINLY THE MOST POPULAR SUBJECT FOR SPECULATION AND EXAMINATION OF "INVISIBLE HANDS" IS THE WORK OF LOBBYISTS. NEARLY EVERY POLITICAL SCIENCE STUDENT WHO COMES TO WASHINGTON HAS THE IDEA THAT "PRESSURE GROUPS" AND "SPECIAL INTERESTS" EXERT AN UNDULY GREAT AMOUNT OF INFLUENCE. THERE IS NO QUESTION, OF COURSE, THAT THE HUNDREDS OF PAID LOBBYISTS THAT ROAM CAPITOL HILL DO HAVE SOME INFLUENCE, AND THIS IS A SUBJECT WE COULD SPEND ALL DAY DISCUSSING.

AUG 13 1965

-2-

HOWEVER, I WOULD LIKE TO DISCUSS WITH YOU AN "INVISIBLE HAND" WHICH DOES NOT RECEIVE THE ATTENTION IT DESERVES. I HAVE REFERENCE TO THE "INVISIBLE HAND" OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT IN THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS. THIS FORCE IN RECENT DECADES HAS BECOME MORE AND MORE POWERFUL AT THE EXPENSE OF CONGRESSIONAL POWER. IT IS EXERTED IN A VARIETY OF MEANS -- SOME SUBTLE, SOME BRUTAL.

LET'S LOOK AT A FEW OF THESE TECHNIQUES THAT HAVE BEEN AND ARE BEING USED ON FARM LEGISLATION.

FIRST -- UNLESS PROPOSED OR SUPPORTED BY THE ADMINISTRATION, MAJOR FARM PROPOSALS ARE NOT ENACTED.

IN DOING SOME RESEARCH ON THESE REMARKS, I LEARNED THAT FROM 1925 TO 1960 -- A PERIOD OF 35 YEARS -- NINE MAJOR FARM POLICY PROPOSALS WERE CONSIDERED BY CONGRESS. SIX OF THESE WERE ENACTED INTO LAW -- ALL WITH THE APPROVAL AND SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT AND THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

ONE OF THE POLICY PROPOSALS WHICH FAILED -- THE MC NARY - HAUGEN BILLS IN 1927 AND 1928 -- FAILED BECAUSE OF PRESIDENTIAL VETOES. A SECOND FAILURE, THE BRANNAN PROPOSALS OF 1949, FAILED BECAUSE OF FARM ORGANIZATION AND CONGRESSIONAL OPPOSITION. THE THIRD FAILURE WAS THE EISENHOWER-BENSON PROPOSALS IN THE LATE 1950's FOR FREER PRODUCTION AND MARKETING OF FARM COMMODITIES. IT ALSO FAILED BECAUSE OF CONGRESSIONAL OPPOSITION.

ON THE OTHER HAND, NO MAJOR FARM LEGISLATION HAS BEEN ENACTED WITHOUT THE ACTIVE SUPPORT AND APPROVAL OF THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE AND THE PRESIDENT. WHILE CONGRESS HAS REJECTED SOME PROPOSALS AND OTHER PROPOSALS HAVE FAILED TO BE ENACTED WHEN THEY WERE OPPOSED BY MOST FARM ORGANIZATIONS AND PRODUCERS, AS IN THE CASE OF THE BRANNAN PLAN, THE FACT STILL REMAINS

AUG 13 1965

-4-

FIRST -- TRADES OR DEALS ARE OFTEN ARRANGED BY THE ADMINISTRATION ON UNRELATED LEGISLATION.

IN 1964, YOU MAY REMEMBER, THE SENATE DEVELOPED A COTTON AND WHEAT BILL IN FEBRUARY AND MARCH. IT AUTHORIZED THE PRESENT CERTIFICATE PLAN FOR WHEAT AND THE CURRENT COTTON PROGRAM. THE ADMINISTRATION WAS ANXIOUS TO HAVE THE BILL TAKEN UP PROMPTLY BY THE HOUSE. I WELL REMEMBER, HOWEVER, THAT WE ON THE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE WERE TOLD THAT A COTTON-WHEAT BILL WOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED UNTIL THE ADMINISTRATION'S FOOD STAMP PROGRAM HAD BEEN APPROVED. AFTER FIRST TABLING IT, OUR AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE WAS CALLED INTO SESSION AGAIN AND THE FOOD STAMP BILL DRAFTED BY THE ADMINISTRATION WAS APPROVED. REPRESENTATIVES FROM URBAN DISTRICTS WERE SUCCESSFUL. THE FOOD STAMP BILL WAS SCHEDULED FOR FLOOR DEBATE AHEAD OF THE FARM BILL AND WAS PASSED. THEN THE COTTON-WHEAT BILL FOLLOWED AND IT TOO WAS PASSED BY A SCANT 10 VOTES.

THIS YEAR'S DEAL BEING SPONSORED BY THE ADMINISTRATION INVOLVES THE REPEAL OF SECTION 14 (b) OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT AND THE OMNIBUS FARM BILL.

THE LABOR INTERESTS HAVE BEEN ESPECIALLY AGGRESSIVE IN THIS SESSION OF CONGRESS. WITH A LARGE DEMOCRATIC MAJORITY ELECTED LAST FALL, LABOR LEADERS LOOKED UPON THIS SESSION OF CONGRESS AS THE GOLDEN OPPORTUNITY FOR WHICH THEY HAD BEEN WAITING. THIS WAS THE TIME TO GET STATE "RIGHT-TO-WORK" LEGISLATION REPEALED. THEY KNEW THE VOTE ON THE REPEAL OF THE "RIGHT-TO-WORK" AMENDMENT, SECTION 14 (b) OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT, WOULD BE CLOSE. THEY ALSO KNEW THAT MANY REPRESENTATIVES FROM RURAL DISTRICTS WOULD BE CONCERNED WITH EXTENDING FARM PRICE SUPPORTS THIS YEAR.

AUG 13 1965

-5-

I AM NOT EXAGGERATING IN TELLING YOU THAT EVERY WEEK THIS SPRING AND SUMMER, LABOR LOBBYISTS WERE ON CAPITOL HILL LOOKING FOR VOTES. THEY INSISTED THAT THE CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS ARRANGE FOR A VOTE ON REPEAL OF THE "RIGHT-TO-WORK" AMENDMENT BEFORE TAKING UP MAJOR FARM LEGISLATION.

AS YOU KNOW, THEY WERE SUCCESSFUL. THE BILL REPEALING SECTION 14 (b) IN THE LABOR LAW WAS BROUGHT TO A VOTE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES THE LAST WEEK IN JULY.

ONE OF OUR WASHINGTON FARM CORRESPONDENTS, WAYNE DARROW, REPORTED THE RESULTS AS FOLLOWS:

"NORTHERN FARM STATE DEMOCRATS VOTED OVERWHELMINGLY FOR REPEAL
OF 14 (b), WHICH LETS STATES OUTLAW COMPULSORY UNION SHOP CONTRACTS.
THEIR CITY DEMOCRATIC BRETHERN DEMANDED THIS IN EXCHANGE FOR FARM
BILL VOTES. SOUTHERN RURAL DEMOCRATS VOTED 62-3 AGAINST THE REPEALER,
BUT NORTHERN FARM DEMOCRATS WERE 79-6 IN FAVOR OF THE REPEALER.
(WE HAVE USED 30% RURAL POPULATION AS THE BASIS FOR THIS TABULATION.)

"RURAL NORTHERNERS CAN CLAIM CREDIT FOR THE WHOLE 21-VOTE MARGIN
BY WHICH THE REPEALER WAS PASSED, AND THEREFORE ALSO THE RIGHT TO
CITY DEMOCRATIC SUPPORT FOR THE FARM BILL. WITH THE DIRKSEN REAPPOR-
TIONMENT RESOLUTION STALLED IN THE SENATE, CITY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS
ARE WINNING BOTH OF THEIR MAJOR DEMANDS.

"MAJOR FOCUS OF THE ATTACK ON THE FARM BILL MAY SHIFT AS A RESULT
OF THE RIGHT-TO-WORK LAW VOTE. INCREASING THE WHEAT CERTIFICATE VALUE
HAS PREVIOUSLY BEEN MOST OPPOSED. URBAN MEMBERS IRKED BY THE BIG DIXIE
VOTE AGAINST RIGHT-TO-WORK REPEAL ARE NOW DRAWING A BEAD ON THE COTTON
SECTION, WHICH ALREADY HAS TROUBLE A'PLENTY AMONG ITS OWN FOLKS."

AUG 13 1965

-6-

THE QUESTION REMAINS..... WILL THIS YEAR'S DEAL COME OFF?
WILL URBAN DEMOCRATS NOW VOTE FOR THE OMNIBUS FARM BILL? I AM NOT CERTAIN,
BUT WITHIN TWO WEEKS WE WILL KNOW THE ANSWER.

SECOND -- PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGNS DISGUISED AS "INFORMATION" ARE USED BY
THE ADMINISTRATION TO BUILD UP POPULAR SUPPORT.

YOUR ORGANIZATION'S NEWSLETTER OF THIS PAST WEEK CLEARLY SETS FORTH
THE FACTS ON A.S.C.S. LOBBYING. THE DELIVERY OF CHECKS IN PERSON TO FAR-
MERS IN ORDER TO EXPLAIN THE FARM BILL WAS BUT ONE EXAMPLE OF A VARIETY OF
METHODS BEING USED BY THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH. THESE VARIOUS DEVICES, ALWAYS
SHROUDED WITH THE CLOAK OF "INFORMATION SERVICES", ARE USED AT THE GRASS
ROOTS LEVEL AND IN THE CONGRESS ITSELF. MOVIES, TELEVISION, NEWS RELEASES,
PACKETS..... THE WHOLE SCOPE OF COMMUNICATIONS MEDIA IS USED AND, OF COURSE,
PAID FOR BY TAXPAYERS.

THIRD -- PRESIDENTIAL OR WHITE HOUSE INTERVENTION IS USED ON MEMBERS
OF CONGRESS.

THESE TECHNIQUES ARE OF TWO GENERAL CATEGORIES. ONE IS CALLED THE
CARROT, THE OTHER IS CALLED THE STICK. THE CARROT APPROACH IS USUALLY USED
FIRST AND IS OFTEN USED ON MEMBERS OF THE OPPOSITE PARTY.

REMEMBER, BILLIONS OF DOLLARS IN DEFENSE CONTRACTS ARE NEGOTIATED
EVERY YEAR. THERE IS LITTLE DOUBT THAT IN MARGINAL CASES, A MEMBER'S VOTE
ON AN ISSUE MAY DEPEND ON HIS CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT GETTING CERTAIN CONTRACTS.

PUBLIC WORKS, WATERSHED CONTROL PROJECTS, AND FOOD STAMP PROJECTS ARE
OTHER TYPES OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES WHERE APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC
PROJECTS, AT PARTICULAR TIMES, MAY BE DEPENDENT ON A CONGRESSMAN'S SUPPORT
OR OPPOSITION TO A PARTICULAR BILL.

AUG 13 1965

-7-

AN OFT-REPEATED WASHINGTON STORY THIS YEAR CONCERNS A DEMOCRATIC SENATOR WHO WAS CRITICAL OF THE VIET NAM SITUATION. THIS PARTICULAR SENATOR, DURING A WHITE HOUSE VISIT, WAS REPORTEDLY ASKED BY THE PRESIDENT: "WHO GAVE YOU THE MATERIAL YOU ARE USING ON VIET NAM?" THE SENATOR REPLIED: "WALTER LIPPMAN," TO WHICH THE PRESIDENT REPORTEDLY REPLIED: "WELL, THE NEXT TIME YOU WANT A DAM IN YOUR STATE, GO SEE WALTER LIPPMAN."

IF THE CARROT APPROACH DOESN'T WORK, THERE IS ALWAYS THE STICK..... THIS INCLUDES THE DENIAL OF CAMPAIGN FUNDS, THE DENIAL OF THE FACILITIES OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE, PRIMARY OPPOSITION, AND OTHER TACTICS. THIS APPROACH OBVIOUSLY WORKS MUCH MORE EFFECTIVELY ON THE MEMBERS OF THE PRESIDENT'S PARTY THAN ON THE PARTY OUT OF POWER.

YES, THE "INVISIBLE HAND" OF THE EXECUTIVE IS CONSTANTLY IN OPERATION IN THE CONGRESS. THE EFFORTS OFTEN SUCCEED, BUT THOSE WHO WITHSTAND THE PRESSURE ACT BOTH PRUDENTLY AND INDEPENDENTLY. YET THE FACT REMAINS THAT THE "INVISIBLE HAND" OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH IS RAPIDLY GROWING STRONGER WITHIN OUR FEDERAL SYSTEM.

THE DECLINE OF CONGRESS AS A POLICY-MAKING BODY IN RECENT DECADES HAS BEEN WIDELY NOTED IN MANY BOOKS AND ARTICLES. WRITERS VARY IN APPROVING OR CONDEMNING, AS WELL AS IN THEIR ESTIMATES OF THE EXTENT OF THE DECLINE. SOME REGARD THE TREND WITH RESIGNATION: OTHERS BELIEVE IT CAN BE REVERSED. BUT ALL AGREE THAT THE STATURE OF CONGRESS HAS DIMINISHED, THAT ITS POWER HAS DETERIORATED, AND THAT IT HAS BECOME SUBORDINATE IN SIGNIFICANCE TO THE PRESIDENT IN MANY IMPORTANT RESPECTS.

THE EMERGENCE OF THE PRESIDENT AS CHIEF LEGISLATOR IS TRACED BACK TO THE TWO ROOSEVELTS AND WOODROW WILSON. WILSON BROUGHT TO THE PRESIDENCY

AUG 13 1965

-8-

A POSITIVE THEORY OF EXECUTIVE POWER IN WHICH THE PRESIDENT WAS REGARDED AS A KING OR PRIME MINISTER WHOSE DUTY IT WAS TO EXERCISE LEADERSHIP OF CONGRESS IN WORKING TO CARRY THROUGH HIS LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM.

WITH THE COMING OF THE NEW DEAL, CONGRESS BECAME MERELY A JUNIOR PARTNER OF THE EXECUTIVE. THE DETERIORATION OF LEGISLATIVE POWER PROCEEDED ALONG SEVERAL FRONTS UNDER THE AGGRESSIVE ADMINISTRATION OF FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT. THE PRESIDENT ASSUMED PRIMACY AS THE AUTHOR OF THE LEGISLATIVE AGENDA. PARTY LEADERS IN CONGRESS BECAME SPOKESMEN FOR THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM. NUMEROUS INDEPENDENT REGULATORY COMMISSIONS WERE SET UP, WITH QUASI-LEGISLATIVE AS WELL AS QUASI-JUDICIAL FUNCTIONS. THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE APPROPRIATIONS PASSED BY THE LEGISLATURE BECAME FURTHER AND FURTHER REMOVED FROM CONGRESSIONAL SCRUTINY AND CONTROL. AND FOREIGN POLICY, MARKED BY THE INCREASED USE OF THE EXECUTIVE AGREEMENT TO CIRCUMVENT CONGRESS' PREROGATIVES IN TREATY-MAKING, BECAME MORE COMPLETELY THAN EVER A PROVINCE OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH. THE CRISIS OF WORLD WAR II REINFORCED THESE TRENDS, AFTER THE TEMPORARY REVOLT OF CONGRESS DURING THE SECOND ROOSEVELT ADMINISTRATION.

SINCE WORLD WAR II CONGRESS HAS MADE A NUMBER OF EFFORTS TO REGAIN SOME OF ITS FORMER STATURE IN THE GOVERNMENTAL POWER SYSTEM. BUT IT HAS BEEN HINDERED BY ITS DEFICIENCIES IN A PERIOD IN WHICH FOREIGN POLICY HAS OVERSHADOWED ALL OTHER ISSUES ON THE AMERICAN POLITICAL HORIZON.

WE SHOULD REMEMBER, THOUGH, THAT IN FRAMING THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION AT PHILADELPHIA IN 1787, THE FOUNDING FATHERS SET UP A SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT THAT PROVIDED FOR LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL POWERS AND ASSIGNED THEIR EXERCISE TO SEPARATE BRANCHES OF THE GOVERNMENT IN WASHINGTON. EACH BRANCH WAS GIVEN SOME CHECKS ON THE OTHER TWO, SO THAT WE HAVE A SYSTEM OF

AUG 13 1965

-9-

SEPARATED BRANCHES AND SHARED POWERS. THE FRAMERS DELIBERATELY INTERMINGLED THE POWERS OF THE THREE DEPARTMENTS TO THE EXTENT NECESSARY, IN THEIR JUDGMENT, TO ENABLE EACH TO DEFEND ITSELF AGAINST THE OTHERS. THE RESULT IS BETTER DESCRIBED AS A SYSTEM OF CHECKS AND BALANCES AS WELL AS A SYSTEM OF SEPARATED POWERS.

THIS SYSTEM OF CHECKS AND BALANCES HAS CAUSED RIVALRY, SUSPICION, AND HOSTILITY BETWEEN CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT AT INTERVALS THROUGHOUT OUR NATIONAL HISTORY. AT THIS POINT I WOULD REMIND YOU THAT THE SYSTEM OF CHECKS AND BALANCES IS SERIOUSLY THREATENED AS A RESULT OF THE U. S. SUPREME COURT'S DECISION OF JUNE 15, 1964. THE SO-CALLED "ONE-MAN, ONE-VOTE" DECISION IS A STRIKING EXAMPLE, IN MY OPINION, OF JUDICIAL LEGISLATION, AND THE RELUCTANCE OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH TO EXERT ANY EFFORTS TO STAVE OFF THE IMPACT OF THIS DECISION IS SOMEWHAT RELATED TO MY SPECIFIC TOPIC THIS AFTERNOON.

SIMPLY, THE ISSUE AT THIS POINT IS WHETHER THIS CONGRESS WILL GIVE STATES THE OPPORTUNITY TO RATIFY OR REJECT AN AMENDMENT WHICH WOULD PERMIT THEM, UNDER CERTAIN WELL-DESCRIBED CONDITIONS, TO APPORTION ONE LEGISLATIVE BODY OF A BICAMERAL LEGISLATURE CONSIDERING FACTORS OTHER THAN POPULATION. THE "INVISIBLE" HANDS IN THIS BATTLE HAVE BEEN THE SO-CALLED LIBERALS, THE BEST EXAMPLE BEING THE CHAIRMAN OF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, EMANUEL CELLER OF NEW YORK, WHO HAS BEEN DOING EVERYTHING IMAGINABLE AND PERHAPS INVISIBLE TO EXTEND THE HEARINGS AND OTHERWISE DELAY A SHOWDOWN ON THE REAPPORTIONMENT BILLS, INCLUDING MINE, PENDING IN HIS COMMITTEE. THE WILL OF THE MAJORITY IN CONGRESS IS BEING FRUSTRATED BECAUSE OF "INVISIBLE" PRESSURES BROUGHT TO BEAR ON THE SO-CALLED "LIBERALS" IN CONGRESS BY LABOR LEADERS, CIVIL RIGHTS

AUG 13 1965

-10-

LEADERS, AND BIG CITY POLITICAL BOSSES. IT SEEMS STRANGE THAT THIS CONGRESS SHOULD REFUSE TO GIVE STATES THE OPPORTUNITY TO RATIFY AN AMENDMENT AND SHOULD REFUSE TO GIVE THE PEOPLE IN EACH STATE THE RIGHT TO VOTE ON A PLAN OF LEGISLATIVE REAPPORTIONMENT, FOR, IN EFFECT, THEY ARE SAYING THE PEOPLE OF KANSAS AND THE OTHER 49 STATES CANNOT BE TRUSTED OR DO NOT KNOW WHAT THEY ARE DOING. SO BY DOING NOTHING, THIS BLOCK OF LIBERALS IN THE U. S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND THE U. S. SENATE ARE PREVENTING ACTION ON THE MOST IMPORTANT DOMESTIC ISSUE OF OUR TIME. LET ME REMIND YOU THAT THESE ARE THE SAME SELF-STYLED CHAMPIONS OF MINORITY GROUPS AND CHAMPIONS OF THE RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE WILLING TO CHOKE RURAL AMERICA WITH THEIR "INVISIBLE" HANDS. THE POINT IS THAT WE HAVE "INVISIBLE" HANDS NOT ONLY IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH, BUT IN THE LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIAL BRANCHES OF OUR GOVERNMENT AS WELL. IN THIS PARTICULAR INSTANCE, IT APPEARS TO ME THAT A VERY FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT OF AMERICANS IS BEING DESTROYED BY A NUMERICAL MINORITY OF THE MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, FOR AS YOU KNOW, OUR CONSTITUTION REQUIRES A 2/3 VOTE IN THE HOUSE AND SENATE BEFORE A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT MAY BE SUBMITTED TO THE STATES FOR RATIFICATION. THERE HAVE BEEN REPORTS OF "BEHIND-THE-SCENES" ACTIVITY BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY AND OTHER ADMINISTRATION LEADERS TO BURY THE REAPPORTIONMENT ISSUE. MANY OF US STILL HAVE HOPE THAT CONGRESS WILL EXERT ITSELF AND PERMIT THE PEOPLE TO DECIDE THIS VITAL ISSUE. THOSE OF YOU WHO CHECKED THE VOTE ON THE "DIRKSEN AMENDMENT" IN THE SENATE ON AUGUST 4 MAY HAVE BEEN SURPRISED TO FIND RURAL SENATORS SUCH AS MC GOVERN OF SOUTH DAKOTA, BURDICK OF NORTH DAKOTA, MC GEE OF WYOMING, NELSON AND PROXMIRE OF WISCONSIN, MC CARTHY AND MONDALE OF MINNESOTA, BAYH AND HARTKE OF INDIANA, YARBOROUGH OF TEXAS, AND ANDERSON AND MONTOYA OF NEW MEXICO LINED UP AGAINST WHAT, IN MY OPINION, IS IN THE INTEREST OF THEIR OWN STATES.

AUG 13 1965

-11-

THIS POINTS UP THE DIFFICULTY AND THE TREMENDOUS ODDS OTHER SENATORS, DEMOCRAT AND REPUBLICAN, FACE IN OBTAINING A FAVORABLE VOTE ON THIS VITAL ISSUE BEFORE ADJOURNMENT.

I PERHAPS HAVE STRAYED FAR AFIELD FROM MY TOPIC, BUT DO FEEL THE ISSUE OF REAPPORTIONMENT IS THE MOST IMPORTANT DOMESTIC ISSUE BEFORE CONGRESS, AND IT IS MOST FRUSTRATING TO SEE THIS SESSION SLIPPING AWAY WITHOUT ACTION ON THIS IMPORTANT PROPOSAL.

AS FARM BUREAU LEADERS INTERESTED IN PROGRESS, THESE "BEHIND-THE-SCENES" ACTIVITIES NOT ONLY CONCERN YOU, BUT UNDOUBTEDLY ARE DISCOURAGING AT TIMES. THIS ACTIVITY IS NOT SOMETHING NEW, NOR IS IT CONFINED TO CONGRESS, BUT IT DOES SEEM TO BE INCREASING AS THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CONTINUES TO PLAY A LARGER AND LARGER ROLE IN THE LIVES OF EVERYONE. IN MY FIVE YEARS' EXPERIENCE IN CONGRESS AS A MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, I HAVE BEEN FRANKLY DISTURBED MANY, MANY TIMES BECAUSE OF THE SPLINTERING OF FARM GROUPS AND BECAUSE AT TIMES MEMBERS OF THIS COMMITTEE ARE CAUGHT IN THE MIDDLE OF WHAT APPEARS TO BE IMPOSSIBLE SITUATIONS.

GENERAL FARM ORGANIZATIONS HAVE PERFORMED MANY VALUABLE FUNCTIONS OVER THE YEARS, AND IT MAY BE OF INTEREST TO NOTE CHANGES IN POSITIONS OVER THE YEARS. IN 1938 THE FARM BUREAU FAVORED PRODUCTION CONTROLS FOR AGRICULTURE, WHILE THE GRANGE AND OTHER FARM GROUPS OPPOSED CONTROLS AS "REGIMENTATION" OF FARMERS. IN 1938 THE CHAIRMEN OF BOTH THE HOUSE AND SENATE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEES OPPOSED CONTROLS AND REFUSED TO INTRODUCE THE FARM BUREAU-ADMINISTRATION-SPONSORED MEASURE. TODAY THE FARM BUREAU-SPONSORED MEASURES USUALLY PROVIDE FOR LESSENING CONTROLS, BUT THE CHAIRMEN OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE COMMITTEES ON AGRICULTURE NOW FAVOR CONTROLS AND HENCE, FARM BUREAU PROPOSALS ARE GIVEN LITTLE CONSIDERATION.

AUG 13 1965

-12-

DESPITE THE CHANGES IN ATTITUDES WHICH HAVE TAKEN PLACE OVER THE YEARS, I WOULD ASSUME THAT EVERYONE HERE IS DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY INTERESTED IN THE SO-CALLED "OMNIBUS" FARM BILL WHICH WILL BE CONSIDERED ON THE HOUSE FLOOR NEXT WEEK. THIS BILL CONTAINS SEVEN DIFFERENT TITLES AND DEALS NOT ONLY WITH WHEAT, FEED GRAINS, COTTON, DAIRY PRODUCTS AND WOOL, BUT ALSO HAS A CROPLAND ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM AND A MISCELLANEOUS SECTION DEALING WITH BOILED PEANUTS, TOBACCO ALLOTMENTS, AND AUTHORIZATION FOR A STUDY ON THE PARITY OF INCOME POSITION OF FARMERS. THERE ARE SOME HERE WHO ARE OPPOSED TO THE ENTIRE BILL, OTHERS WHO MAY FAVOR THE OMNIBUS APPROACH, AND YET OTHERS LIKELY OPPOSE CERTAIN SECTIONS AND APPROVE OTHERS. YOU CAN IMAGINE THE DILEMMA FACED BY A MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM AN AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT IN DETERMINING WHETHER TO OPPOSE OR SUPPORT THIS MEASURE. MANY "INVISIBLE" HANDS HAVE BEEN AT WORK IN SHAPING THIS LEGISLATION, AND QUITE FRANKLY, "BEHIND-THE-SCENES" ACTIVITIES ARE IN FULL SWING ON CAPITOL HILL NOW AS LEADERS DETERMINE IF THEY HAVE THE VOTES TO PASS THE BILL AND BEAT BACK ALL AMENDMENTS THEY FEEL ARE UNDESIRABLE.

IT WOULD TAKE A WEEK TO FULLY EXPLAIN EACH OF THE TITLES, BUT AS A MEMBER OF THE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE, I HAVE LISTENED TO HOURS OF TESTIMONY AND HAVE PARTICIPATED IN MANY EFFORTS TO IMPROVE THE BILL. IN MY OPINION, THE "OMNIBUS" FARM BILL WILL BE ENACTED WITH SOME MODIFICATIONS. NATURALLY, I AM INTERESTED IN AN AMENDMENT I PLAN TO OFFER WHICH WOULD RAISE THE RESALE FORMULA ON SALE OF CCC STOCKS OF WHEAT FROM 105% OF THE CURRENT SUPPORT PRICE, PLUS CARRYING CHARGES, TO 115%. PASSAGE OF FARM LEGISLATION IS NEVER EASY, AT BEST, SO THE "INVISIBLE" HANDS OF BOTH THE EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE BRANCHES OF OUR GOVERNMENT ARE IN FOR A BUSY WEEK.