

out that in the more than 40 years we have had active intervention in agriculture by government, without exception, without exception the action by federal government was designed not to place dollars in the pockets of farmers but to keep on hand a plentiful supply of healthy, wholesome food for two hundred plus million people below the cost of production. It was cheaper to a certain extent to subsidize a certain portion of agriculture than to allow the market system to fluctuate. I am going to say something on this floor that will shock you today. I would prefer there would be no farm program, no farm program whatsoever, than the one that has been passed by the Congress in 1985, notwithstanding the pronouncements of my good friends in the Congress, to the contrary. Let me tell you why. I prefer, and I know Senator Chambers will agree with me on this, I prefer unorganized chaos to organized poverty, and organized poverty is what you have in the present program. I saw in this morning's newspaper that the budget committee said we are going to have to get by without any wage increases for state employees and I am concerned about that. Let me tell you something. The federal farm program today drops the loan rate for corn from 2.54 a bushel to \$1.92. Gramm-Rudman drops that to \$1.84. You have to pay for the storage. That takes off 27 cents. That leaves it \$1.57. You leave 20 percent of your land lay idle to qualify. You are down to a buck and a quarter and then you go begging to the federal government for what they call a deficiency payment. Tell a state employee, tell a federal employee, tell anyone else, we'll pay you half what you are worth and then you go to the Treasury and beg the Congress, who really doesn't know what is going on, for a deficiency payment. We have had five or six various embargoes, without exception, one of them supposedly to punish the Russians for invading Afghanistan. The rest were to hold down the price of food for consumers and each time we did it we created a new enterprise in Brazil, in Argentina, China. Those countries today are all food exporting nations. One time they were not. Now the irony of this whole thing, and I hope I don't run out of time, the irony of this whole thing is this. There isn't a person on this floor, I don't think, who really believes that the passage of Initiative 300 has helped farmers, nor is there anyone here who really believes that if we repeal it, it is going to hurt farmers. It has become a strawman, a symbol, something around which people rally because in the days of the Roman circuses we took...the emperor took the minds of the people off their