

Chapter IX

Administration

On November 30, 1963, one week after taking the oath of office, President Lyndon B. Johnson gave a clear statement of the goals and direction of his policy on management. In a memorandum to heads of Departments and agencies, he wrote: 1/

I have pledged that the Executive Branch will be administered with the utmost thrift and frugality; that the Government will get a dollar's value for a dollar spent; and that the Government will set an example of prudence and economy.

To carry out this pledge, I intend: --To examine agency budget requests with the determination to hold the 1965 Budget to the barest minimum consistent with the efficient discharge of our domestic and foreign responsibilities. . . .

To assist me in carrying out my pledge, I ask you: --To assume personal day-to-day responsibility for making your agency a model of good management and economical administration.

. . . There are as many savings to be made in the future as have ever been made in the past. The citizen's faith in free government is strongly influenced by the extent of his confidence that public servants are alert and efficient in conserving the Nation's resources entrusted to their care. For this reason, we must work hard to reduce the costs of Government, not only for the sake of the savings to be made, but also in the interest of vindicating the people's confidence in the institutions of democracy.

1/ Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, 1963-64, Vol. I, p. 15.

- 2 -

This emphasis on economy and efficiency as an end as well as a means of serving the public interest was to continue as a major theme of the Johnson Administration. Most written communications to the Department signed by the President, rather than a member of his staff, were concerned with cost reduction. The President's two personal visits to the Department were for the purpose of honoring employees for cost reduction.

The Department had been carrying on a vigorous management improvement and cost reduction program as a part of effective and efficient program administration but attention had been primarily focused on the scope of the Department's responsibility to meet the needs of an expanding population. 1/

Secretary Freeman had recommended in a March 29, 1963 letter, enactment of a bill to establish an additional office of Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. He called attention to the great increase in responsibility of the Department of Agriculture since the positions of two Assistant Secretaries and an Administrative Assistant Secretary had been authorized. The increased responsibility was, Mr. Freeman had said, reflected in an increase of 130 percent in budget expenditures from around \$3.2 billion in fiscal year 1953 to about \$7.5 billion in fiscal year 1963. It was also reflected in an increase in employment of 53 percent during this period, an increase from 62,000 average

1/ Memorandum to The President from Orville L. Freeman, December 11, 1963; In: Orville L. Freeman Chronological File in Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

annual positions to over 95,000 positions. 1/

The Department's responsibility, Mr. Freeman said, had grown in response to the increasing needs of a growing population in farm, rural, and urban areas. Increased responsibility to farmers, rural residents, and consumers in the United States was occurring along with increased responsibility for food and technical service to people in underdeveloped areas of the world.

Although the job of Secretary of Agriculture was one of the toughest assignments in the Government, the Secretary had fewer top level assistants than any other member of the Cabinet. The Department of Agriculture had five positions at the Under Secretary and Assistant Secretary level compared with 13 for the State Department, 10 for the Justice Department, 7 for the Treasury Department and 6 for the Post Office, Interior, Commerce and Labor Departments.

Secretary Freeman found the "thrift and frugality policy of budgeting" would cut deeply into the programs which he had relied on for the Department's attack on rural poverty, first called "widening participation in prosperity." 2/

1/ U. S. Congress, 88th, 1st Sess., House of Representatives, Committee on Agriculture, Hearings on . . . Establishment of Additional Office of Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, April 26 and May 6, 1963, pp. 2 and 3.

2/ Memorandum to Charles S. Murphy from Walter W. Heller, November 18, 1963; In: John A. Schnittker Chronological File in Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

- 4 -

In a December 6, memorandum, Secretary Freeman evaluated his conference with the Director and staff of the Bureau of the Budget.

He wrote: 1/

In relation to Rural Area Development I made a strong pitch. Gordon said he was not convinced this would work, neither was he prejudiced. He agreed with our plan of pilot projects to prove the workability of this program and then subsequent appropriations if it developed satisfactorily.

I pointed out that under research, conservation and development, and also under rural renewal, that the fund allotments were indeed miserly and that they would hardly do more than provide for some planning and technical assistance where we would like to make some loans. I again mentioned that we were shaping all the programs in the Department to try and contribute to the goal of new economic activity in the community, but that we did need a few nickels or dimes if we were going to give even the pilot projects a chance to prove themselves.

They asked exactly what I wanted and I said we ought to have a million or two more dollars on those programs to at least encourage us and to show people in the field and around the country that this program was being taken seriously.

Secretary Freeman in a December 11, 1963 memorandum to the President protested that the Department of Agriculture had been a "political punching bag" for a long time. He wrote: 2/

1/ Orville L. Freeman, Conservation and discussion with the Bureau of the Budget, December 6, 1965, Memorandum for Files; In: Orville L. Freeman Chronological File in Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

2/ Memorandum to the President from Orville L. Freeman, December 11, 1963; In: Orville L. Freeman Chronological File in Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

- 5 -

Your comments to me this morning when I left your office about the number of employees and potential increases in the Department of Agriculture concerned me deeply. My concern does not represent personal sensitivity, but the truth is that Agriculture, the farmer and this Department have been a convenient political punching bag for a long, long time as you well know. Therefore, I am taking the liberty to set down a few simple facts and figures in this brief note which I hope will be helpful as you make final judgments on the budget for this Department.

1. As it now stands, we will have cut expenditures in the Agricultural budget from the 1964 estimate of \$7,466 million down to \$5,947 million, or approximately \$1½ billion. Where NOA is concerned, there will be a \$220 million increase, but this is occasioned by the need to reinstate the capital in the Commodity Credit Corporation previously expended. We have worked very hard to cut back our budget and have cooperated and will continue to make every effort to do so with the Bureau.

2. Manpower - Year-end manpower figures, rather than average annual positions, tend to make the Department of Agriculture look bad. The current estimates for example for 1964 is 116,800 at the end of the 1964 fiscal year. A worse date could not be selected to make us look bad, for we have many part-time employees in the Nation's forests, making crop estimates, working on conservation projects, etc.

It is sometimes said that the Department of Agriculture has increased its personnel more rapidly than other Departments of our Federal Government. Facts do not bear this out. When actual 1962 employment figures are compared with the fiscal 1964 estimates initially submitted, at least five other Cabinet Departments of the Government had a greater percentage manpower increase than the Department of Agriculture. . . .

Following the December 11 meeting with the President, the Department carried out an intensive review of the budget over a four day period. Each division in the Department was asked to list its priorities in terms of on-going programs. Secretary Freeman forwarded the resulting adjustments in the budget to the Bureau of the Budget on

December 18, 1963. 1/

The sacrifices were being recommended, he wrote, with what he believed to be the assurance that the Department of Agriculture was not being asked to bear more than its fair share of the sacrifices needed. A number of programs being held back or cut back were, in the Secretary's judgment, vital to the national economy and to the development of natural and human resources. Secretary Freeman wrote that he hoped both the political situation and the state of the economy would soon allow resumption of the scheduled progress critical to meeting the Nation's needs.

In the judgment of the House Committee on Appropriations, the Department of Agriculture received a greater reduction in appropriated funds, as submitted in budget estimates, "than the sum total for all departments in the Federal Government." 2/ Specific budget cuts have been discussed in earlier chapters covering the Department's functions.

The President's memorandum of November 30, 1963 on budget re-examination, was followed on December 25, 1963 by a memorandum on the control of Federal employment, and on January 17, 1964 by a request for a thorough and careful review of publications. President Johnson asked, at a Cabinet Meeting, for a report on the savings that could be

1/ Letter to Kermit Gordon from Orville L. Freeman, December 18, 1963; In: Orville L. Freeman Chronological File in Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

2/ U. S. Congress, 88th, 2nd Sess., House of Representatives, Committee on Appropriations, Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1965, Report No. 1387, May 8, 1964, p. 2.

made by eliminating publications. 1/ Cost reduction was again stressed at a Cabinet meeting on May 2, 1964. 2/ In June, President Johnson announced a new program of Presidential awards for employees and units **making** substantial improvements in management. 3/ The citations were to be given in addition to monetary or honorary awards previously authorized. Secretary Freeman gave the Administrative Assistant Secretary responsibility for developing the details and administering the program in the Department of Agriculture. To be eligible for an award the idea or contribution had to be put into effect between July 1, 1963 and November 30, 1964. The Department's Inspector General, Lester P. Condon, assigned a member of his staff to research the cost reduction system of the Department of Defense.

Joseph M. Robertson, Administrative Assistant Secretary, wrote to agency heads that he was impressed with the Defense Department's program but was convinced that with the proper use of imagination in the reflecting/Department's day to day cost reduction program it would compare favorably with that of any other government agency. 4/

1/ Memorandum to Joe Robertson and Tom Hughes from The Secretary, January 17, 1964. In: Orville L. Freeman, Chronological File in Lyndon Baines Johnson Library.

2/ Memorandum to The Secretary, Cost Reduction, from Lester P. Condon, Inspector General, May 11, 1964. In: Files of the Agricultural History Branch of the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

3/ Orville L. Freeman, Memorandum to All Employees of the Department of Agriculture, Presidential Citation for Economy and Efficiency, June 29, 1964. In: Files of the Agricultural History Branch of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

4/ Joseph M. Robertson, Memorandum to Heads of Department Agencies, Cost Reduction, November 17, 1964. In: Files of Agricultural History Branch of the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

The Department set up a Departmental Task Force on work measurement during December 1963. A report of the study with recommendations was sent to the Administrative Assistant Secretary during May 1964. 1/ Agencies were asked to submit comments on the report and plans for action on the recommendations by July 31, 1964. 2/

The following recommendations were included in the Task Force's report: 3/

All agencies and all offices in the Department of Agriculture should be encouraged to use or continue using work measurement systems wherever they are practical and useful to apply.

All agencies should proceed with the development and refinement of productivity indexes, or where this cannot be done, with the development and refinement of partial productivity indexes.

The Secretary of Agriculture, in his capacity as administrator of the Department, should be provided with summaries of data collected by work measurement systems...in the agencies and offices.

There is need for systematic interchange of information about work measurement, as well as other phases of management work, between the agencies and offices of the Department.

Supervisors throughout the Department should be trained in the use of management techniques, including work simplification, distribution, scheduling, and measurement.

1/ Memorandum to Joseph M. Robertson from William R. Van Dersal, The Departmental Task Force on Work Measurement, May 1964. In: Files of the Office of Personnel, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

2/ Orville L. Freeman Memorandum to Heads of Department Agencies, Report by Departmental Task Force on Work Measurement, July 6, 1964. In: Orville L. Freeman Chronological File in Lyndon Baines Johnson Library.

3/ Work Measurement in the United States Department of Agriculture, A Report prepared by the Department Task Force on work measurement.
In: Files of Office of Personnel, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

In order to further the implementation of work measurement in the agencies and to improve utilization of the data...staff offices of the Secretary [should] ... analyze and summarize for the Secretary the data supplied by the agencies.... Establish department-wide consistency....

There is need to express gains in efficiency in terms that express them correctly.... So-called dollar 'savings' resulting from management improvement work have recently been impounded by the Bureau of the Budget or cut from the budget submissions to the Congress. We believe this has happened because of a misunderstanding of what these improvements actually were.

By December 31, 1964, Secretary Freeman was able to report marked progress in the Department's cost saving campaign. 1/
He estimated that a reorganization and rationalization of science and research would result in an estimated savings of \$8 million. Savings from combining meat and poultry inspection services ranged from one half to one million dollars. Mr. Freeman estimated a total saving of more than \$1 billion at a time when service was expanded. He called attention to a very sharp decrease in the number of employees in the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

On April 23, 1965, Vice President Humphrey presented Presidential citations to employees and units of the Department of Agriculture for effecting significant cost reductions in the Department's work. 2/

1/ Memorandum to The President, Economy Efficiency, Reorganization, from Orville L. Freeman, December 31, 1964. In: Orville L. Freeman, Chronological Files in Lyndon Baines Johnson Library.

2/ U.S. Department of Agriculture, Background Information, Presidential Citation Award Ceremony, U.S. Department of Agriculture Press Release, April 23, 1965. In: Files of the Agricultural History Branch of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Speaking at the ceremony, Secretary Freeman said that improvements made in management operations of the Department over the last four years were valued at over one billion dollars. This saving was the largest achieved by any of the non-defense Cabinet level departments. Improvement management practices had made it possible to reverse a rise in employment which had been almost continuous for a decade. 1/

Productivity per man hour in the Department had been steadily rising. Improved methods included adoption of automatic data processing methods.

Paper work costs had been cut by about \$370,000 a year by eliminating 119 reports and improving 149 others. A major consolidation of Soil Conservation Service field staffs and units into four Regional Technical Service centers would save over \$133,000 in fiscal 1965 and more than \$373,000 in fiscal 1966.

President Johnson came to the Department for cost reduction ceremonies on April 5, 1966 and on April 2, 1968. 2/ In 1968 he told the employees receiving awards, "I believe that this Department is manned by the most dedicated people I know in Government -- who are working every day for efficiency, for cost effectiveness."

1/ U.S. Department of Agriculture, Background Information, Presidential Citation Award Ceremony, U. S. Department of Agriculture Press Release, April 23, 1965. In: Files of the Agricultural History Branch of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

2/ U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of Personnel. Cost Reductions USDA 1968; and U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of Personnel. The Department of Agriculture and the President Join in the War on Waste, 1966. In: Files of Agricultural History Branch, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Memorandum to The President from Orville L. Freeman, June 30, 1967; Memorandum to The President from John A. Schnittker, March 6, 1967; Memorandum to the President from Orville L. Freeman, February 9, 1967. In: Files of Agricultural History Branch, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

In recognition of Secretary Freeman's contribution to cost reduction, President Johnson had appointed him, on March 25, 1968, to serve on the Council on Cost Reduction in Government. The President wrote, " I am confident that the Council will benefit from your close association with the phenomenal productivity gains made by American farmers and also from the very effective cost reduction program that you have fostered in the Department of Agriculture." 1/

Secretary Freeman's study of political science and his administrative experience from serving three terms as Governor of Minnesota had grounded him in experience which he applied to the budget process and to broader phases of administering the Department of Agriculture.

The interest in administration had also been reflected in the selection of top staff which included political scientists with experience in State government as Administrative Assistant Secretary, executive assistant to the Secretary, and special assistant to the Secretary.

Early in 1964, Secretary Freeman began working with Administrative Assistant Secretary Robertson and Executive Assistant Hughes on clarifying administrative relationships and responsibilities in the Office of the Secretary. 2/ In the final analysis, Mr. Freeman wrote, the Secretary had to be responsible for everything that took place in the Department. But the Under Secretary and the Secretary spoke as

1/ Letter to Orville L. Freeman, from Lyndon B. Johnson, March 25, 1968. In: Selected Secretary's Files in Lyndon Baines Johnson Library.

2/ Memorandum to Tom Hughes from the Secretary, March 28, 1964; Memorandum to the Under Secretary and others from the Secretary, April 22, 1964; Memorandum to the Under Secretary and others from The Secretary, April 13, 1964. In: Orville L. Freeman, Chronological File in Lyndon Baines Johnson Library.

- 12 -

one person. The decision of either was to be accepted and immediately implemented. Responsibility for communication between them was their own responsibility.

As President of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Under Secretary's special area of responsibility was "domestic and foreign commodity programs, including price supports, purchases, loans, storage and our efforts to maintain a balanced overall commodity program." The Under Secretary's responsibility also included Food for Peace programs and commercial trade. As Chairman of the Budget Committee and Program Review Board, the Under Secretary was responsible for program and budget development.

The Secretary gave personal attention to other areas of operation in the Department with special emphasis on rural areas development and related programs "such as OEO and Appalachia, natural resources, international agricultural affairs, disaster emergencies, civil defense, research, public relations, etc."

The staff of the Secretary was to also serve the Under Secretary. They were to act as the "eyes, ears, and expeditors. There should be no uneasiness but instead positive cooperation when members of the staff contact and work with people in operating agencies some levels below the Administrators." Matters taken up with the Secretary and Under Secretary were, wherever possible, to be checked with appropriate staff people. When staff and operating people failed to reach agreement, the question was to be taken through regular channels for consideration and decision of the Secretary or Under Secretary.

In addition to serving the Secretary in staff capacity, Assistant Secretaries and Directors had the following responsibilities:

- (a) John A. Baker -- rural areas development, natural resources, co-ops, 'War on Poverty', agricultural credit.
- (b) George L. Mehren -- marketing, food use, consumers, National Marketing Commission.
- (c) Dorothy H. Jacobson -- international agricultural affairs -- including trade, technical assistance, aid, P.L. 480 and related areas.
- (d) Willard W. Cochrane -- economics, statistics, program adviser to the Secretary.
- (e) Nyle C. Brady -- research, science and educational matters.
- (f) Joseph M. Robertson -- personnel, budget, administrative services, and general management problems within the Department.

Staff Assistants had the following areas of responsibility:

- (a) Tom Hughes serves as Executive Assistant to the Secretary and is his personal contact man on sensitive matters. All questions involving matters of policy sensitivity where the Secretary is concerned should be checked with Tom Hughes.
- (b) James Sundquist functioning as Deputy Under Secretary of Agriculture will carry out staff assignments directed by the Secretary and Under Secretary. He will have special responsibilities in rural areas development, 'War on Poverty', natural resources and related matters. He will also work closely with the Secretary and Rod Leonard in preparing statements, testimony, and speeches. He will assume many of the staff duties formerly performed by Dorothy Jacobson.
- (c) John Bagwell is the chief lawyer for the Department and works closely with the Secretary, Under Secretary, Assistant Secretaries, and Agency Heads on all matters involving actual or potential legal questions.

(d) Lester P. Condon, as Inspector General serving under the direct supervision of the Secretary, is responsible for the development and conduct of a comprehensive program of department-wide internal audits and investigations.

(e) Ken Birkhead and his staff serve as the focal point in the Department for legislative contacts. He should be kept current on all developments in the Congress affecting the entire Department. He is to give service to people on the Hill and to interpret the Department's programs there. He will maintain the Department's White House contacts on matters involving legislation.

John Bagwell, Ed Jaenke, John Schnittker, Bob Lewis and others may be called upon to work with Ken Birkhead in the field of legislation and outside liaison.

(f) Robert S. Reed serves as a special Assistant to the Secretary responsible for Department coordination of defense mobilization planning and for natural disaster programs.

(g) Rod Leonard is Press Secretary to the Secretary. He has prime responsibility for the preparation of materials for public and Congressional appearances. He also serves as a general trouble shooter. He should be contacted on anything spoken or written with important public relations implications. In addition, he works with the information media inside the Department and outside the Department to improve the image of American agriculture.

(h) Byron G. Allen maintains contacts with State Departments of Agriculture and other State and federal agencies in the field of inter-governmental relations generally. Anything affecting our relations with State Departments of Agriculture should be coordinated carefully with Byron Allen.

(i) George Barnes has continuing responsibility for improving the image of the Department with Washington news media and specific assignments in the public relations of the trade negotiations, pesticides investigations, and will serve as Departmental coordinator for interviews and material to be supplied to the Kennedy Library.

(j) John Schnittker, a member of Willard Cochrane's Staff Economists Group, also serves the Secretary and the Under Secretary in a staff capacity with special assignments on trade and commodity programs.

- 15 -

(k) Thomas J. Flavin, as Judicial Officer, serves for the Secretary of Agriculture as the final deciding officer in regulatory proceedings of an adjudicative nature subject to sections 7 and 8 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

(l) Donald A. Norberg, in the office of Thomas R. Hughes, serves as a special assistant on the Secretary's staff.

(m) Audrey Warren, the Secretary's personal secretary, handles his appointment calendar and in cooperation with Ken Birkhead, Rod Leonard and Tom Hughes, coordinates and schedules appearances outside of Washington.

(n) As in the past, from time to time, personnel in line assignments will be asked to take a special project for the Secretary in some of the more sensitive areas such as commodity programs, legislation on the Hill, trade negotiations, etc.

The memorandum directed that correspondence referred from the White House, prominent members of Congressional Committees, and presidents of farm organizations be given first priority and handled with maximum dispatch. Congressional correspondence, by order of the White House, was to be acknowledged in three days.

The Secretary's office was to be alerted in advance of major policy decisions and problems before being referred to the Secretary for final decision. The Secretary's office had been confronted with problems which had already reached a deadline for a decision. It was essential that this situation be avoided.

A bimonthly report of special events, progress, unusual developments, ^{and} anticipated problems was to be made to the Secretary.

- 16 -

The memorandum concluded: "No organization can be better than its people. We have wonderful people. So that the talents of all may be used to the maximum we must arrange our working relationships to accomplish maximum communications and efficiency. This clarification of line and staff responsibility is issued to serve that purpose."

The problem of insuring that decisions made and actions taken by agencies and by Assistant Secretaries were in line with Department goals and policies as defined by the Secretary was a continuing one. Agency heads and Assistant Secretaries tended to become spokesmen for their agencies and the special interests and Congressmen willing to back their particular programs rather than representatives of a Department-wide policy as defined by the Secretary.

Secretary Freeman followed the memorandum on June 19, 1964, with a memorandum to top staff personnel setting up a luncheon to discuss staff and line relationships. 1/ The memorandum called attention to dual staff and line responsibility. The Secretary stressed the importance of overall responsibility to the Department. He wrote:

1/ Memorandum to Under Secretary Murphy, John Baker, George Mehren, Joe Robertson, Nyle Brady, Willard Cochrane, Tom Hughes, John Schnittker, Jim Sundquist, George Barnes, Rod Leonard, Ken Birkhead, Horace Godfrey, and John Bagwell from The Secretary, June 19, 1964; In: Orville L. Freeman Chronological File in Lyndon Baines Johnson Library.

- 17 -

Each of you has primarily an overall Departmental responsibility. Your operational responsibility comes second to your Department-wide responsibilities which might be termed staff rather than line in nature. This as well as the specifics of day to day operations, communications, and systems currently followed to reach policy decisions and to seek to avoid undue delay, failure to consider all viewpoints, and the danger of overlooking some issues of prime importance, all need to be reviewed.

Secretary Freeman continued to give attention to the problem of the staff and operating responsibilities within the Department. The memorandum on staff and line relationships was revised and reissued in 1965 and 1968. 1/

The problem of staff and line relationships as well as the establishment of priorities to give direction and leadership to staff and operating people in the Department was also a major concern of Administrative Assistant Secretary Robertson. Budget decisions needed to be made among competing agency programs in the light of priorities in Department-wide policy objectives.

1/ Memorandums dated July 8, 1965 and March 6, 1968; In: Orville L. Freeman Chronological File in Lyndon Baines Johnson Library.

In a June 29, 1964 memorandum to the Administrative Assistant Secretary, Mr. Freeman discussed some of the problems. 1/

I hope we can carefully plan the budget process this year so we can work out an efficient approach to both policy, and also nuts and bolts management, housekeeping decision making.

Fundamentally I've been thinking a good deal about your charge that I, myself, was not thinking in terms of priorities and, therefore, not giving a sharp or clear enough focus of direction within the Department. There is merit in what you say.

Basically I have not been able to give enough time to the budget making process. I cannot give the time to go through housekeeping details. We really need to separate the housekeeping details and the real policy decisions as to where we're going to invest to get the best return for the dollar in reaching our program objectives. Our budget people have been unwilling to make recommendations along this line, confining themselves basically to the housekeeping side of it and to informing those who are supposed to make policy decisions but find it difficult in light of inadequate exposure in depth to what is going on. So somehow we've got to work out a more workable pattern to reach our twin goals.

At this time John Schnittker is going ahead with a very basic kind of study, an analysis to set down on a policy and program level what is and what ought to be. Discussions on commodity programs and also other program objectives have been going forward with which you are familiar.

1/ Memorandum to Joe Robertson from The Secretary, June 29, 1964.
In: **Orville L. Freeman** Chronological File in Lyndon Baines Johnson Library.

All of this really needs to be integrated into a carefully planned budget making process. I haven't gotten completely clear in my mind how to do this, but it would be ideal if at a given place in the proceeding, perhaps at a second hearing for each Agency Head, inclusive attention was focused on priorities, policy and program, and we in light of some housekeeping background could then probe in depth and try and get the real feeling as to how effective the given operation was in terms of reaching certain policy goals. At such a session perhaps both Mr. Murphy and myself should be present -- maybe others as well, we can talk about that.

This whole new approach ought to be, I think, reviewed by the overall top policy group which met for lunch last week, again at your instance, for I was following up then as I'm sure you were aware with your ideas of some weeks ago that we needed to focus attention of some of our assistant secretaries and administrators on the fact that they are first and always Department-wide policy making staff operators before they become agency and program advocates. We'll talk about this.

The Secretary's resolve to combine policy and program analysis with a carefully planned budget making process was strengthened by a May 13, 1965 memorandum from the President on budget review and program planning for 1967.

The President wrote that his administration was trying to change the budget preview from "an exercise in numbers to an exercise in ideas, in judgment, in priorities; in short, to an examination in depth of what we are doing currently and what we ought to be doing in the future". He wrote, "Our decisions now -- and the directions that follow from those decisions -- will be of the utmost consequence to full realization of the gains for which the foundations have been laid."

President Johnson asked each agency head to take a personal hand in the Budget preview and to review carefully possible alternatives to activities and new proposals. The lowest priority items, even if considered essential, were to be identified and analyzed.

Under Secretary Schnittker, who had been studying policy and program priorities, proposed combining the functions of the Program Review Board and the Budget Committee. The combined committee could, he suggested, more effectively review agency program plans, budgets, legislative proposals, cost reduction efforts, manpower control problems, and other issues of a Department-wide nature. 1/

The Budget Committee had been established on June 2, 1961 for the purpose of making recommendations to the Secretary on budget estimates and related matters. 2/ The Program Review Board had also been established in 1961 to: review the operations of the various agencies; provide the Secretary with a regular procedure for obtaining the views and advice of his immediate staff charged with program direction and coordination; provide the Secretary's

1/ Memorandum to The Secretary from John A. Schnittker, July 1, 1965, and Memorandum to Assistant Secretary John Baker and others from John A. Schnittker, June 10, 1965; In: John A. Schnittker Chronological File in Lyndon Baines Johnson Library.

2/ U. S. Department of Agriculture, Secretary's Memorandum No. 1456, June 2, 1961; In: Files of Agricultural History Branch of the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

- 21 -

immediate staff with a regular procedure for ascertaining and discussing facts as a basis for making judgments and giving advice to the Secretary; and provide for a coordinated review of interagency problems. 1/

The Program and Budget Review Committee was formally established on July 2, 1965. The members of the Committee were: the Under Secretary who served as Chairman, the Assistant Secretaries, the Director of Agricultural Economics, the Director of Science and Education, the Deputy Under Secretary, and the Executive Assistant to the Secretary. 2/

In addition to his proposal on the Program and Budget Review Committee, Under Secretary Schnittker proposed an expansion in the Staff Economists Group to provide staff assistance to the Secretary and the Committee in the area of program planning, appraisal, and priority analysis. The Staff Economist Group had been established on April 3, 1961 as the Economic Advisory Staff in the Office of the Director of Agricultural Economics. 3/

1/ U. S. Department of Agriculture, Secretary's Memorandum to Heads of Department Agencies, July 23, 1963.

2/ U. S. Department of Agriculture, Secretary's Memorandum No. 1578, July 2, 1965.

3/ U. S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Economics Notice No. 1, April 3, 1961; In: Files of Agricultural History Branch of the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget also proposed using the Staff Economist Group for program evaluation. He referred to the President's statement at Cabinet meeting on cost effectiveness and year-round program review. Director Schultze stated that the Department of Agriculture seemed well equipped for the job and urged modification or extension of the charter of the Staff Economist Group. 1/

On September 13, 1965, Under Secretary Schnittker reported that he and Administrative Assistant Secretary Robertson had begun to link the areas of work of the Staff Economists Group and the budget analysts of the Office of Budget and Finance. They were working on a number of program issues that had arisen in connection with the 1967 budget. Mr. Schnittker wrote that an independent group in or near the Secretary's Office was needed for the field of operations analysis. 2/

The Under Secretary referred in his memorandum to the need to set up the independent group to enable the Department to carry out the President's directive. The President's directive had been

1/ Letter to Orville L. Freeman from Charles L. Schultze, June 26, 1965; In: John A. Schnittker, Chronological File, July 1, 1965.

2/ Memorandum to the Secretary from John A. Schnittker, September 13, 1965; In: John A. Schnittker Chronological File in Lyndon Baines Johnson Library.

given to Cabinet members and agency heads on August 25, 1965. The President said: 1/

I have asked you to meet with me this morning to discuss the introduction of a new planning and budgeting system throughout the Government.

The objective of this program is simple: to use the most modern management tools so that the full promise of a finer life can be brought to every American at the least possible cost. . . .

This is what I want to introduce today -- a new planning-programing-budgeting system developed by our top management experts led by Budget Director Charles Schultze. Once in operation, it will enable us to:

- (1) Identify our national goals with precision and on a continuing basis
- (2) Choose among those goals the ones that are most urgent
- (3) Search for alternative means of reaching those goals most effectively at the least cost
- (4) Inform ourselves not merely on next year's costs, but on the second, and third and subsequent year's costs of our programs
- (5) Measure the performance of our programs to insure a dollar's worth of service for each dollar spent.

This system will improve our ability to control our programs and our budgets rather than having them control us. It will operate year round. Studies, goals, program proposals, and reviews will be scheduled throughout the year instead of being crowded into 'budget time.'

To establish this system and carry out the necessary studies, each of you will need a central staff for program and policy planning accountable directly to you. To make this work will take good people, the best you now have and the best you can find.

1/ Public Papers of the President, Lyndon B. Johnson, 1965, Vol. 2 pp. 916-917.

- 24 -

The President's directive was followed on October 27, 1965 by a Secretary's memorandum directing the heads of a number of agencies including the Agricultural Research Service, the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, the Consumer and Marketing Service, the Farmers Home Administration, the Foreign Agricultural Service, the Forest Service, the Rural Electrification Administration and the Soil Conservation Service to select or designate a staff of highly competent persons to assist him on a full time basis in helping to prepare the Department's Program and Financial Plan. 1/ The agency staffs were to report directly to the agency head.

Secretary Freeman announced that a special staff was being established in the Office of the Secretary to coordinate and conduct special studies, to review and help prepare the Program and Financial Plan, and to analyze the effectiveness of programs designed to achieve major Department objectives. The staff was to be directed by Howard W. Hjort who was designated Special Assistant to the Under Secretary.

Although the Under Secretary had primary responsibility for establishing the system and for coordinating its operation, the Secretary announced that he would "personally participate in the evaluation and approval of the Department's Program and Financial Plan."

1/ U. S. Department of Agriculture, Secretary's Memorandum No. 1589, October 27, 1965; In: Files of the Agricultural History Branch of U. S. Department of Agriculture.

- 25 -

In initiating the planning-programming-budgeting system, programs were to be grouped according to their major objectives or missions. In many cases the groupings would cut across agency lines.

Permanent Department and agency planning and programming staffs, operating within the framework of overall policy guidance would: conduct comprehensive reviews to define program objectives in specific terms capable of being analyzed with definite time periods in which the objectives were to be accomplished; identify concrete measures of program objectives; and develop and compare alternative ways of accomplishing objectives.

On February 1, 1967, Howard Hjort was able to report that a planning-programming-budgeting system had been initiated and was moving toward a full-fledged PPB system. 1/ The system was being designed to provide more complete and timely information for those responsible for making decisions on Department programs. The traditional budget system would continue to be used by the Congress for at least several years into the future. Consequently both systems would need to be operated.

PPB

A full-fledged/system, Mr. Hjort wrote, would be comprehensive, operate at all major decision points, would include planning, management control and operational control processes, would focus on missions rather than activities or functions. Such a full-fledged system had an approved

1/ Memorandum to The Secretary and Under Secretary, Planning-Programming-Budgeting System from Howard W. Hjort, February 1, 1967; In: John A. Schnittker Chronological File in Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

long-range plan of action, complete with targets and a control system to make sure action was on target. The lines of authority ran from the top down.

The system on February 1, 1967, while still far from a full-fledged system, had a mission oriented structure with programs assigned to the following five major missions:

- a. The Performance of the Agricultural and Forestry Industries;
- b. The Well-being of the American People;
- c. Improving Rural Areas and Communities;
- d. Agricultural Exports and Agricultural Development Efforts Abroad; and
- e. General Administration and Program Support.

The staff at the Department level (PEP), to serve the Secretary and Under Secretary, included 15 professional and 15 clerical and stenographic people. Of the 15 professional, 9 were assigned to the Analytic Group and 4 to the Programming Group.

The agencies of the Department were not prepared to carry their share of responsibility for a full-fledged system, Mr. Hjort reported. The agencies need more analysts and better trained analysts. He analyzed some of the problems with the system. He wrote:

A mission oriented program structure cuts across the appropriation, organizational and information structures now being used by the Department. The appropriation, organizational and information structures tend to follow activity lines -- research, extension, credit and so forth -- instead of missions.

A mechanical procedure has been developed to track decisions made in the appropriation structure into the program structure and vice versa. There is no real problem between these two structures, it simply requires some additional work to operate the two.

The proposed long-range information program tends to follow agency and activity lines and, therefore, will not be as effective as it would be if it followed mission lines.

There is a problem that stems from the difference between the organizational structure and the mission oriented structure. The mission oriented structure cuts across the authorities of the Assistant Secretaries and Directors because their responsibilities follow activity lines. The Secretary and Under Secretary are the only ones with across the board responsibilities. Therefore, there is no line of authority running through the Assistant Secretaries and Directors. Instead, the line is direct from the Secretary and Under Secretary to the Administrators. As a result, the PEP Staff can effectively serve only the Secretary and Under Secretary. While this may be desirable, I believe it limits the effectiveness of the PEP Staff, primarily because of the limited amount of time the Secretary and Under Secretary have to spend with program problems. Their time should be reserved for the most important problems and decisions.

There are two problems associated with staffing for PPB. First, the agency PPB staffs are too weak. Additional analysts are needed and the quality of the agency staffs need to be upgraded. These problems can be handled by more active recruiting on the part of the Administrators. There may be the need for minimum standards established for PPB staff members.

Second, there is duplication among the staff offices serving the Office of the Secretary. While the PEP Staff has responsibility for all programs of the Department, the Staff Economist Group has responsibility for evaluating and developing farm programs and RPDES has responsibility for evaluating research activities of the Department. This duplication of staff resources leads to confusion and will eventually lead to ill-will.

Mr. Hjort indicated that since October 1965, when the first instructions on PPB had been issued, a shift in emphasis had taken place. By February 1966, Program Memoranda had become the key decision-making documents replacing the Program and Financial Plan which had been originally conceived as the key document. The Program and Financial Plan was becoming the document to record decisions. The special studies summarized in Program Memoranda were to be the key documents. Program Memoranda would no longer cover all programs of the Department. This meant that the analysis or evaluation component of the system was becoming more important while planning in the sense of scheduling and control functions was becoming less important.

If analysis was to become synonymous with PPB, the staffing pattern might need reorganization. In this case the PEP staff could be abolished with responsibilities for special studies assigned to one or more of the other staff offices.

Mr. Hjort recommended moving forward toward a full-fledged PPB system. In this case, a review and revision, if necessary, of the mission oriented program structure should be made. Serious consideration would need to be given to assigning the responsibility for the missions of the Department to the Assistant Secretaries and Directors making modifications in program structure. Firm targets would need to

be established for the major programs of the Department.

The program categories had been changed by February 28, 1968. They had been increased from four to six and had been renamed. The following categories were given to the Senate Committee on February 28: 1/ Income and abundance; Growing nations--New Markets; Dimensions for living; Communities of tomorrow; Resources in action; and Science in service of man. A seventh category of general support was also included.

In his testimony on the PPB system, Assistant Secretary Robertson referred to it as a different way of looking at the budget which the President, the Secretary, and the Bureau of the Budget found helpful.

In the meantime, Secretary Freeman had begun setting out the goals and policies of the Department in a series of six major addresses. He felt the addresses would give "all the agencies in the Department a clear, sharp focus on overall Department targets." The addresses would, he felt, help to set priorities, and build a stronger sense of common purpose.

The addresses were on the following subjects: Income and Abundance; Resources in Action; Communities of Tomorrow; Science in Service of Man; Growing Nations--New Markets; and Knowledge for Living.

1/ U. S. Congress, 90th, 2nd Sess., Senate, Committee on Appropriations, Hearings on . . . Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriations, Part 1, p. 253.

- 30 -

The first address of the series was given at Tulsa, Oklahoma on January 20, 1967. 1/ Others followed during February and March.

On March 1, 1967, Secretary Freeman announced that he planned to set up joint program and information task forces organized around the goals and policies covered in the six major addresses. 2/ Under Secretary Schnittker asked Howard Hjort and members of his staff to speed up a reconsideration of the program categories used in the PPB operation. He also called the Assistant Secretaries together to discuss the new task forces.

The Under Secretary reported that there was some concern over the fact that the program categories represented by the task forces were not the same as the four substantive program categories used in PPB.

Harold Lewis, Director of the Office of Information, in a March 3 memorandum wrote that the important thing was to develop long-range Department goals and statements that could be used to shape up program and information approaches which could be used to advance long-range program proposals. 3/

Since the PPBS approach was largely concerned with internal governmental affairs and the information approach was aimed to achieve public understanding "through outgoing methods" it was not essential,

1/ U. S. Department of Agriculture Press release 178-67, January 20, 1967. See also 291-67, January 30, 1967; 401-67, February 6, 1967; 497-67, February 15, 1967; 880-67, and 933-67, March 23, 1967; and U. S. Department of Agriculture. Agriculture/2000, 72 pp., Washington Government Printing Office. 1967.

2/ Note to the Secretary from John A. Schnittker, March 2, 1967; In: John A. Schnittker Chronological File in Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

3/ Memorandum to the Under Secretary, AG/2000 Program Policy and Information Task Forces, from Harold Lewis, March 3, 1967; In: John A. Schnittker Chronological File in Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

in Mr. Lewis' view, that the categories in PPBS and the information approaches coincided.

The Program Policy and Information Task Forces were to serve as a mechanism in getting administrative and information people together in planning and developing policy guidance that could be translated into substantive programs and to information approach and drive. He wrote:

1. To realize the goals of the AG/2000 approach, we need effective, aggressive, close and forward-looking teamwork on the part of administrative (program) and information people--at both the Department and agency levels. A chief aim of the proposed task forces is to bring administrative people together to consider and develop forward looking policy direction that can go into the development of substantive programs and be the basis for sound and creative information programs.
2. To get the guidance needed by both administrative and information people, long-range Department policy goals need to be developed--looking ahead to the kind of Department and the kind of agricultural industry we want in the years ahead.
3. The chief result of the work of the task forces would be to get the agencies further keyed into the AG/2000 effort--including of course both administrative and information people.

In a meeting on task forces, Under Secretary Schnittker and the Assistant Secretaries agreed that the task forces should be related to the planning, programming, and budgeting work of the PEP staff. 1/ The program structure for the PPB system was to be revised to include a separate category for resources and a separate category for science and education. The change would make the planning conform more closely to the information categories and would help "to make the most of the good visibility" which ^{was} attached to resources and research.

1/ Memorandum to The Secretary, Task Forces, from John A. Schnittker, March 31, 1967; In: John A. Schnittker Chronological File in Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

- 32 -

Secretary Freeman reported to President Johnson on the task forces and the publication of a pamphlet entitled Agriculture/2000 on July 27, 1967. 1/ Each task force he wrote would set out intermediate benchmarks and, in so far as possible, quantitative targets to measure progress toward the 2000 goals. Each task force was to be education and public relations-conscious. Mr. Freeman stated that he had coined the phrase "preventive public relations" and instructed each task force to be alert to problems and anticipate criticism and misunderstanding.

Secretary Freeman told the President that the task force system had evolved out of a number of stimuli, particularly the President's instructions to institute the system of "planning, programming and budgeting." The task forces were to serve the following useful purposes:

1. It will lift the sights of the USDA, and make us think forward in terms of the broad picture.
2. It will give a sense of direction, purpose, participation and morale to everyone within the Department. Every employee becomes a part of something larger than his day-to-day assignments.
3. It will make it easier to jump agency lines, thereby more effectively and systematically mobilizing our resources.
4. The quantitative measures which we are developing will be helpful for management all the way up and down the line. This is particularly true for top management in the constant struggle to keep current with progress and alerted to short falls.

1/ Memorandum to The President, Agriculture/2000-Goals and How to Reach Them, July 27, 1967; In: Orville L. Freeman Chronological File in Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

Under Secretary Schnittker was critical of the task forces. In a January 9, 1968 memorandum calling the task forces unnecessary, he wrote: 1/

We attribute results to them that would (or could) have been achieved through regular organizations. Liberal interpretation of the job of Assistant Secretaries and putting the heat on Information would have produced about the same results. Revising the old memorandum setting down administrative relationships in the Office of the Secretary would have provided an adequate charter.

But the task forces exist and you have firmly committed yourself to them. I believe you will want to go on with them -- unless the case against the task force mode of operation were clear cut. But it is not and will not be clear cut. One can work effectively in almost any administrative milieu.

So the realistic choices for the next year are alternative task force arrangements. Two possibilities stand out:

1. Proceed about as in 1967 but eliminate Science and reconsider chairmanships.
2. Continue Communities of Tomorrow and Resources in Action but suspend the others.

I favor (2).

Under any arrangement, it is important that Howard's staff work closely with (and for) the task force chairman (or operating Assistant Secretary). After all, functioning Assistant Secretaries represent the Secretary; it should not be argued that the staff is rendered less useful to you if it also serves your representative in preparing the choices you must ultimately make. It is also important under any arrangement that agencies continue to increase their analytic capability to complement Howard's staff and to serve the agency head.

Reporting (whether early warnings, current problems, or program attainment statistics) is essentially linked to program categories and is a function of agencies, PPB, and Assistant Secretaries, not task forces.

1/ Memorandum to The Secretary, Task Forces, from John A. Schnittker, January 9, 1968; In: John A. Schnittker Chronological Files in Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

- 34 -

Secretary Freeman continued to stress the importance of task forces as a major innovation in his administration. On October 2, 1968, he gave the following evaluation in an oral report to the President and the White House staff: 1/

In 1961 when I came to the Department of Agriculture it resembled a kind of ducal fiefdom in which 21 agencies, operating as fiefs, were competing with one another. Each had its own mission assigned by law from Congress.

Immediate reorganization of the Department was prevented by a pressing need to develop new commodity policies to overcome the heritage of the disastrous Republican epic of the 1950's which had left behind a farm income that had dropped \$3 billion and staggering surpluses that were crushing the agricultural community.

Nonetheless, early in my administration we began focusing on some fundamental reorganization proposals and moved to install modern management techniques including the use of data processing, a Departmentwide payroll system, centralized services, and a number of other badly needed reforms.

Perhaps the most critical innovation came about 4 years ago when we began to shape the Agriculture/2000 concept and with it the effort to create common Department goals which would be achieved by stimulating each Agency into developing a common sense of direction, a sharing of resources, and a sense of total Department purpose.

Today, the Department of Agriculture is structured around six mutually reinforcing goals: (1) Income and Abundance, (2) Growing Nations and New Markets, (3) Communities of Tomorrow, (4) Resources in Action, (5) Science in the Service of Man, (6) Dimensions for Living.

1/ Orville L. Freeman, The Department of Agriculture: Struggles, Achievements, Issues Ahead, Under the Administration of Orville L. Freeman, October 2, 1968, Unpublished manuscript; In: Files of Agricultural History Branch of the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

- 35 -

So that the Agencies in the Department may participate in reaching each of these goals (and the fact of the matter is each Agency does have a service-contribution to make), task forces have been established for each goal under the chairmanship of an appropriate Assistant Secretary and with all Agencies represented.

These task forces have specific responsibilities to share in policy formulation, in coordinating and evaluating goals, in taking full advantage of education-public relation- information opportunities, and at the same time not getting crosswise with the direct operating responsibilities of on-going agencies who still budget as required by Congress and are accountable to Congress as legally constituted entities.

The results have far exceeded expectations. A new sense of purpose, direction and pride has spread throughout the entire Department, replacing the historic separatism that prevailed eight years ago.

An enhancing factor has been the staff meetings we hold each morning bringing together some 75 people including the Secretary's staff and all Agency heads and their assistants. These sessions, held before regular work hours, focus on common Department problems and targets rather than on the particular problems of special agencies. This technique has given every Administrator direct access to the Secretary each day and developed a camaraderie and sharing of problems cutting clear across Agency lines.

The impact has been significant. The Department's annual budget and 5-year forward plans are now organized into programs and program elements keyed to the six missions and are reviewed by the task forces in their progressive stages. Morale has improved. Coordination is greatly strengthened with resulting better use of resources. Focusing on goals rather than only functions has made it possible to establish budget priorities more effectively.

Collectively it adds up to greater stability, improved efficiency and increased benefits for the farmer, the consumer, and the agriculturally-oriented business community.

Coordinating agency programs in the light of overall Department objectives was only one of the difficult administrative problems facing the Secretary of Agriculture in 1964. Bringing Department agencies and programs into compliance with legislative and Presidential directives on civil rights was one of the Secretary's most complex administrative problems.

Insuring that government programs were administered without discrimination against minority groups was a major concern of President Johnson. Frequent progress reports were required from the Department of Agriculture and other agencies. In his first address to Congress as President, Lyndon B. Johnson urged the Congress to pass the civil rights bill as a memorial to President Kennedy. He said, "We have talked long enough in this country about equal rights. We have talked for one hundred years or more. It is time to write the next chapter, and to write it in the books of law." 1/

In anticipation of enactment of the civil rights bill, Secretary Freeman stated that full compliance with the spirit as well as the letter of the law would be the Department's policy.

He asked each agency to analyze the bill to determine how its programs would be affected and to prepare a list of programs and activities that might be expected to present unusual problems. 2/ Programs and

1/ Public Papers of the Presidents, Lyndon B. Johnson, 1963-64, Vol. I, p. 9.

2/ Memorandum to Assistant Secretaries and Agency Heads, Implementation of Civil Rights Bill, from The Secretary, June 15, 1964; In: Orville L. Freeman Chronological File in Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

- 37 -

activities that would not be affected were also to be listed. Each agency was directed to prepare a plan for speedy and orderly transition from existing program administration to bring it into compliance with the law. The analysis, lists, and plans were to be turned into the appropriate Assistant Secretaries by the close of business on June 19. Regulations to implement the legislation were to be prepared so they could be submitted to the President when requested.

Assistant Secretaries and Directors with their Agency Heads were to be directly responsible for carrying out the directive. Resources of the Secretary's staff including the Office of the General Counsel and the Office of the Inspector General were to be available for assistance.

The Administrative Assistant Secretary was to serve as Department-wide coordinator and to serve as liaison with executive agencies outside the Department in initiating the program. Each agency was to designate a coordinator for the program. Agency coordinators were to be authorized and able to make decisions without "undue consultations."

On June 23, Secretary Freeman stated as government policy that government public information programs, educational activities and services of a like character were to be available to all persons on an equal basis. 1/ Acceptance of speaking engagements and participation

1/ Memorandum to Assistant Secretaries, Agency Heads and Staff Assistants, Federal Participation in Segregated Meetings, from Orville L. Freeman; In: Orville L. Freeman Chronological File in Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

in conferences were to be consistent with that policy. Department employees were obligated to make specific inquiries concerning the groups practice of segregation before accepting an invitation.

Mr. Freeman wrote:

The Federal government should not sponsor, support, or financially assist, directly or indirectly, any conference, convention or meeting held where participants are segregated or are treated unequally because of race. This policy includes the granting of Federal funds to reimburse the expenditure of non-Federal agencies under grant-in-aid programs.

Any possible exceptions to the policy were to be cleared with the appropriate Assistant Secretary or Director before any commitments were given.

When President Johnson approved the Civil Rights Act of 1964 on July 2, 1964, he stated that he had directed agencies of the Government to "fully discharge the new responsibilities imposed upon them by the law and to do it without delay and to keep me personally informed of their progress." 1/

Title I of the Civil Rights Act provided for more effective enforcement of the right to vote in Federal elections without regard to race or color. 2/ Title II was concerned with discrimination in places

1/ Public Papers of the President, Lyndon B. Johnson, Vol. 2, p. 843.

2/ 78 Stat. 241.

- 39 -

of public accomodation. Title III was concerned with discrimination in public facilities. Title IV was concerned with discrimination in public education. Title V extended the life and added to the authority of the Commission on Civil Rights.

Title VI required that every Federal agency which provided financial assistance through grants, loans, or contracts eliminate discrimination on the grounds of race, color, or national origin in these programs. 1/ Actions by a Federal agency to carry out the requirements of the title might include termination of programs where discrimination was taking place or refusal to grant assistance to such a program. Each agency was required to publish rules or regulations to carry out the purposes of the title. The rules or regulations were subject to the approval of the President. Before a Federal agency could act to enforce compliance, notice had to be given of alleged failure to comply and an opportunity for a hearing had to be provided. In addition, a written report had to be submitted to Congress 30 days before the cut off date. Compliance action could be appealed to the courts. Federal assistance in the form of insurance or guaranty was not covered by the law.

Title VII established a Federal right to equal opportunity in employment. It created an Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to assist in implementing this right. Title VIII required the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a survey of persons of voting age by race, color, and national origin to determine the extent to which such persons have registered and voted by geographic areas. Title IX gave the Attorney

1/ U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, Civil Rights Digest, August 1964.

- 40 -

General authority to intervene in any Federal court action seeking relief from the denial of equal protection of the laws. Title X established a Community Relations Service in the Department of Commerce. Title XI gave the right to jury trial in criminal contempt cases.

Secretary Freeman directed Assistant Secretaries and agency heads to prepare a list with one line descriptions, of programs and activities covered by Title VI of the Act. 1/ A second list was to be made of programs or activities covering loans, grants, contracts of assistance, and other assistance programs not covered by Title VI. The second list was to give reasons why Title VI did not affect the activities. The Secretary also asked for drafts of regulations prohibiting discrimination in agency programs activities.

Secretary Freeman held a series of seminars on civil rights during the week of August 3, 1964. He made the following statement on Department policy:

So far as this Department is concerned, there will be no delays in eliminating discrimination where it exists within the agencies of the Department; and there shall be no delays in eliminating discrimination in the operation of any program carried out by the Department. . . discrimination has no place either in the way an agency operates, or in the programs that it administers.

1/ Memorandum to Assistant Secretaries and Agency Heads, Implementation of Civil Rights Bill, from The Secretary, July 7, 1964; In: Files of the Agricultural History Branch of the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

- 41 -

The seminars had been preceded on July 10 by a memorandum on implementation of the Civil Rights Act of 1967. 1/ The Secretary stated he would direct and coordinate all phases of the program as it affected the Department. The Under Secretary, Assistant Secretaries and Directors were to assist the Secretary in carrying out the responsibility. The Administrative Assistant Secretary was to serve as staff representative to coordinate and direct the day-to-day activities. Agency heads and staff officers were to be personally responsible for positive and affirmative direction in keeping with the spirit as well as the letter of national policy.

The State Administrative Committees were given responsibilities for carrying out the Civil Rights Act. The committees consisted of the the State Director of the Farmers Home Administration, the State Conservationist of the Soil Conservation Service, and State Executive Officer of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service and a representative from the Consumer and Marketing Service, the Agricultural Research Service, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Forest Service, Statistical Reporting Service, and the Office of the General Counsel. The State Director of Extension, or his representative, was invited to participate in committee deliberations on items involving activities of the Extension Service. 2/

1/ U. S. Department of Agriculture, Secretary's Memorandum No. 1560, July 10, 1964.

2/ U. S. Department of Agriculture, Secretary's Memorandum No. 1492, Supplement 2, March 22, 1962.

The Office of the General Counsel would provide agencies with legal interpretations on compliance procedures. The Office of Inspector General would review agency compliance as a part of the Department's audit and investigative program.

President Johnson approved the Department of Agriculture's civil rights regulations on December 3, 1964. 1/ The regulations became effective on December 30, 1964. They prohibited the following specific discriminatory actions: 2/

- (i) Deny an individual any service, financial aid, or other benefit provided under the program;
- (ii) Provide any service, financial aid, or other benefit, to an individual which is different, or is provided in a different manner, from that provided to others under the program;
- (iii) Subject an individual to segregation or separate treatment in any matter related to his receipt of any service, financial aid, or other benefit under the program;
- (v) Treat an individual differently from others in determining whether he satisfies any admission, enrollment, quota, eligibility, membership or other requirement or condition which individuals must meet in order to be provided any service, financial aid, or other benefit provided under the program;
- (vi) Deny any individual an opportunity to participate in the program through the provision of services or otherwise or afford him an opportunity to do so which is different from that afforded others under the program (including the opportunity to participate in the program as an employee but only to the extent set forth in paragraph (c) of this section).

1/ Public Papers of the Presidents, Lyndon B. Johnson, 1963-64, Vol. 2, pp. 1638-1639.

2/ 29 F.R. 16274.

(2) A recipient, in determining the types of services, financial aid, or other benefits, or facilities which will be provided under any such program, or the class of individuals to whom, or the situations in which, such services, financial aid, other benefits, or facilities will be provided under any such program or the class of individuals to be afforded an opportunity to participate in any such program, may not, directly or through contractual or other arrangements, utilize criteria or methods of administration which have the effect of subjecting individuals to discrimination because of their race, color, or national origin, or have the effect of defeating or substantially impairing accomplishment of the objectives of the program as respects individuals of a particular race, color, or national origin.

(3) As used in this section the services, financial aid, or other benefits provided under a program receiving Federal financial assistance shall be deemed to include any service, financial aid, or other benefit provided in or through a facility provided with the aid of Federal financial assistance.

Employees and agencies of the Department ^{were} prohibited from excluding from participation in, denying the benefits of, or subjecting to discrimination "any person in the United States on the ground of race, color, creed or national origin under any program or activity administered by such agency, officer, or employee."

Employees and agencies of the Department were forbidden to "deny to any person in the United States (1) equal access to buildings, facilities, structures, or lands under the control of any agency of this Department or (2) under any program or activity of the Department, equal opportunity for employment, for participation in meetings, demonstrations, training activities or programs, fairs, awards, field days, encampments, for receipt of information disseminated by publication, news, radio, and other media, for obtaining contracts, grants, loans, or other financial assistance or for selection to assist in the administration of programs or activities of this Department.

- 44 -

In the meantime, the staff of the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights had begun their study of the extent and quality of services rendered to Negro rural families by agencies of the Department which provided direct service at the county level. The research techniques used as the basis for evaluation included: conferences and interviews with program administrators and experts from private and State universities; review and evaluation of program material; statistical analyses of service data; and staff field trips. 1/

Between March and August 1964, Commission staff visited State offices of one or more agencies of the Department in 6 States and county offices in 22 counties in 8 Southern States. During these trips 177 agricultural officials, committeemen, farmers, and others were interviewed.

The report on agricultural programs was officially sent to Secretary Freeman by President Johnson on February 27, 1965. Mr. Johnson made the following comments on the report:

The Commission's report points out that 98% of all Negro farm operators in the United States are located in southern states and thus the Commission centered its attention in those areas. Based on its study and review of the material available to it, the Commission concluded that Negro families have not participated equally in those programs designed to assist our rural population. These programs so essential to our continued welfare and economic growth must reach all in our rural areas if they are to be effective in lifting those areas to full economic self-sufficiency.

1/ Letter to Orville L. Freeman from Lyndon B. Johnson, February 27, 1965; In: John A. Schnittker Chronological File in Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

Under your strong leadership, the Department has developed new and improved methods of promoting the economic growth and well-being of our rural areas. The new emphasis which the Civil Rights Act of 1964 gives to equal treatment for all persons provides the basis for assuring that the benefits of these efforts will be available to all. Equality of opportunity is essential if we are to achieve the rural renaissance which you so vigorously champion.

The Commission stated that the Farmers Home Administration program of low-cost credit and supervised farm management seemed ideally suited to raise the Negro tenant from his depressed condition, but during a quarter century of operation it had not made substantial inroads upon the problem of tenancy for Negroes. During this period the position of the Negro farmer relative to white Southern farmers has steadily worsened.

In order to improve the Negro farmers position the Farmers Home Administration would have had to provide him with a combination of loans and technical assistance which would have equipped him to master new, diverse, and larger farming operations. It would have had to improve his grasp of financial management and planning. In the Commission's judgment the Farmers Home Administration had not provided the necessary help. It had "not given comparable service to Negro farmers similarly situated in terms of the size of loans, the purposes for which the loans are to be used, or the technical assistance necessary to fully achieve the purpose of such loans."

In 16 Southern States the number of all loans had increased by 25 percent in comparison with 1960. In 1964 in these States, 4.7 percent of white operators and 5.7 percent percent/ of Negro operators received loans from the Farmers Home Administration.^{1/} However, a statistical analysis of data in 13 counties during 1963 and 1964 indicated that 33 percent of the borrowers were white and received 66 percent of the funds. In contrast Negroes who were 67 percent of the borrowers received 34 percent of the funds in an area where 55 percent of all farm operators were Negroes. When the loans were analyzed by economic class of borrowers, data revealed that the average loan size to whites was substantially higher than the loans to Negroes. Furthermore, the disparity between the average size of loans increased steadily as net worth decreased. The average size of loans for white operators with net worth of \$6,000 or less was four times greater than the average for Negroes with net worth of less than \$6,000.

The Commission also analyzed data on types of loans for white and Negro operators. ^{2/} The data indicated that poor whites received loans to acquire or expand their farms, to stock and equip them, and to improve their housing or financial position. Loans for Negroes tended, particularly for those in the lower economic class, to be

^{1/} Ibid., pp. 67 - 70.

^{2/} Ibid., pp. 71 - 78.

made for living expenses and annual operating costs. Sixty three percent of funds loaned to Negroes were for living expenses, annual operating expenses, and emergencies, but only 34 percent of the much larger amounts of funds received by white operators went for these purposes. Almost 50 percent of white funds went for acquisition of land or housing, but 25 percent of funds loaned to Negroes were for these purposes.

Although the need for intensive supervision of Negro borrowers must have equalled, if not exceeded, the need for whites, a larger percentage of white borrowers received intensive supervision. Only 41 percent of white borrowers received limited supervision but 63 percent of Negroes received limited supervision. As a result of its survey and analysis of the data, the Commission concluded "The FHA provides for limited services to largely marginal Negroes." 1/

The Commission concluded that the Soil Conservation Service had also provided inadequate and unequal service for Negro farm operators. The report stated:

Service to individual owners by an SCS work unit commences with a farm plan of recommended conservation practices. In the 67 counties for which data was submitted, where the largest numbers of Negro farm owners are concentrated, 66 counties reported that soil conservationists had prepared one plan for every four white farm owners. Only one county reported less--an average of one plan for every five white farm owners. But for Negroes only a third of the counties reported one plan for every four Negro farmers. In 41 counties the participation of Negroes in the program was much lower....

1/ Ibid., p. 82.

By another measure of service, number of acres planned for Negroes and whites, the same disparities are shown. A substantially smaller proportion of Negro-owned land is covered by SCS plans. In many counties the differences in proportion between white- and Negro-owned acreage were pronounced....

In 9 counties among the 67 studied almost equal proportions of Negro and white acreage or over 50 percent of Negro acreage was reported as having an SCS plan. In five of these counties Negro soil conservationists were serving Negro farm owners. For three of the remaining counties other explanations seemed apparent....

The positive results achieved in a few counties suggest that a large area of unserved Negro-owned land in the other counties studied could profit from the services of soil conservationists. For where a Negro employee has been assigned this task specifically, or where a white conservationist has undertaken to perform the work, both the Negro farmers and the over-all conservation program have gained.

Discrepancies in service were found even between white and Negro farmers with the same size of farm....

Discrimination **seemed** apparent in the service of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service. The report of the Commission gave the following summary of its study:

The virtual exclusion of Negroes from the ASCS structure poses one of the most serious problems with which the Department of Agriculture should be concerned, particularly since this exclusion is compounded by the discriminatory operation of the county committee elections. The lost opportunity to develop Negro leadership, to further democratic procedures in Federal programs, and to accelerate the economic advancement of Negro farmers are the high costs of failure of ASCS to assume responsibility for the manner in which elections for its programs have been conducted in those areas of the country where Negroes have been denied the ballot.

Meanwhile, the persistence of an entirely white structure in county after county where the economic welfare of Negroes is being decided in their absence cannot help but raise questions as to the equity with which ASCS programs are being administered. Negroes have been further isolated by the fact that they have not been employed above the menial level in ASCS offices--one of the most important economic institutions in many rural towns.

The extension of economic benefits, through larger allotments and increased participation in cost-sharing grants, will require objective evaluation of the present situation and the establishment of increased participation by Negro farmers who are presently not part of the program as a continuing program goal.

Secretary Freeman had taken action during December 1964 to investigate charges of irregularities in the election of community ASC committeemen in a number of Mississippi counties. Community committeemen and county committeemen had responsibility for administration of price support programs. Charges had been made of intimidation and threats against candidates for Negro committeemen who had permitted their names to be placed on ballots. 1/ The Department had begun careful preparations six months in advance of the election of committeemen to insure free and open elections, Mr. Freeman stated. Many Negroes who voted in the election had never voted for committeemen before. 2/ On April 2, 1965, Secretary Freeman announced that in Madison County, Mississippi, the County Committee was calling for new elections of community committeemen in two communities. 3/

1/ U. S. Department of Agriculture Press releases 4139-64, December 4, 1964 and 4291-64, December 18, 1964.

2/ Ibid.

3/ U. S. Department of Agriculture Press release 1059-65, April 2, 1965.

Secretary Freeman had proposed that an announcement be made prior to the release of the report of the Civil Rights Commission that during 1965 Negroes would be appointed to the State Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee in every State of the Nation where there were Negro farmers. He wrote the President on January 15, 1965, that there were current vacancies on State Committees for Arkansas, Alabama, Georgia, and Louisiana. 1/ A vacancy would also occur soon in Kentucky. The memorandum to President Johnson had been followed on February 3 by a memorandum to Vice President Humphrey suggesting that an announcement be made by the President or Vice President. 2/ Mr. Humphrey was asked to bring the matter to a head since conflicting responses had come from the White House. Lee White of the President's staff had suggested that it would be better to approach the issue on an individual basis when vacancies came up and the Department could report qualified Negroes were available. An announcement was not made before the report of the Commission was released. 3/

1/ Memorandum to the President, Civil Rights Commission Report, from Orville L. Freeman, January 15, 1965. In: John A. Schnittker Chronological File in Lyndon Baines Johnson Library.

2/ Memorandum to the Vice President from Orville L. Freeman, February 3, 1965. In: John A. Schnittker Chronological File in Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

3/ Memorandum to Orville L. Freeman from Joseph M. Robertson, February 1, 1965. In: John A. Schnittker Chronological File in Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

Secretary Freeman issued a public statement on the Civil Rights Commission's report on February 26, 1965. Mr. Freeman said: 1/

I know of no one, except those who refuse to face facts, who would disagree with the Commission finding that there has been discrimination in the administration of programs. This discrimination has been the result of social patterns that have prevailed for a long time. However, this does not make it right, and there is underway within the Department a massive effort to make the operation of programs in every area consistent with the philosophy and goals of this Administration and the philosophy of the Congress expressed in the Civil Rights Act.

The Commission Report does not reflect, in every instance, the effort that USDA employees are making to administer programs fairly and effectively in the South. But there is no point in quarreling with details of the Report, or in attempting to analyze point by point the fairness of the Report. Let me just say that, wherever programs depend on local action and local elections, the operation of such programs has a strong tendency to conform to long-time social patterns in the area.

Although these facts of life make the job of racial fairness more difficult, they do not make it any less necessary. The rights of all citizens to participate with equal opportunity in the Federal farm programs, or to obtain equal employment in Federal agencies, must be upheld at all times. The drive to achieve this has the sanction of law and is reflected in the policies and orders of this Department since the beginning of this Administration.

We are making advances in the field of racial equality in the administration of USDA programs. The Report of the Civil Rights Commission will enable us to achieve even more rapid progress....

Where Farmers Home Administration had no Negro county committeemen prior to 1961, there are now Negro county committeemen -- and there will be more. Where no Negroes served as elected community committeemen in communities other than those with 100 percent Negro population, there are now Negro community committeemen, and the Department will insist that Negro farmers shall have full access to farmer committee polling places and shall be able to participate in the selection of those farmers who will locally administer farm programs.

1/ U. S. Department of Agriculture Press release 732-65, March 8, 1965.

These actions reflect some of the efforts which have been made in the past four years to insure equal opportunity in the USDA and in the programs administered by the Department. It is my firm purpose to use all the powers vested in the office of Secretary of Agriculture to insure that all vestige of discrimination and inequality will be removed from the USDA.

The press release was followed on March 1 by a letter to President Johnson from Secretary Freeman which pledged, "It is my firm purpose to use all the powers vested in the Office of Secretary of Agriculture to insure that every vestige of discrimination and inequality is eliminated from this great Department that President Lincoln referred to as 'the Peoples Department.'" 1/

On March 26, 1965 Secretary Freeman reported to the President that the following steps ^{been} had/ taken to implement the recommendations of the Commission on Civil Rights. 2/

First, the agencies studied by the Commission have reviewed the findings and recommendations of the Commission's study and have reported to me actions they are taking to correct the discriminatory practices indicated in the study. In addition, I have directed that each of these agencies provide me with periodic progress reports until the reported unfair practices have been eliminated.

Second, all agencies of the Department have been directed to take immediate steps to encourage and increase participation by Negro rural residents on an equal basis in all programs of the Department. This will require a concerted effort to extend assistance and guidance in expanding facilities, operations, and practices to Negro farm families, and to expand programs for rural Negro youth and homemakers. In each agency established program goals and objectives are being reviewed and revised where necessary so that men in the field are supported in their efforts to achieve this.

1/ Letter to the President from Orville L. Freeman, March 1, 1965.
In: John A. Schnittker Chronological File in Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

2/ Letter to the President from Orville L. Freeman, March 26, 1965.
In: Files of Agricultural History Branch of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Third, a task force has been established to conduct an extensive and continuing review and evaluation of the Departmental programs to assure that these programs are efficiently accomplishing the objectives established by Congress on a completely nondiscriminatory basis. This task force will utilize all the expertise of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's research units in developing proper evaluation procedures. I have asked that this group submit its first report to me within thirty days with recommendations for changes in present methods where necessary to provide for equal opportunity.

Fourth, all remaining discrimination and segregation in offices and related facilities used in Department programs is to be eliminated without delay. In those instances where immediate action is precluded because new construction or facilities are required, action will be taken as rapidly as possible. All rehousing should be completed not later than December 31, 1965....

Fifth, the Inspector General of the Department has been charged with the responsibility to make continuing and special surveys of agency operations and will report to me immediately any inadequacies in compliance with the Department's policy and directives in this area.

Sixth, all agencies have been directed to take every appropriate step necessary to insure that the democratic process will be guaranteed in all nominations and elections to local agricultural policy and decision-making posts and to assure that all segments of the community are fairly considered for representation on appointive policy and decision-making committees. The same will apply to those committees and boards which are within my authority and discretion to appoint.

The agencies whose programs were reviewed in the Commission's report have already taken significant steps to increase the participation of Negro rural residents on their committees and boards and will continue to review the participation of white and Negro rural residents in these groups. I have requested periodic reports of the steps taken or to be taken to assure equality of opportunity in this regard. Furthermore, you should know that my

review has not been confined alone to the agencies covered by the Commission's study. All agencies of the Department are presently reviewing their programs and activities and are submitting regular reports to me on their progress in achieving equal opportunity.

Seventh, I plan to establish a citizens advisory committee on civil rights consisting of distinguished representatives from a variety of backgrounds and interests to review the activities of the Department with respect to equality of opportunity to advise me of the effectiveness of these program and policy directives and to recommend changes where necessary.

Replying to Secretary Freeman's letter on April 17, 1965, President Johnson noted that steps designed to correct deficiencies/^{were} dependent upon reports and responses from various units of the Department. President Johnson asked for a report within 60 days on progress actually made. 1/

The Civil Rights Task Force had been appointed on March 8, 1965 with the assignment of seeing that action was taken to implement the recommendations of the Commission. The membership of the Task Force consisted of three Deputy Assistant Secretaries, the Assistant Director of Science and Education, Director of the Research and Operations Division of the Office of the General Counsel and a staff member of the Office of Congressional Liaison. Deputy Assistant Secretary Trienah Meyers served as Chairman. Staff assistance was provided by William M. Seabron, Assistant to the Secretary on civil rights coordination. 2/

1/ Letter to Secretary Freeman from Lyndon B. Johnson, April 17, 1965. Copy in: Files of Agricultural History Branch of U. S. Department of Agriculture.

2/ See U.S. Department of Agriculture Press release 736-65, March 8, 1965. See also Memorandum to the Secretary of Agriculture from Task Force Established to Review the Recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission, March 24, 1965. In: John A. Schnittker Chronological File in Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

The Task Force reported on March 24, 1965 that four agencies surveyed in the Commission's report had started to collect relevant data with respect to program service afforded minorities. The Task Force recommended that the research units of the Department be used:

...to determine the extent to which agricultural programs are achieving their objectives with respect to individuals of all races and colors. For this purpose racial data and statistics on persons receiving the benefits of Department programs should be maintained as part of an effective reporting and evaluation system. Such data should be used only for the purpose of evaluating the effectiveness of Department programs and should be maintained under safeguards which will prevent their use for discriminatory purposes." 1/

On April 2, 1965, Secretary Freeman announced a number of actions taken to implement recommendations of the Commission on Civil Rights. 2/ These included appointment of a Negro farmer in Mississippi, Arkansas and Maryland to serve on the State ASC Committee, appointment of a committee to review plans submitted by the State Extension Service, and appointment of a Citizens Advisory Committee on Civil Rights to advise the Secretary of Agriculture. Executive Assistant to the Secretary, Thomas R. Hughes, was designated to serve as Chairman of the Citizens Advisory Committee. William Seabron served as Executive Secretary.

Mr. Seabron was able to report on April 14, 1965 that a substantial number of Negroes would be hired as part-time county employees of

1/ See Task Force Report cited above. See also note to Mr. Robertson from John Schnittker, March 22, 1965. In: John A. Schnittker Chronological File in Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

2/ U. S. Department of Agriculture Press release 1059-65, April 2, 1965. See also Secretary's Memorandum No. 1575, April 29, 1965.

829

county ASC committees. They would be used as performance reporters in the South and elsewhere. 1/ The Soil Conservation Service had adopted a policy, effective July 1, 1965, of measuring accomplishments by the number of farmers assisted rather than acres planted under soil conservation practices. The practice of measuring accomplishment by acres under a conservation plan had encouraged work with large rather than small land holders. All offices of the SCS in the South had been desegregated. He also reported that 45 percent of all loans in 16 Southern States made by the Farmers Home Administration from funds transferred by the Office of Equal Opportunity had gone to Negro borrowers.

Secretary Freeman issued a memorandum on April 22, 1965, which requested agency heads to: 2/

1. Take immediate steps to encourage, where it does not already exist, increased participation in your programs by Negro rural residents on an equal basis with whites. I further ask that you devise and employ means to insure this increased participation in both the administration and benefits of local program activities.
2. Take immediate action to secure complete elimination of all remaining segregation and discrimination with regard to office and space and related facilities at field installations.
3. Establish at once procedures to enforce nondiscriminatory service assignments within your program areas. All personnel, both Negro and white, at every level, will serve all Department clientele equally and without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin of either the Department officer or the client to be served.

1/ William M. Seabron, Remarks made at the Civil Rights Regional Conference, Atlanta, Georgia, April 14, 1965.

2/ U.S. Department of Agriculture Secretary's Memorandum No. 1572, April 22, 1965.

4. Cooperate with the Departmental Committee on Program Review and Evaluation in action to establish methods of evaluating the effectiveness of procedures to bring about full participation for all in Department programs on a nondiscriminatory basis.

I have charged the Inspector General of the Department with the responsibility to make continuing review and special surveys of agency operations and to report to me immediately any inadequacies in compliance with the Department's policy and directives in this area.

The right of all of our citizens to participate with equal opportunity in both the administration and benefits of all programs of this Department is not only legally required but morally right.

The Department's report on "actual progress" in the four agencies **was sent** studied by the Civil Rights Commission/on June 17, 1965. Secretary Freeman told President Johnson that firm action had been taken, but "in a poet's words, we 'have promises to keep and miles to go before we sleep.'" 1/The Office of the Inspector General, Mr. Freeman reported, was conducting the first phase of a special three-phase civil rights audit and this Office was giving priority to all complaints alleging discrimination. The twenty-one complaints of racial discrimination in consumer food programs received since January 1, 1965, was cited as an example. Twelve of the complaints were substantiated and the discriminatory practices eliminated.

A Department survey had revealed discriminatory practices in 188 buildings housing Department offices. Elimination or agreement for prompt elimination had been reached with lessors for 158 buildings. Negotiations were continuing in 25 cases. In 5 cases the Department would move to other quarters.

1/ Letter to The President from Orville L. Freeman, June 17, 1965.
In: Files of Agricultural History Branch of U.S. Department of Agriculture.
Twelve page report is attached to the teller.

contracts

The Economic Research Service had initiated research/with predominately Negro colleges and universities. Agency actions included appointment of 37 Negroes to State Advisory Committees of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation and an increase in the employment of Negroes by the Soil Conservation Service. They also included an increase in loans to Negroes for livestock, machinery and real estate improvement from a total of 304 in the last six months of 1964 to a total of 1,344 in the first five months of 1965. The Federal Extension Service reported that 19/^{non-}white delegates attended the 1965 National 4-H Club Conference. 1/ In addition bi-racial committees were judging 4-H Club records in 14 Southern States.

The agencies of the Department continued to report progress in correcting the administrative deficiencies found by the Civil Rights Commission. As measured against conditions found by the Commission progress was substantial. As measured by the standards and goals set by the Civil Rights Commission, the Department still had a long distance to travel before its promises could be kept.

William L. Taylor, Staff Director of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, gave the following evaluation on February 15, 1967 in testimony before the National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty: 2/

Two years ago the Civil Rights Commission did a study of Federal farm programs in the deep South to determine what impact they were having on equalizing opportunities for

1/ The delegated included 10 Negro youngsters, 4 American Indians, an Eskimo, 5 Spanish-Americans, and 4 youngsters of Oriental background. Only one Negro participated in 1964. U.S. Department of Agriculture Press release 1539-65, May 17, 1965.

2/ William L. Taylor, Testimony before the National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, February 15, 1967. Mimeograph copy in Files of Agricultural History Branch of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

- 59 -

Negroes. A principal finding in that study was that in the administration of these Federal programs, there was an acceptance of discrimination and of the inferior status of Negroes -- in short, an acceptance of the pervasive assumption that there are two distinct Southern agricultural economies, one white and the other Negro....

Follow-up work on the Cooperative Extension Service since the Commission's report in 1965 suggests that the situation has improved to some extent. There has been some integration of State extension offices and an increase in training opportunities for Negro agents. Services to rural residents, however, are still carried on largely on a segregated basis. As recently as May 1966, the Commission found that in Georgia only 7 of 130 professional employees on the State staff were Negroes. No Negro in that State holds the title of county agent or county extension home economist. An analysis of salaries revealed an average differential of \$455 in favor of white assistant county agents and an average of more than \$1,100 in favor of white associate county agents. To this day, no Negro holds a supervisory position at the county level.

According to information received from the Department of Agriculture, the situation at the Farmers Home Administration has improved in the last two years. The number of Negro employees in FHA county offices has nearly tripled and the number of Negro county and area committeemen has nearly quadrupled. Three Negroes now serve in supervisory positions. Regarding FHA loans, however, the gap between whites and Negroes has not been closed. For example, although the number of farm ownership loans to Negroes in Southern States nearly doubled between 1964 and 1966, loans to whites still averaged \$5,600 more than loans to Negroes.

Common to all of the agricultural programs examined by the Commission is racial inequity. In none of the programs are Negroes occupying key decision-making positions. A part of the problem involves the administrative structure of many Federal programs providing assistance to rural areas. While the Federal Government provides the funds, the key decisions on how these funds are to be used are made locally, often by private groups whose only connection with the Federal Government is financial support.

A prime example of this is the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS), which administers the crop allotment and price support programs. Although the program is administered in Washington and in State and area offices by Federal employees, at the county level locally elected committees are interposed. These committees make the decisions on the size of a farmer's allotment, on adjustments of program benefits between landlords and tenants, and on the appeals of farmers objecting to cuts in allotments. The county committees, whose members are usually elected by the vote of community committeemen, hold the real power in the ASCS program. As of the time of the Commission's report two years ago, not a single Negro had been elected to a county committee in the South. Of the 37,000 community committeemen and alternates representing 7,400 community committees in the deep South, only about 75 were Negroes. By the end of 1966, a little progress had been made. There were 543 Negro community committeemen -- 113 in regular positions and 430 in alternate positions with no vote. Of the more than 5,000 county committeemen, however, there still were no Negroes in regular positions. There are 319 counties in the South where Negro farm operators comprise 20 percent or more of the total farm operators, and 58 counties where Negro farm operators outnumber the whites. Yet Negroes are virtually unrepresented in decision-making positions in the ASCS.

Decentralization and local determination of how local problems should be met theoretically are desirable. In the kind of society we all would like to have, this system could operate effectively and compassionately for the benefit of all citizens. In the kind of society that exists in some parts of the Nation, however, and particularly in the rural South, this system results in a perpetuation of discrimination and inequity. For the Federal Government, under the guise of local autonomy, to permit the kinds of discriminatory practices that the Commission found to exist in its study is an abdication of responsibility and acquiescence in inequality.

In part because of discriminatory administration, Federal programs have not provided the assistance they should in enabling Negroes to become economically self-sufficient. Continued economic dependence in turn has deterred Negroes from exercising important rights....

Economic dependence stems from many causes. But one important factor is the manner in which Federal programs often operate in the rural South. The necessities of life which should be available to people as a matter of right, instead often are treated as largesse which may be doled out by local authorities only to the 'deserving poor.'

Examine, for example, the way in which we distribute food to people in need. The Federal Government sponsors a surplus food distribution program, but basic decisions about need are left to local authorities. Time and time again these authorities have used their power as a lever to deter Negro citizens from asserting their rights or to punish them for having done so. Each time the problem has come to national attention, in Haywood and Fayette Counties, Tennessee, in LeFlore County, Mississippi, and in other places, the Federal Government acted after the fact to see that hungry people were fed. But we still have not established a system of administration which prevents such abuses from arising. As we move now from surplus food distribution to the food stamp program as a means of meeting the needs of the poor, care must be exercised to assure that this program is administered in ways which do not defeat its purpose.

Mr. William L. Taylor in a statement submitted to the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty on June 14, 1968, reported on an investigation begun in the fall of 1967 into Alabama agriculture which culminated in a hearing held during April and May of 1968 in Montgomery, Alabama. 1/ The conclusion was inescapable, he said, that Government was not intervening effectively at any point to provide Negroes with an opportunity to lead decent and productive lives. The legacy of slavery, he reported, still continued " in the

1/ William L. Taylor, Statement submitted to the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, June 14, 1968. Mimeographed copy in Files of Agricultural History Branch of U. S. Department of Agriculture.

form of widespread racial discrimination, poverty and economic dependence."

He gave the following criticism of the programs of the Department of Agriculture:

In this situation the test of effectiveness of government programs is whether they enable people to escape from their condition of economic dependence. Too often programs do not accomplish this objective.

The simple requirement of cash payments every month under the Federal Food Stamp Program is an obstacle to participation by those who are in greatest need -- even when the cash payment is reduced to 50 cents per person.

The Government has programs under the Farmers Home Administration to assist farmers who cannot obtain credit from normal sources. But the majority of black people are too poor to be eligible for FHA loan programs. Their earnings are meager and they have nothing to mortgage or commit to the moneylending agency.

The result therefore is that when government programs fail to reach people they remain dependent upon their old masters -- the plantation owner, the furnishing merchant, the boss-man.

Some government programs also substitute their own form of dependency for the existing system. . . .

Loan programs to self-help cooperatives are encumbered with burdensome restrictions. For example, the Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association is trying to break the cycle of economic dependence for black farmers by establishing a marketing cooperative for vegetables. But SWAFCA has run into an unsympathetic Farmers Home Administration which insists on imposing restrictions and conditions to a loan which, in the words of its president 'would simply destroy the whole philosophy behind the coop. . . that individuals will learn and do for themselves.' The supervision of the SWAFCA loan would be in the hands of the State FHA Director, Mr. Robert C. Bamberg, the owner of a large plantation who made abundantly clear at the hearing his low opinion of the abilities of Negro farmers. . . .

- 63 -

In one of the counties investigated, 80 percent of the Negro children suffered from anemia due to malnutrition and, as a result, had a life expectancy 8 to 10 years less than white children. Federal programs that provide food have been instituted or applied for in some counties only within the last year because the decision has been left up to local authorities. The commodities distributed in counties with such a program do not provide adequate diets, even though the Secretary of Agriculture has the authority to increase the variety of foods. The food stamp program fails to reach many people because of the cost of the stamps. . . .

The Cooperative Extension Service's farm agents instruct farmers in modern farming practices. They have not done this for thousands of poor Negro farmers. Negro farmers also have been excluded from benefits of programs of the Farmers Home Administration already mentioned. . . .

Congress must recognize in law that every American citizen is entitled to certain basic necessities as a matter of right. These should include the right to an adequate and nutritious supply of food, to full health care, to an education that prepares an individual to be a productive member of society. It is clear that to make these rights meaningful, the Federal government must be prepared to devote far more resources to programs of food, welfare, health and education than it is now allocating. It is also clear that this must mean an end to systems which allow local authorities to determine whether the citizens will receive the benefits of these programs. The underlying theory of local control of education and other programs is that it provides diversity and choice. Where, instead, local control results in deprivation and provides a breeding ground for ignorance, it can no longer be rationalized.

Second, we must find ways of assuring that these programs are implemented through structures and institutions which are responsive to the people the programs are designed to serve. This means that it is not enough merely to shift the focus of dependency from a plantation owner to a government agency. People must be given some measure of influence or control over programs and decisions which affect them. It also means that as difficult as this may be, we must find ways to assure that the policies and practices of people who administer the programs are in absolute accord with the purposes the programs are designed to serve. . . .

Under Secretary Schnittker considered civil rights actions one of the areas where the Department might move events in the right direction during the final months of the Johnson administration. 1/ He suggested

1/ Memorandum to The Secretary from John A. Schnittker, July 9, 1968; In: John A. Schnittker Chronological File in Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

that after the September ASCS elections and the November political elections the rules might be revised to ensure the election of a number of Negro ASCS county committeemen. He suggested that at least the procedures might be set in motion which would lead to a major reexamination of the rules before the next Secretary of Agriculture held an election. He wrote that he^{had}/hoped such action could be taken before the ASCS elections in 1968:

One area where we might yet make a further mark is the farmer committee system. I had hoped that we might take some measures yet this summer to ensure the election of a number of Negro ASCS county committeemen this fall. I reviewed this at length with Ray Fitzgerald and I am discouraged about it. He does not believe that we have a good chance to elect any Negro county committeemen this fall, and he does not recommend that we take any specific actions in the remaining months of the summer to help ensure the election of some Negro county committeemen. I expect Fitzgerald is right on this since we would just stir up a big storm in the Southeast if we started to do it without preparation this late in the season.

Concern over the reaction of members of the House and Senate Committees on Agriculture and of the Subcommittees on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture checked both the pace and the extent of action to carry out the recommendations of the Commission on Civil Rights.

The comments of Congressman Whitten, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations, on a letter to farm and other organizations stating that it was mandatory that representatives of the Department

participate only in meetings of organizations and groups whose policies were not discriminatory, illustrate some of the Department's problems.

Congressman Whitten said: 1/

I realize what the practices of the Government may be and what the general policies are with regard to discrimination.

However, those who have the responsibility should do what they can to bring about improvements in relationships.

I have been reading in the paper that the Department of Agriculture is having all sorts of problems with farm groups. I have heard testimony before this committee that the farmer's share of the income dollar is going down and down, except for that paid directly from the Treasury.

It strikes me that, instead of trying to tell these folks that you cannot talk to them, you had better be cooperating with them to help agriculture.

I am wondering whether this is a department-wide situation where you will not even counsel with farm organizations which might help you, at a time when you need help, or whether you will just limit yourself to our own little crowd.

Strained relationships with Southern Congressional leaders who held key positions as chairmen of the committees with jurisdiction over agriculture resulting from civil rights activities was only one of many difficult problems. The President's resolve to reduce expenditures for farm programs, despite the declining price parity ratio, at a time when farm organizations were sharply divided presented Secretary Freeman with the difficult problem of securing farm organization support for

1/ U. S. Congress, 90th, 1st Sess., House of Representatives, Committee on Appropriations, Hearings on . . . Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1968, Part 3, pp. 605, 607, and 608.

farm legislation. The declining number of farmers and of Congressmen representing farm areas made it difficult to secure enactment of farm legislation with divisions among farm organizations.

Secretary Freeman, during 1964 and 1965, attempted to maintain contact with the general farm organizations and to work out a common front. Because of its size and its opposition to government price and income support programs, the American Farm Bureau Federation was given special attention during 1964 and 1965. President Shuman, the resolutions committee, and the board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation were invited to meet with the Secretary and other officials at the Department of Agriculture.

John Schnittker, then Director of Agricultural Economics, appeared before the American Farm Bureau Federation's pre-convention resolution session to review farm developments. Mr. Schnittker also kept in touch with the Washington office of the Federation. He reported to the Legislative Director that Department officials had been discouraged by President Shuman's speech at the convention and reminded him that the invitation to him and the Board for a visit with Secretary Freeman was still open. 1/ President Shuman in his December 7, address had denounced government farm programs stating that farmers "have been penalized by government price fixing and control programs that have wrecked market prices" and that the "advocates of government supply-

1/ See Memorandums to the President, December 1, 1964 and December 8, 1964 from Orville L. Freeman; In: Orville L. Freeman Chronological File in Lyndon B. Johnson Library and Memorandums to the Secretary and Under Secretary from John A. Schnittker, December 17, 1964 and February 18, 1965; In: John A. Schnittker Chronological File in Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

management and the socialization of agriculture are not ready to give up." 1/

On January 11, 1965, Secretary Freeman reported to President Johnson that he had had an interesting and useful conference with Charles Shuman and that they had agreed there might be a middle ground in relation to the farm commodity programs. 2/ Mr. Shuman considered the long range retirement program recommended by the National Agricultural Advisory Commission consistent with some of the Farm Bureau's proposals. By April 1965 ^{was} /President Shuman /calling the bill "a hoax designed to trap both farmers and consumers. . . /it/ would make farmers more dependent than ever on government subsidies for their livelihood, and at the same time raise the price of food to consumers, especially those with low incomes." 3/

While the American Farm Bureau Federation was calling for a return to the freedom of the market place, the National Farmers Union was criticizing the Administration's farm bill for not measuring up to the policies adopted by the Farmers Union at its March 1965 convention. The resolutions called for full parity and income protection

1/ American Farm Bureau Federation, Official News Letter, Vol. 43, No. 50, December 14, 1964.

2/ Memorandum to the President from Orville L. Freeman, January 11, 1965; In: Orville L. Freeman Chronological File in Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

3/ American Farm Bureau Federation, Official News Letter, Vol. 44, No. 15, April 12, 1965.

- 68 -

only on family-farm production. They stated "We favor computation of support prices that provide farm families an opportunity to earn full parity family-farm income and give farm-produced commodities a constant purchasing power." 1/ Congress was called upon to include this protection in the Agricultural Act of 1965.

President Patton of the National Farmers Union placed the blame for the "unsatisfactory" Administration bill on the "misguided and mistaken budget slicers" who were whittling away farm income. He said, "The President has entrusted farm policy formation to those in government who know the least about agriculture and the bill reflects their know-nothingness." 2/

In a speech before a conference of farm organizations sponsored by the Missouri Farmers Organization, Secretary Freeman tried to secure united backing for the Administration's bill from most farm organizations. The Farm Bureau was the only major farm organization not attending the conference.

Secretary Freeman made the following comments on the Administration's farm proposals and the disunity among farm organizations which if it continued would prevent enactment of any legislation. 3/

1/ National Farmers Union. 1965 Policy, Adopted by the Delegates to the Annual Convention on March 17, 1965. In: Files of Agricultural History Branch of U. S. Department of Agriculture.

2/ National Farmers Union, National Union Farmer, Vol. 42, No. 5, May 1965.

3/ U. S. Department of Agriculture Press release 1151-65, April 13, 1965. See also Memorandum to Rod Leonard from The Secretary, April 7, 1965. In: Orville L. Freeman Chronological File in Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

- 69 -

Our farm programs must always be adapted to the requirements of the future. Today, they should be focused more precisely on the opportunity for parity of income for America's family farmers and lower government costs. But we must recognize that farm programs will be necessary as long as the advance in agricultural technology continues to outpace the growth of population at home and markets abroad.

Thus, in 1965, at a time when the American farmer is the beneficiary of improved public understanding....and has the support of a President actively committed to his welfare.... and can go to a Congress sympathetic to his needs, it would seem that passing farm legislation would be a breeze.

But such is not the case. Instead, it is likely that not one commodity program would be extended by the Congress if the vote were taken today. This currently bleak picture is the product of disunity in agriculture's own house, of friction which fritters away our strength because it confuses and disillusions our friends.

This disunity in agriculture's house takes many forms.

For some, it reflects a belief in the free market so strong as to almost constitute a theocracy which forbids any kind of Governmental activity even at the expense of destroying the family farm system. But we have overcome these extremists before, and we can do it again.

Other kinds of disunity are more dangerous.

Competing interests among producers on the same farm commodity threaten agriculture's house as never before. The most recent example of this was an editorial in a mid-west newspaper complaining that Federal programs failed to give preference to the "superior" wheat produced in its area of influence over the "inferior" wheat produced in the Northwest. The reverse sentiment is held by the Northwest. Similarly, the cotton growers of the Southeast cannot agree on policy with the growers in the delta, and neither of these groups want the same thing as high plains growers in Texas or irrigation farmers in California. The same kind of divisions create abrasive relations among tobacco farmers, rice growers and peanut producers -- and are potential sources of division in the case of practically every commodity produced in this country.

Such divisions are understandable, for there are legitimate differences which flow from competition between regions and between varieties as each seeks an improved position. However, vigorous competition should not overshadow the legitimate interests of the farmer and his family -- North, South, East and West -- in a decent income. This is a big and boisterous country with room for a great many differences, but those differences should not be allowed to block national action which is essential to the welfare of every farmer -- particularly this year when important farm commodity programs await Congressional action.

- 70 -

The third area of division is the most difficult -- and dangerous -- of all, for it is the product of the massive and irreversible changes now underway throughout agriculture. Many farmers have little to show for their work and sweat at the end of a year. Their income is low. Yet they see a nation becoming more prosperous around them, and their frustration grows as they fail to share in it. When they try to increase their efficiency the cost of new equipment, chemicals and other production items consume much of the increase in income. They seem, like Alice in the book 'Through the Looking-Glass,' to be running faster and faster just to stay in the same place.

As frustration mounts, disillusion sets in. Many farmers lash out at farm programs that don't seem to go far enough or at farm leaders who don't seem to do enough. Such a reaction is understandable. The fact that it exists calls for action. But it doesn't mean that we should abandon commodity programs. It does mean that farm leaders must develop programs which are at the same time acceptable to the country and responsive to the complex needs of agriculture and all who farm today. Such programs must give more than hope, they must give promise that the opportunity for parity of income for the efficient family farmer will be realized. This will require greater maturity and better leadership than ever before.

The country cannot afford the terrible cost of ending commodity programs, nor can agriculture indulge the luxury of demanding the impossible. The end result of both extremes is the same. Either way the farmer will lose, and the country will lose, for our commodity programs will be lost.

Everyone here had a part in developing the legislative program which the President sent to Congress last week. It can meet the test of public acceptability if understood. It will meet the test of solid progress toward parity of income if passed by the Congress. It can be passed if everyone in this room gets solidly behind the program and works hard for it during the next several months. . . .

The representatives of more than 50 farm organizations attending the meeting agreed on a statement endorsing the direction and approach of the Administration's farm program. Representatives of the National Farmers

- 71 -

Union and the Grange helped to draft the statement of general support for the Agricultural Act of 1965. 1/

Support of the farm organizations attending the meeting helped to secure enactment of the ^{Food and} Agricultural Act of 1965. While supporting the Administration bill, the National Farmers Union continued to press for additional government action to raise farm income for family farmers.

Secretary Freeman invited the presidents of a number of farm organizations and a small group from their board of executives to meet with him to discuss price support and adjustment problems and trade negotiations on November 22, 1966. Members of the group were invited to lunch with President Johnson at the White House. The conference was successful. President Johnson directed Secretary Freeman to hold annual policy conferences. 2/

The breach between the Department and the American Farm Bureau Federation continued to widen. On October 20, 1967, Secretary Freeman, in an address to Agway Cooperative called the Farm Bureau-sponsored bill a threat to every American farmer's well-being. He said:

1/ See Memorandum to John Schnittker, John Baker and others from The Secretary, November 16, 1966. In: John A. Schnittker Chronological File in Lyndon B. Johnson Library. See also Memorandum to Marvin Watson, Farm Conference--President's participation, from Orville L. Freeman. In: Selected Records from Secretary's Files in Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

2/ U. S. Department of Agriculture Press Releases 582-67 and 592-67, February 21, 1967.

The very magnitude of the farm program abolition effort is unusual. Congressman Curtis of Missouri introduced a bill on March 16, which would do away with the wheat and feed grain programs, and it has now been followed by 20 more bills identical or virtually identical to it.

The Curtis bill that the abolition forces are behind in Congress is one which would abolish the wheat and feed grain programs and replace them with recourse loans. It isn't a farm bill, it's a banker's bill. It would abolish authority for price supports on wheat and feed grains. It would abolish acreage allotments and base acreages for corn, wheat, and grain sorghum. This bill is sponsored and supported by the American Farm Bureau Federation.

The choice this bill poses -- despite efforts to fuzz it up -- is the classic choice between having a program and no program at all. If the wheat and feed grain programs are for all practical purposes destroyed, it won't take an urban-dominated Congress long to gut and destroy the dairy, cotton, rice and other programs as well. The harsh, cold, unescapable fact is this: The Farm-Bureau-sponsored Curtis bill . . . the banker's farm bill . . . poses a threat to every American farmer's well-being.

Looking down the road, farmers have only three general alternatives where farm programs are concerned:

First, they can continue and improve present New Era programs, with loan rates set at a level to make our products competitive in export, and price support payments to increase income and encourage program participation. With this type program, we can be reasonably confident of expanding domestic consumption and moving our farm products in world trade, with continued growth in exports.

These exports now account for the harvest of one acre out of every four in the United States. The steady increase in farm income since 1960 should also continue, hopefully at a faster rate.

Option number two, theoretically at least, are the old mandatory programs, but with strict controls on a bushel, bale and poundage basis. This approach would increase farm income at less government cost than the New Era programs. But in recent years, farmers have turned down a mandatory program for feed grains. Prospects for enactment of this kind of program are practically nil.

Third, there is the 'no program' alternative which, as we have just seen, is being offered in the Congress by the American Farm Bureau right now.

We have more than an inkling of what 'no programs' would mean to farmers. Those of us who have been around long enough to remember dime corn and two-bit wheat are certainly knowledgeable on this subject. But in more recent times, impartial economic studies validated by the price depressing effect of overproduction in this very year of 1967, have shown us that 'no programs' would mean serious declines in farm prices and income.

Still, you hear the claim that farm programs could be 'phased out' without hurting anyone. Anyone who believes this can preview 1980 under assumed conditions of 'no programs' very simply. Just read the recent report by the President's Food and Fiber Commission, which contracted for its study with the Center for Agricultural and Economic Development at Iowa State University. . . .

I'm afraid, unfortunately, that the no-program proponents are well aware of the caliber of disaster that awaits the American farmer in the absence of programs, but they're keeping the knowledge to themselves.

Secretary Freeman sent a copy of the address to President Shuman on October 20, 1967. 1/ He told Mr. Shuman that the charge that the Administration was a cheap food Administration was phony. Concerning the address and the news conference which followed, Mr. Freeman wrote: 2/

I added that I felt that was your sincere belief and that I considered you an honorable man, I merely disagreed with you 1000 percent on this subject. . . .

As always, the latchstring is open here. Come on in any time and we'll find a few things to agree on and probably, Charley, we can continue to agree to disagree on even more.

1/ Orville L. Freeman, Address at the annual conference of Agway Cooperative, Inc., October 20, 1967. U. S. Department of Agriculture Press release.

2/ Letter to Charles B. Shuman from Orville L. Freeman, October 20, 1967; In: Orville L. Freeman Chronological File in Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

- 74 -

Except for the American Farm Bureau Federation, major farm organizations continued to support the Administration's farm program. Representatives of 16 farm, commodity, and cooperative organizations met in Washington during March and agreed to back President Johnson's farm message, particularly the recommendation calling for extension of the Food and Agricultural Act of 1965. President Johnson had warned the delegates at the National Farmers Union convention that it would be difficult to get legislation enacted in 1968. 1/ Although agreement was reached on extension of farm legislation farm organization leaders continued to press for additional and stronger measures to raise farm prices and incomes. 2/

Keeping the support of farm organizations with diverse views and interests continued to be one of Secretary Freeman's most difficult assignments.

The Department had to depend on farm organization leaders for its major source of support in securing legislation. Many farm leaders and farmers considered themselves the sole constituents of the Department. Congressional committees on agriculture and appropriations frequently adopted this point of view. But Secretary Freeman during his first year in office

1/ National Farmers Union, National Union Farmer, Vol. 45, No. 3, March 1968.

2/ See Memorandum to DeVier Pierson from the Secretary, November 21, 1967; In: Orville L. Freeman Chronological File in Lyndon B. Johnson Library; Letter to The President from Orville L. Freeman, January 18, 1968; Memorandum to The President from The Secretary, January 11, 1968; Memorandum to The President from Orville L. Freeman, March 28, 1968; Letter to V. E. Rossiter from Orville L. Freeman, November 17, 1966; In: Orville L. Freeman Chronological File in Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

- 75 -

began to emphasize that the Department of Agriculture served a wider interest than the farm interest.

The Department had long been concerned with food. It should in the future take on the problems of rural America. John Baker's phrase "rural renewal" would symbolize exciting new directions. Consideration was given during 1961 to changing the name of the Department to Food and Agriculture. 1/ This idea was dropped but the Administration sponsored bill introduced on January 31, 1962 was entitled the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962. Earlier legislation had not included food in the title.

Secretary Freeman gave his reasons for proposing that the name of the Department be changed to Vice President Humphrey on December 21, 1964. He asked the Vice President's help stating "this might well be the single most important thing we could do this year." Secretary Freeman stated the case as follows: 2/

The Department of Agriculture has been more than a department of agriculture for a long time.

It is first of all a Food Agency for all the American people. Its primary mission is to help provide abundant supplies of food at reasonable and stable prices. A major part of the Department's efforts are devoted to this objective, with amazing success.

A large part of the budget is for food distribution to people who would otherwise be hungry -- food stamps, direct distribution of surplus foods to the needy, Food for Peace--or to school children who would otherwise be less well-nourished. Another part of the budget is for other consumer services -- meat and

1/ Don F. Hadwiger and Ross B. Talbot, Pressures and Protests: The Kennedy Farm Program and the Wheat Referendum of 1963, pp. 92-96.

2/ Letter to Hubert H. Humphrey from Orville Freeman; In: Files of the Agricultural History Branch of the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

poultry inspection, grading services, marketing research, human nutrition and home economics research, consumer education through the Extension Service, etc. These programs benefit the farmer, of course, but the primary beneficiaries are the consumers.

The success of democratic government is influenced greatly by public understanding of the value of the services it performs. Nothing could do more in the long run to increase public acceptance of the USDA and all its programs than general public understanding of its vital role in assuring food abundance for all Americans and for hungry people abroad.

For these reasons, the word 'Food' needs to be added to the title of the Department.

The Department of Agriculture is also, in fact, a department of rural affairs. Much of its efforts are devoted to economic development of rural America in general rather than to agriculture as an industry. In this category are expenditures for small watersheds, rural housing loans, rural business loans under the Economic Opportunity Act, rural electrification loans, recreation loans, and much of the work of the Extension Service, the Soil Conservation Service, and the Forest Service.

Moreover, the Department in its Rural Areas Development program has undertaken -- with conspicuous success in many areas -- to facilitate the programs of other agencies. Because the USDA has field offices in all rural counties, and other agencies have few rural field offices, or none at all, USDA field personnel can work with local communities in making use of the entire range of Federal programs.

To make clear that the Department serves a broader constituency than the farm population, the phrase 'Rural Affairs' needs to be added to the Department's name.

Everybody knows about the Department's farm programs. Most people think the Department's entire budget of \$7 billion is a subsidy to the farmers. The fact is that only between \$2 billion and \$3 billion can properly be charged to this purpose. The breadth of the Department's total program is not understood.

The single most dramatic step to bring about that understanding would be a change in the Department's name.

- 77 -

James G. Patton, in a January 12, 1966 letter to President Johnson, asked that the name of the Department of Agriculture be changed to the Department of Rural Affairs. He wrote such a name "would certainly fit your Great Society concept--that of looking beyond the prospects of abundance to the problems of abundance. As we strive to find a new framework of thought, in this, the first post-industrial society, we must strive to maintain our heritage and values." 1/

Mr. Harry McPherson of the President's staff asked Secretary Freeman for comments and gave his own reaction. He wrote:

I am inclined against this. I like the word 'Agriculture,' and I think it is too well established in the public consciousness to be jettisoned for a 'form-fitting' p.r. phrase like Rural Affairs. 2/

Secretary Freeman sent Mr. McPherson a memorandum from Assistant Secretary Baker stating the case for changing the name. Mr. Baker wrote: 3/

The word 'Agriculture' should be retained in the name of this Department. It is well established and does describe a major mission.

But standing alone it does not adequately encompass the broad scope of the Department's activities. The Department would more aptly be named 'Food, Agriculture and Rural Affairs' or 'Agriculture, Food and Rural Development'.

Addition of the word 'Food' to the name of the Department would recognize more specifically several of our basic missions:

1/ Letter, James G. Patton to Lyndon B. Johnson, January 12, 1966; In: Orville L. Freeman Chronological File in Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

2/ Memorandum to Secretary Freeman from Harry McPherson, January 15, 1966; In: Orville L. Freeman Chronological File in Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

3/ Memorandum to The Secretary from John A. Baker, January 18, 1966; In: Orville L. Freeman Chronological File in Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

- 78 -

- a continuing, sustained abundance of food and fiber;
- protection and regulation of the quality and purity of many food and fiber commodities;
- management of food supply to maintain abundance for domestic and foreign use both in dollar markets and for low income people unable to purchase an adequate diet.

Addition of the word 'Rural Development' or 'Rural Affairs' would recognize the responsibility of the Department for a wide range of activities involving non-farm as well as farm residents:

- rural community development and planning;
- rural community facilities;
- rural community institutions such as cooperatives, conservation districts, development and facility planning by local rural governmental units;
- rural housing, electrification and telephones;
- natural resources conservation and development on privately and publicly owned rural lands;
- enhancement of natural beauty and development of outdoor recreation facilities on privately and publicly owned land;
- small watershed protection and water development for recreational, municipal and industrial uses as well as flood prevention.

Neither the food policy nor rural development missions quite equate with the word 'Agriculture' which is often read to mean 'farmers and farm production'.

As you know, you have recommended this name change several times, most recently in the Rural Life Task Force report. That report said, 'A dramatic expression of the mandate for the Department to serve all rural people and to broaden its functions in assuring good and adequate food supplies would be to rename the Department of Agriculture as the 'Department of Food, Agriculture and Rural Affairs'.

This recommendation was not accepted as part of the 1966 legislative program. However, it might be well to keep the question open so that it can be discussed again at a later time.

- 79 -

Adoption of the broader name would promote increased understanding and recognition of our broader functions and should ease some of our jurisdiction and appropriation problems as well as highlight the fact that a large share of our appropriations are not for subsidies to farmers.

The change in name for the Department had been again recommended to the President by the Task Force on Agriculture and Rural Life during October 1965. 1/ The recommendation was made again in 1966 in response to a request by the President for recommendations on steps which should be taken to modernize and streamline the Executive Branch of the Government.

In a January 22, 1966 reply to the President's request, Secretary Freeman again proposed that the name of the Department of Agriculture be changed to 'Food, Agriculture and Rural Affairs.' He noted that a legislative proposal had been discussed within the Executive Branch but had never been formally proposed. 2/

Secretary Freeman also proposed that legislation be recommended to increase the number of Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture. The third legislative proposal was for the establishment of a "capital budget." 3/

The following administrative proposals which had been submitted earlier were resubmitted: 4/

1/ See Chapter VIII of this manuscript.

January 22, 1966
2/ Memorandum to Joseph A. Califano from Orville Freeman; In: File of Selected Secretary's Records in Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

3/ Ibid.

4/ Ibid.

Abolishment of the Commodity Exchange Commission. This is a provision of the bill pending in Congress to amend the Commodity Exchange Act. The Commerce Department might object to such action except as a part of the bill.

Proposed Executive Order to establish the President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty. Pending in the White House for signature.

Proposed Executive Order to transfer the ocean-freight subsidy under Public Law 480 to the Commerce Department. Was considered within the Department and perhaps discussed with other entities.

Proposed Executive Order to make the Secretary of Agriculture responsible for administering the credit provisions of Title IV of Public Law 480. Draft was sent to the Budget Bureau for processing. The Bureau has indicated that it may hold the proposal until the new extension of Public Law 480 is passed.

Proposed Executive Order providing for appointments to the career service of former ASC county office managers. Was sent to the Budget Bureau but later was opposed by the Bureau and the Civil Service Commission.

Secretary Freeman stated that some 21 organizational changes had been made but he considered establishing the position of Director of Science and Education on December 11, 1963; the International Agricultural Development Service on August 2, 1963; and the Consumer and Marketing Service on February 8, 1965, the most important of the organizational changes. 1/

An organizational change made after January 1966 was establishment of the Office of Management Improvement on July 28, 1966. This Office replaced the Office of Management Appraisal and Systems Development. The

1/ Ibid.

- 81 -

Director of Office of Management Improvement was asked "to mount a sound comprehensive automatic data processing management program for the Department."

Although Secretary Freeman did not persuade the President and the Congress to adopt some of his administrative proposals, he had brought the Department and its programs -- which touch more people than those of any other agency -- into sharper focus before the American people. The Department's mission was given new scope and its administrative organization was strengthened.

Appendix C

Personnel Administration

In his memorandum to heads of Departments and agencies, November 30, 1963, President Johnson emphasized the need for pressing vigorously ahead with programs for manpower control and utilization and the responsibility of each employee "not only for doing his assigned job to the best of his ability, but also for devising and proposing ways to improve his performance." 1/ Two weeks later he asked these executives to convey his personal message to all employees:

In these first days, men and women of all ranks within the government have asked me, "What can I do to help?" Many more of you, deeply committed to the Federal service, are undoubtedly asking yourselves the same question. It is impossible for me to make a direct and personal response to all of you, much as I would like to do so. Yet there is an answer which I would like to express to every employee in every agency at every location in the Federal Government. It is simply this: "Give your best to your job and your country."

As your Chief Executive, I will do my utmost to maintain the high quality and character of the career service in the government and to advance its usefulness through improvement. I will look to those who direct the day to day activities of this great work force and to the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission for continuing reports and recommendations to assist me in this purpose.

We have a great resource of abilities and talents among the people serving our Federal Government. We have career systems to assure continuity of people and programs. We are organized for the job and the work is before us. President Kennedy did not shrink from his responsibilities, but welcomed them, and he would not have us shrink from carrying forward the great work he began so well. I say to you as I said to the Congress: "Let us continue." 2/

1/ Public Papers of the Presidents, Lyndon B. Johnson, 1963-64, Vol. I, p. 15.

2/ Lyndon B. Johnson to Heads of Departments and Agencies, Dec. 13, 1963. In Files, Agricultural History Branch, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

- 2 -

The President, on January 21, 1964, again called on Government employees as he sought efficiency and economy in the Government itself.

On the other hand:

The Federal Government must be a good employer. It must offer challenging opportunities to its employees. It must be prompt to recognize and reward initiative. It must pay well to attract and keep its share of dedicated and resourceful workers. It must welcome fresh ideas, new approaches, and responsible criticism.

At the same time, he proposed reduction in Federal employment, economy through improved management, and salary reform and adjustment. The years ahead exerted a counteracting influence. 1/

Secretary Freeman discussed many of the key points in personnel administration in his speech on June 2, 1965, complimented personnel leaders on achievement, and challenged them to build on advanced techniques. Automation of personnel records has enabled the Department to meet increasing demands and opened new areas of research, such as MOHR (Management of Human Resources), that still are to be developed more fully to benefit employees and the Department. 2/

Through the years the Department has fostered the organization of employee groups and employees have been active in those within and

1/ Public Papers of the Presidents, Lyndon B. Johnson, 1963-64, Vol. I, pp. 193-94.

2/ U. S. Department of Agriculture Press Release 1748-65, June 2, 1965; U. S. Department of Agriculture, Annual Report of the Director of Personnel, 1965, pp. 4-6; Orville L. Freeman to Joseph Robertson, July 7, 1964; Orville L. Freeman Chronological File, Lyndon B. Johnson Library; "Management Information," Speech of Orville L. Freeman, Nov. 1, 1966, U. S. Department of Agriculture Press Release 3456-66.

- 3 -

outside the Department. Executive Order 10988, issued January 17, 1962, established a new program of employee-management cooperation in the Federal Government. In addition to this media, the Department has continued to maintain a policy of employee access to higher officials. Some agencies have worked on "improved communications" projects between supervisors and employees that not only settle complaints at the lower level but also improve operating performance and management effectiveness. 1/

Civil Rights for Department Employees. The Department has long showed a concern about employment of minority groups, but at the same time it has been faced with social forces that opposed changing existing patterns. During the immediate post World War I years and the Secretaryship of Henry C. Wallace, there was agitation for the employment of Negroes or even the establishment of a Bureau of Negro Affairs. In the 1930's under Henry A. Wallace, several of the new agencies stressed the importance of working with Negroes and employing more in the Department. The Resettlement Administration, the forerunner of Farmers Home Administration, employed a race relations specialist. World War II brought more Negroes to Washington, who as last hired were released in the postwar period.

1/ U. S. Department of Agriculture, Office of Personnel, Memoranda to All Employees, Aug. 9, 1965; Aug. 3, 1967; Joseph M. Robertson to Heads of Department Agencies, Oct. 30, 1967. In Files, Agricultural History Branch, U. S. Department of Agriculture; U. S. Department of Agriculture, Secretary's Memorandum 1569, Feb. 4, 1965; Rev. Mar. 28, 1968.

The Johnson years have seen an increased emphasis on equal opportunity proposals of President Kennedy.

About three weeks before Lyndon B. Johnson took the oath of office as Chief Executive, Alfred L. Edwards was appointed as Deputy Assistant Secretary to aid John A. Baker, Assistant Secretary for Rural Development and Conservation. The first Negro to be appointed to this level of position, he was to work with the Farmers Home Administration, Forest Service, Office of Rural Areas Development, Rural Electrification Service, and Soil Conservation Service.

President Johnson added the prestige of his new position to the ideal of equal rights in his first message to the joint session of Congress on November 27, 1963 when he said:

We have talked long enough in this country about equal rights.... It is time now to write the next chapter, and to write it in the books of law.... I urge you again... to enact a civil rights law so that we can move forward to eliminate from this nation every trace of discrimination that is based on race or color. 1/

A very real problem that the Department faced was the lack of Negroes trained as agricultural economists, statisticians, or scientists to fill professional vacancies as they occurred. Attempts were made to recruit in Negro colleges.

The Department, in mid-1964 was facing the question of adverse criticism by the United States Civil Rights Commission that had been making a study of farm programs and equal opportunity. A more positive

1/ Public Papers of the Presidents, Lyndon B. Johnson, 1963-64, Vol. I, p. 9.

approach became urgent in the circumstances. In late May and early June, several meetings were held in the Secretary's Office on minority employment, its increase and decrease by grades, in various Departmental agencies.

Anticipating the passage of the Civil Rights Bill, on June 15, 1964, the Secretary instructed Assistant Secretaries and agency heads to draw up analyses of ways in which Department programs would be effected, plans for transitions to comply with the act, and regulations to implement the law. The Administrative Assistant Secretary was directed to serve as Departmental coordinator in launching the program and each agency was to submit to him the following day the name of an agency coordinator "capable of exercising good judgement, and authorized and able to make decisions without undue consultations." Some agencies felt that their practices were in line with the new legislation. 1/

On July 2, 1964, President Johnson signed the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and at his cabinet meeting the same day "directed the agencies of this Government to fully discharge the new responsibilities imposed upon them by the law and to do it without delay, and to keep me personally informed of their progress." 2/

Five days later Secretary Freeman followed up on his June 15 memorandum with a request that agencies make a definite determination

1/ The Secretary to Assistant Secretaries and agency heads, June 15, 1964, In Files, Agricultural History Branch, U. S. Economic Research Service.

2/ Public Papers of the Presidents, Lyndon B. Johnson, 1963-64, Vol. II, p. 841.

- 6 -

of ways in which Title VI of the law would effect each program or an explanation why it did not apply. 1/

On July 10, Secretary Freeman stated that while he would direct and coordinate all phases of the program with the assistance of the Under Secretary, the Assistant Secretaries, and the Directors, the Assistant Secretary for Administration was his staff representative to coordinate and direct day-to-day activities. Heads of agencies were to be personally responsible for positive and affirmative direction in carrying out this program in keeping with the full spirit and letter of the National policy. These executives with the top administrators subsequently drafted regulations and instructions to carry out the Act. The Secretary also announced that he would use the State Administrative Committees, appointed in 1962, to work on "field relationships." 2/

At this stage, Assistant Secretary Robertson was to work closely with Thomas Hughes, Executive Assistant to the Secretary, and Kenneth Birkhead, Legislative Liaison. William Seabron, at that time Assistant to the Director of Personnel, was to explore the feasibility of the Secretary meeting with Civil Rights leaders. The Secretary had adopted the policy "that we move forward vigorously and aggressively regardless

1/ Orville L. Freeman to Assistant Secretaries and Agency Heads, July 7, 1964, In Files, Agricultural History Branch, U. S. Economic Research Service.

2/ U. S. Department of Agriculture, Secretary's Memorandum 1560, July 10, 1964; Statement of John A. Baker, Jan. 25, 1965, U. S. Department of Agriculture Press Release 274-65.

- 7 -

of consequences. That we might show some common sense in certain extreme situations by way of timing, ought to be understood but not stated, and certainly so communicated as to give no one an out or a loophole." The Secretary did meet with representatives of the major Negro civil rights organizations to review the Department's method in carrying out the act and to seek areas of mutual cooperation. 1/

The President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity asked for a report on minority group employment as of June 30, 1964, covering all full-time employees, including temporary people, in Washington and the field.

About 250 administrative officers of agencies in the States were invited to a series of one day seminars for groups of 25, held in Washington, August 3-6, 1964, to discuss sections of the Civil Rights Act affecting the Department. Secretary Freeman told one group that they were:

...the most significant we have ever attended together.... The beneficial effects [of the Act] will be felt more quickly and with less misunderstanding if it is carried out promptly with a minimum of confusion.... So far as this Department is concerned, there will be no delays in eliminating discrimination where it exists within the agencies of the Department....

I pledge you the support and backing of the President and of the Secretary of Agriculture. We share with you a firm belief that discrimination has no place either in the way an agency operates, or in the programs it administers. 2/

1/ The Secretary to Joseph Robertson, July 11, 1964, In Files, Agricultural History Branch, U. S. Economic Research Service; Statement of John A. Baker, Jan. 28, 1965, U. S. Department of Agriculture Press Release 274-64.

2/ U. S. Department of Agriculture Press Release 2569-64, Aug. 3, 1964; U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agenda, Civil Rights Seminar, Aug. 6, 1964. In Files, Agricultural History Branch, U. S. Economic Research Service.

Agencies soon sent memoranda to their offices in Washington and the field urging them to observe "the letter and the spirit of the Civil Rights Act." 1/

To add to the pressure, Hobart Taylor, Vice Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, brought to the Secretary's attention the "advantages of bringing persons identified with minority groups into the role of professional advisors and consultants." The Secretary requested that agencies report such utilization on their monthly minority group employment report. 2/

Journalists saw the implications of the implementation of the Civil Rights Act as a challenge to the extension system within the existing social system. The Department was working at maintaining its image. For example, on October 26, 1964, it released a news story on the appointment of a Negro accountant and a Negro chemist. In early 1965, the Office of Personnel released a pictorial review of minority employment in middle and upper grades, USDA Progress in Equal Opportunity Employment. 3/

1/ U. S. Economic Research Service, ERS General Memorandum 29, Aug. 26, 1964; U. S. Agricultural Research Service, Temporary Circular 64-129, Aug. 10, 1964.

2/ U. S. Agricultural Research Service, Temporary Circular 64-153, Sept. 14, 1964.

3/ U. S. Department of Agriculture Press Release 3603-64, Oct. 26, 1964.

In his statement on October 3, 1964 on the achievements of the 88th Congress, President Johnson said:

It [the Civil Rights Act] represents a fundamental American commitment to ensure all our people their full constitutional rights, and equal opportunity to share in the blessing of American life. 1/

Results from agency efforts at recruiting were disappointing. Still there was the problem of basic or professional training complicating the picture. However, monthly reports on minority employment showed a gradual advance, including middle and upper level positions. 2/

By mid-January, Secretary Freeman wrote to the President that the report of the Civil Rights Commission, highly critical of his Department, would be released the following month. One of the problems to be solved was the policy for appointment of Negro ASCS State Committeemen when vacancies occurred where there were Negro farmers. 3/

On January 27, 1965, the Secretary announced the promotion of William M. Seabron from an Assistant to the Director of Personnel to Assistant to the Secretary "to coordinate the responsibilities of Departmental agencies under the Civil Rights Act of 1964." In emphasizing the

1/ Public Papers of the Presidents, Lyndon B. Johnson, 1963-64, Vol. II, p. 1202.

2/ Joseph M. Robertson to the Secretary, Dec. 24, 1964; Carl Heisig to the Secretary, Dec. 10, 1964; Harry C. Trelogan to the Secretary, Dec. 10, 1964. In Files, Agricultural History Branch, U. S. Economic Research Service; Statement of John A. Baker, Jan. 28, 1965, U. S. Department of Agriculture Press Release 274-65.

3/ Orville L. Freeman to the Vice President, Feb. 3, 1965, Freeman Chronological File, Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

- 10 -

importance of this appointment, the Secretary said: "I want the civil rights responsibilities of our agencies effectively coordinated so that there will be no delay in eliminating discrimination wherever it exists within the agencies of the Department." 1/

Seabron rather succinctly analyzed one of his problems shortly after his appointment in USDA Progress in Equal Employment Opportunity thus:

The test of the sincerity with which equal employment opportunity is available for minority group workers in this Agency, however, is inextricably tied to the availability of qualified applicants who successfully complete the various Civil Service tests required to obtain employment consideration. This presupposes equality of educational opportunity which unfortunately does not exist in many sections of our country. To obtain more talent secondary public school education available to minority group youth must be strengthened and a realistic upgrading and updating of college course offerings must be continually achieved in the institutions where the majority of these workers are trained, if quality graduates are to be available.

On February 27, 1965, the United States Commission on Civil Rights submitted its report on its appraisal of Departmental service in Equal Opportunity in Farm Programs. It was particularly critical of the discrimination against Negroes in employment in the field in the Extension Service, the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service and the Farmers Home Administration in numbers, classifications, salary, duties assigned, training, and office space and facilities.

1/ U. S. Department of Agriculture Press Release 259-65, Jan. 27, 1965.

- 11 -

In commenting on the issuance of the Report, Secretary Freeman said:

I know of no one, except those who refuse to face facts, who would disagree with the Commission finding that there has been discrimination in the administration of programs. This discrimination has been the result of social patterns that have prevailed for a long time.

.

The rights of all citizens to participate with equal opportunity in the Federal farm programs, or to obtain equal employment in Federal agencies, must be upheld at all times. The drive to achieve this has the sanction of law and is reflected in the policies and orders of this Department since the beginning of this Administration.

.

In June, 1961, I issued a directive forbidding the use of any standard other than merit or ability in the employment, training, assignment and promotion of USDA employees. Following this action, I met with each agency administrator individually on a number of occasions to discuss program administration and employment practices to secure the rule of equal opportunity.

Over a year ago, I further requested each agency to submit a monthly report on employment levels and hirings to determine agency performance.

In the past year, both key Department officials and I have met with civil rights groups to discuss the effect of the Civil Rights Law on the Department and to indicate the intent of the Department to carry this law out.

Each agency is now required to:

- * End the practices where they exist of permitting segregated services by segregated staffs
- * End the practices where they exist of maintaining segregated staffs and segregated offices.

.

- 12 -

These actions reflect some of the efforts which have been made in the past four years to insure equal opportunity in the USDA and in the programs administered by the Department. It is my firm purpose to use all the powers vested in the Office of Secretary of Agriculture to insure that all vestige of discrimination and inequality will be removed from the USDA. 1/

In line with the President's request for a report on the implementation of the Commission's recommendations, the Secretary appointed a task force to analyze and review its findings. On March 26, the Secretary reported that:

All remaining discrimination and segregation in offices and related facilities used in Department programs is to be eliminated without delay. In those instances where immediate action is precluded because new construction or facilities are required, action will be taken as rapidly as possible. All rehousing should be completed not later than December 31, 1965.

A review of Negro professional staff recruitment and assignment as well as training and promotional opportunities is to be conducted to insure the elimination of inequities that may exist in any of these activities. This review will be the responsibility of the Director of Personnel who will report on his survey by June 20, 1965.

Furthermore, the policy of nondiscriminatory service assignments and operations within the Department will be enforced without exception. All Staff, both Negro and white, at every level, will serve all rural residents equally and without regard to the race, color, creed, or national origin of the staff of the clientele to be served. 2/

1/ U. S. Department of Agriculture Press Release, Feb. 26, 1965.

2/ Lyndon B. Johnson to Orville L. Freeman, Feb. 27, 1965, Freeman Chronological File, Lyndon B. Johnson Library; Task Force Established to Review the Recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mar. 24, 1965; Orville L. Freeman to the President, Mar. 26, 1965. In Files, Agricultural History Branch, U. S. Economic Research Service; U. S. Department of Agriculture Press Release 732-65, Mar. 8, 1965.

- 13 -

The Secretary also told administrators of all the Department agencies that there were parts of it that could be debated with logic and justice. Nevertheless, "it would be the policy of this Department to accept it without a single protest, and to act upon it in a positive manner." 1/

On March 22, Horace Godfrey, Administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, directed State and county offices to step up Negro hiring. In States where 10 percent or more of the farmers were Negro, a Negro should be appointed to the first vacancy on the State Committee; minority group employment should be a percentage equal to their percentage of the non-white farmers; a Negro advisory committee was to be appointed to assure equal opportunity in employment; and plans announced for temporary summer employment of Negroes. Less than two months later, Godfrey received a special award from the Secretary for his "extraordinarily effective administration of the policy of eliminating discrimination of any kind" in ASCS programs. At the time, some civil rights leaders said his agency had done more than any other to end discrimination. 2/

Another follow-up measure was taken on March 31, when the State Administrative Committees were assigned responsibility for negotiating with building owners to eliminate segregation in public facilities or to

1/ U. S. Department of Agriculture Press Release, 1539-65, May 17, 1965.

2/ Washington Farmletter, Apr. 23, 1965; U. S. Department of Agriculture Press Release 1558-65, May 18, 1965; New York Times, May 23, 1965.

- 14 -

negotiate for space where there was no such discrimination. Three days later the Department announced the appointment of the first Negro farmers to ASC State Committees, in Arkansas, Maryland, and Mississippi. 1/

In line with his report to the President on March 26, 1965, the Secretary stated on April 22, what commitments he had made. These included: immediate action to secure complete elimination of all remaining segregation and discrimination in office space and related facilities and establishment of procedures to enforce non-discriminatory service arrangements in program areas. "All personnel, both Negro and white, at every level, will serve all Department clientele equally and without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin of either the Department officer or the client to be served." The Office of the Inspector General was to make continuing review and special surveys to insure compliance. 2/

A Citizens Advisory Committee on Civil Rights was established on April 29, 1965, to review Departmental policies, practices, and procedures, advise the Secretary on effectiveness of program directives, and recommend changes in rules, regulations and orders to assure freedom from discrimination. At its first meeting, heads of agencies reported on steps being taken

1/ U. S. Department of Agriculture, Secretary's Memorandum 1560, Sup. 1, Mar. 31, 1965; Press Release 1059-65, Apr. 2, 1965.

2/ U. S. Department of Agriculture, Secretary's Memorandum 1572, Apr. 22, 1965; Lester P. Condon to all Agency Heads, May 5, 1965. In Files, Agricultural History Branch, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

- 15 -

to achieve compliance with the Act. The Committee recommended that the Department take the initiative in training Negroes for jobs in its offices. 1/

In making his report to the President on progress on the elimination of discrimination on June 17, 1965, he commented: "we have promises to keep and miles to go before we sleep." He could point with pride to the progress in integrated office quarters and facilities and increased employment of Negroes in the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, the Farmers Home Administration, and the Soil Conservation Service. The Federal Extension Service also reported steps taken to ameliorate discriminatory practices. 2/

On July 19, 1965, John Schnittker, as Acting Secretary, sent the President another report, on Negro recruitment, assignment, training, and promotional opportunities within the Department. During the 10-month period, June 30, 1964 to April 30, 1965, Negro full-time employment increased 17 percent, from 3,056 to 3,585, despite an 11 percent decline in overall full-time employment. The Department's Office of Personnel's survey on opportunities for Negro professionals had revealed many unrealized problems. He announced the Department's intention to hold a

1/ Washington Farmletter, May 21, 1965; Rock Island Argus, May 22, 1965; U. S. Department of Agriculture Press Release 1569-65, May 19, 1965; Secretary's Memorandum 1575, Apr. 29, 1965.

2/ Orville L. Freeman to the President, June 17, 1965. In Files, Agricultural History Branch, U. S. Economic Research Service.

- 16 -

series of field conferences to inform field officials what was to be expected of them under the equal employment opportunity program.

Joseph M. Robertson, Assistant Secretary for Administration, asked the Director of Personnel to represent him at these conferences. 1/

Assistant Secretary Robertson continued to take a firm stand on the implementation of the full conception of "Equal Employment Opportunity." In a memorandum to heads of agencies on September 24, 1965, the same day on which President Johnson signed Executive Order 11246 revising and strengthening earlier policy, he wrote:

"Equal employment" and "affirmative action" are terms like justice, honesty, and virtue, that are often discussed and accepted without questioning their real meaning. The purpose of this memorandum is to analyze what these terms mean and what is involved in practicing them.

"Equal employment" and "affirmative action" are simply matters of morality - right as opposed to wrong. They also involve principles of good management - economy, efficiency, and reduction of wasted resources, abilities, and manpower.

Equal employment does not mean that unqualified people are to be employed or that the Civil Service Act or any other laws or regulations are to be violated. It does mean that qualified minority personnel are to be "sought out" and that they shall have "full access" to training programs, work assignments, details, and many other techniques to qualify them for appropriate advancement. Minority personnel cannot effectively compete or share in the full rewards of our society by our simply declaring a state of equal opportunity to exist. Equal opportunity must mean for them - the opportunity to be equal in every respect.

1/ John A. Schnittker to the President, July 19, 1965; Joseph M. Robertson to Heads of Department Agencies, Sept. 21, 1965. In Files, Agricultural History Branch, U. S. Economic Research Service.

- 17 -

There now exists a gap - economically, culturally, and educationally - between minority group citizens and others in our society. This gap cannot be closed without affirmative action. This means more than simply putting up a poster, taking down a sign, or endorsing some new policy. It involves deliberate, aggressive, positive action in recruiting, assigning, upgrading, and training personnel. It involves realistic tools for screening applicants. It involves opening "fillable" jobs to minorities, not just those for which other personnel are not available, or the least desirable jobs. It means following the spirit as well as the letter of the law.

Supervisory and managerial personnel are the key to making affirmative action and the equal employment opportunity policy meaningful. The supervisor has authority over his employees which can be used to advance them, to hold them back, to terminate them, or to exercise his biases. All supervisory personnel of the Department must make it unmistakably clear - by deed as well as by word - that it is the policy of the Department to vigorously support the letter and the spirit of affirmative action for equal employment opportunity. There can be no evasion, no mere lip service, no minimizing its intent or application. The meaning of this policy is clear and understandable. It applies to all employees and must be activated with no mental reservation on the part of any supervisor or manager.

On April 1, 1966, the Director of Personnel announced that the Secretary had approved the regulations on equal employment opportunity, including a procedure on handling complaints. When the Department, using a form prepared by the Civil Service Commission, asked employees to complete a form on racial or national origins, many complained. Monthly statistical reports on minority employment had been discontinued in May and only annual information was compiled on a regular basis. 1/

1/ U. S. Department of Agriculture, Office of Personnel, Personal Letter 713-5, Apr. 1, 1966; Washington Post, Aug. 1, 1966.

- 18 -

When Director of Personnel made his report for the 1966 fiscal year he included as major activities:

1. Setting up and assisting in the conduct of 17 field conferences to discuss and plan activities for cooperative efforts in the EEO area. These conferences were chaired by agency personnel officers representing the Director.
2. The Director actively participated in a series of 8 field conferences conducted by the Office of the Secretary on EEO and civil rights programs.
3. USDA regulations on EEO were completely revised in light of the new CSC regulations.
4. We worked with the agencies in the preparation of detailed plans for progress in EEO. Included in this was development of an overall USDA plan for progress.
5. The Department has implemented the minority group population census. This census will provide information which was before unavailable concerning numbers, grade levels, occupational areas and other information concerning minority group personnel.
6. We have continued our intensive contacts with representatives of CSC and other Departments and Agencies in promoting EEO. We have also maintained our contacts with educational institutions and minority group organizations in furthering this program.

Although policies for implementing the Civil Rights Act and the Equal Employment Opportunity Program were formalized, problems continued. Personnel ceilings reduced the opportunity for the employment of minority group applicants. The continuation of recruiting in depressed areas, such as the Appalachian, also presented competition. Recruiters found prospects not interested in Federal employment or offered better positions elsewhere. The Department also found it easier to apply and implement the program in Washington than in the field.

- 19 -

At a meeting of the Department's Citizens Advisory Commission on Civil Rights held in Raleigh, North Carolina in December 1966, many of the problems of Southern States were brought to the front. Some found it easier to apply the personnel procedures at the State level than in county operations. The difference in programs and traditions had influenced compliance or continued non-compliance. 1/

Members of the House Appropriations Committee questioned the Secretary about civil rights in the Department. Freeman told them that hiring was "in terms of ability and qualifications." But, he continued: "We have found a shortage of qualified Negroes for many professional and subprofessional jobs, and this has been the greatest problem in connection with hiring minority groups." To solve this problem, the Department had "tried to encourage Negroes to develop the skills that could be used in the Department." 2/

The Office of the Special Assistant to the Secretary for Civil Rights was strengthened in April 1967, by the appointment of several Field Civil Rights Specialists. They were to provide "civil rights guidance to Department agencies and the public..., examine USDA agency facilities, and the methods by which Department programs are made available to the public..., to assure that agency policies and procedures are effectively carried out."

1/ Edwin P. Rogers to the Administrator, Farmers Home Administration, Mar. 1, 1967. In Files, Agricultural History Branch, U. S. Economic Research Service.

2/ U. S. Congress, House Committee on Appropriations, Hearings...Department of Agriculture Appropriations, 1968, p. 104.

Application of the Act of 1964, brought with it complaints and revealed areas not covered by previous Departmental regulations. On March 18, 1968, William Seabron, Special Assistant to the Secretary on Civil Rights, asked the Secretary to issue regulations on "Equal Employment Opportunity in the Cooperative Extension Services," as soon as legally possible. The new regulations covering a unique area of employment were issued August 29, 1968. Each land grant college was to furnish the Secretary an acceptable program "to assure that employment is provided without discrimination." The regulations also provided for a formal complaint procedure, reports on implementation of the program, and provisions for dealing with non-compliance. On October 21, 1968, the Secretary delegated responsibility under the regulations that had become effective on September 28, to the Administrator, Federal Extension Service, the Equal Employment Opportunity Officer (Assistant Secretary for Administration), the Director of Science and Education, and the Director of Science and Education.

In four years since President Johnson signed the Civil Rights Act, the Department has definitely made advances as it has implemented it. On June 30, 1963, there were 3,074 Negroes employed, representing 3.3 percent of the total; On June 30, 1964, there were 3,057 or 3.3 percent; On June 30, 1965, there were 4,324 or 4.5 percent; On June 30, 1966, there were 4,770 or 4.7 percent; On November 30, 1967, the number had

- 21 -

increased to 5,214 or 5.76 percent of total employment. In 1968, the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service reported that:

- Negroes serve on State Committees in five southern States
- 75 Negroes serve on Marketing Quota Review Committees in southern States
- State Advisory Committees on minority group problems serve in 11 southern States
- County Advisory Committees on minority group problems have been created on a pilot basis
- 310 Negroes are employed in permanent full-time positions county offices
- 40 Negroes are employed on a full-time basis in State Offices in the southern States
- 120 Negroes are employed in the Washington Office 1/

The Challenge of Youth. President Johnson announced the establishment of a program of Presidential Scholars on April 16, 1964, "to recognize the most precious resource of the United States--the brain power of its young people--to encourage the pursuit of intellectual attainments among all our youth." Following the appointment of the first group of these outstanding high school graduates (2 from each State), Secretary Freeman

1/ Statistics furnished by Departmental Office of Personnel; Narrative report of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service on the Johnson Administration, 1968. In Files, Agricultural History Branch, U. S. Economic Research Service.

suggested to the President that they represented an unused reservoir for the Federal Government; that the Government might profit from a program:

Whereby interesting and challenging government employment might be offered as a part of this scholarship program. If we had a young man or young woman interested in science or public administration who had worked during the summer or for periods of time during their college tenure for the government, Uncle Sam might have a much better chance of recruiting them for permanent government employment when their education is completed. 1/

On October 3, 1964, President Johnson announced another program to benefit older young people when he spoke to a group of college student leaders. By Executive Order 11183, he established the White House Fellows program for 15 outstanding young people between the ages of 23 and 36. One was to be assigned to each cabinet member for a 15-month period to give them "first-hand, high-level experience with the workings of the Federal Government and to increase their sense of participation in our national affairs." Those assigned to the Department of Agriculture have interjected a fresh look at the Department's activities. 2/

Repeatedly the President has spoken of his concern for those other young people who in an increasingly technological society have been entering the labor market handicapped by inadequate education. Programs of the Department have provided some assistance through extension education and aid to low income families. Through the years, some have entered

1/ Public Papers of the Presidents, Lyndon B. Johnson, 1963-64, Vol. I, p. 468; Orville L. Freeman to the President, June 18, 1965, Secretary's Files, U. S. Department of Agriculture; Executive Order 11155, May 25, 1964.

2/ Public Papers of the Presidents, Lyndon B. Johnson, 1963-64, Vol. II, p. 1205; Executive Order 11183, Oct. 3, 1964.

- 23 -

low paying jobs and continued their education at night; others have worked in the summer. Beginning with the Action for Youth Program in 1964, with about 80 underprivileged young people hired by the Department in the Washington area, a more concerted program was underway. In 1965, in line with many statements, President Johnson initiated the Youth Opportunity Campaign to provide summer employment that would be the first step toward a permanent career or an opportunity to earn money for further education for economically deprived boys and girls, ages 16 to 21. Each year the Department has employed a large number. In 1965, there were 1,939; in 1966, there were 1,760; in 1967, there were 2,079; and in 1968, there were 2,775. Some of these have shifted over in winter months to part-time employment under the Back to School Program, thus continuing their education. 1/

Employment and Recognition of Women. Another area of special interest to the President was the employment of women. He was, in fact, continuing efforts begun earlier. Executive Order 10980, dated December 14, 1961, had established the President's Commission on the Status of Women to study the general area of status of women, including their employment in the Federal Government and develop recommendations for overcoming discrimination. Its report submitted to the President on October 11, 1963, led to the establishment of an Interdepartmental

1/ Statistical Information furnished by U. S. Department of Agriculture, Office of Personnel, Oct. 31, 1968; Memorandum to Heads of Department Agencies, May 28, 1965. In Files, Agricultural History Branch, U. S. Department of Agriculture; U. S. Department of Agriculture, Hope: Highlights of Personal Experiences in the U. S. Department of Agriculture under the President's Youth Opportunity Campaign, 1966; U. S. Department of Agriculture Press Release 1689-65, June 2, 1965.

- 24 -

Committee on the Status of Women and a Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women by Executive Order 11126, dated November 1, 1963. The Secretary served on both the President's Commission and on the Interdepartmental Committee. 1/

After the first meeting of the Interdepartmental Committee, its Chairman requested Heads of Departments and agencies, "in line with the President's recent personal emphasis, make a special effort to see that all employees are informed of your program to effect full equality of opportunity without regard to sex." Secretary Freeman asked Heads of agencies "to assume full responsibility for an aggressive approach providing for active recognition and application of nondiscrimination on the basis of sex in making appointments, advancement, or training of employees." The Director of Personnel drew up the plan for implementing an active program. 2/

The announcement on March 20, 1964, of Dorothy H. Jacobson's nomination by President Johnson as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for International Affairs represented a tremendous advance from the very early days of the Department when women took temporary employment, filling small envelopes with seed for free distribution by Congress. While some

1/ 26 F.R. 12059; 28 F.R. 11717; 30 F.R. 6427.

2/ U. S. Department of Agriculture, Secretary's Memorandum 1052, Feb. 26, 1964; W. Willard Wirtz to Orville Freeman, Jan. 27, 1964, Secretary's Files, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

moved into professional work, many remained in lower grades. Assistant Secretary Jacobson was the first woman to serve in that capacity or as an Assistant to the Secretary. Dorothy Jacobson had also been involved in the activities of the President's Commission on the Status of Women. 1/

Generally, the appointment or promotion of women to positions of less prestige occurred with little publicity. In February 1965, however, Isabelle Kelley, a long-time employee of the Department, was appointed as Director of the Food Stamp Division of the Consumer and Marketing Service. She had previously received the Department's Superior Service Award, as have a number of other women, for her achievements. 2/

The trend was underway. The President continued to urge the Departments to act as he carried on his "search for highly qualified women for service in the Federal Government." Some women moved into work formerly limited to men. 3/

By Executive Order 11375, dated October 13, 1967, President Johnson reinforced his expressed intent to have the Federal service exemplify equal employment opportunity for all persons by adding "sex" to existing Executive Order 11246 prohibiting discrimination in Federal employment because of race, color, religion or national origin.

1/ U. S. Department of Agriculture Press Release 932-64.

2/ U. S. Department of Agriculture Press Release 494-65, Feb. 16, 1965.

3/ U. S. Department of Agriculture, Office of Management Services Memorandum 79, Dec. 9, 1964; Agricultural Research Service Temporary Circular 64-177, Oct. 29, 1964; Joseph M. Robertson to Heads of Department Agencies, Mar. 2, 1965. In Files, Agricultural History Branch, U. S. Economic Research Service; USDA Employee Newsletter, Sept. 29, 1966.

The Department has been proud of the achievements of its women employees. Three have received the Federal Woman's Award--Allene R. Jeanes, Research Scientist, Agricultural Research Service, 1962; Verna Mohagen, Personnel Director, Soil Conservation Service, 1963; and Ruth Benerito, Research Chemist, Agricultural Research Service, 1968.

In February 1968, the Departmental Office of Personnel published USDA Women in Action, presenting brief sketches of the work of such employees. In his foreword, President Johnson explained again his views:

Discrimination because of sex--no less than discrimination because of race or religion or place of birth--is in artificial and degrading barrier. Over the years, American women have had to fight against the myth that they were naturally barred from positions of responsibility in our society. Through their determination, hard work, and demonstrated ability, they have exposed that myth for the pernicious prejudice it is.

.
Some still refuse to recognize the capabilities of women as employees. In this society, with its constant and growing need for talent, sensitivity, and insight, their mistaken reluctance deprives America of a priceless human resource. We are determined that their views will not prevail in the government.

Employment of Special Groups. The Department has continued the program initiated by President Kennedy in employing mentally retarded people and other handicapped persons. In endorsing President Johnson's statement in 1964, Secretary Freeman called attention to the fact that "they are strongly motivated and loyal, their attendance regular, their accident rate low, and their productivity high." Agencies responded.

- 27 -

In 1964, the Department appointed 190 handicapped people; in 1965, 259; in 1966, 546; in 1967, 536; and in the first nine months of 1968, 462. 1/

The Department has for years benefitted from the reservoir of its retirees, as they served on special projects, as consultants, and on advisory committees. The Department has served senior citizens through its various programs. In his announcement of Senior Citizens Month in 1966, the Secretary of Agriculture urged heads of agencies and field offices "to enlist the wisdom and experience of senior citizens in your programs--not only this month but all during the coming year." The Ottawa National Forest in Michigan employed 45 such citizens in 1968 in information activities to promote tourism in the area. Some served as tourist guides in the Forest. 2/

The Department has shown its interest in the employment of returning servicemen especially after World War I, World War II, and the Korean Conflict. Following President Johnson's message to Congress on January 30, 1968, in which he gave his objective for a program of

1/ Orville Freeman to Heads of Department Agencies, July 2, 1964; Statistical information furnished by Office of Personnel, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

2/ Orville Freeman to Heads of Department Agencies and All USDA Field Offices, Apr. 13, 1966; USDA Employee Newsletter, Sept. 26, 1968. In Files, Agricultural History Branch, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

- 28 -

service to "Vietnam Era Veterans," Secretary Freeman urged heads of agencies to join him in making it a reality. He asked them to meet the challenge by giving Vietnam veterans "personalized assistance and information concerning the benefits available to them, and special consideration for employment in this Department." 1/

Training Activities. Through the years, the Department has benefitted from the training given by the USDA Graduate School (See Chapter VII). It has, however, not relied entirely on this facility. It has given an increasing amount of training, during working hours, especially to lower grade employees. This has enabled those with limited basic training, especially from minority groups, to prepare themselves for advancement. The Department has continued in the Management Intern Program with promising young professionals.

There have been a number of interagency development training programs. Seminars in executive development for GS-13 through GS-18 have been designed to cut across agency lines to give top management officials a broad view of the Department, Federal and State Governments, and the World. The seminars for middle managers, GS-11 through GS-14, have been designed to provide an opportunity for a broader understanding of the Department with an emphasis on improving manager skills. The seminars on problem analysis and decision-making for grades GS-13

1/ Orville L. Freeman to Heads of Department Agencies, Apr. 2, 1968, Secretary's Files, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

through GS-18, are to improve skill in analyzing problems and making program decisions. Luncheon meetings for training officers and program officials have been continued. 1/

The separate Departmental agencies have also carried on training programs of seminars, luncheon meetings, conferences, and the like. They have also profited from the program at the Civil Service Commission's Executive Seminar Center at Kings Point, New York. Other outside training has been facilitated by special legislation for returning servicemen and exchange of Federal and State employees and the Government Employees Training Act.

The Department also publishes a number of training aids. Employees are urged to attend professional meetings, where some of them receive special recognition. The Department also encourages its employees to qualify for various scholarships, fellowships, and internships, such as the Princeton Mid-Career Program, the National Institute of Public Affairs, and Legislative internships.

Recognition of Excellence. Each year the Department honors some of its outstanding employees at its Annual Honor Awards Ceremony. Many employees receive performance awards that include a cash award; some

1/ U. S. Department of Agriculture, Annual Report of the Director of Personnel, 1963, pp. 59-61; 1964, pp. 26-28; 1965, pp. 57-68; 1966; pp. 16-17.

receive awards in connection with the "Cost Reduction Program," announced by the President in 1964--a reemphasized suggestion program. 1/

The Department has been proud of all employee accomplishments. Agencies have been encouraged to suggest candidates for national outside awards programs. An Arthur S. Fleming Award was received by Martin E. Abel, Deputy Assistant Secretary, International Affairs in 1968; by Edwin Jaenke, Associate Administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, in 1967; Lester R. Brown, Administrator of the International Agricultural Development Service, in 1966; and by Serge N. Timasheff, Head, Physical Chemical Investigations, Milk Properties Laboratory, Agricultural Research Service, in 1964. Horace Godfrey, Administrator, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service received the National Civil Service League Career Service Award in 1967; and Edward P. Cliff, Chief, Forest Service received it in 1968. In 1968, Gary Bearden, Director of the Washington Data Processing Center, was the recipient of the William A. Jump Award, honoring the renowned Budget and Finance Officer of the Department. Donald A. Williams, Administrator, Soil Conservation Service; and Edward Knipling, Director, Entomology Research, Agricultural Research Service received the Rockefeller Public

1/ Orville L. Freeman, Memorandum to All Employees of the Department of Agriculture, June 29, 1964; Orville L. Freeman, "Cost Reduction in the U. S. Department of Agriculture," Defense Management Journal, 4(1):3-6, Winter 1967-68.

Service Award in 1966 and 1967, respectively. Knipling received the 1967 National Medal of Science. Many other employees have received recognition from various groups.

On August 17, 1965, Vice President Humphrey presented the President's Safety Award to Secretary Freeman, an award in which each employee shared honor. The Department has continued its safety program under President Johnson's Mission Safety-70 Goal, announced February 16, 1965. In 1966, the Department received Honorable Mention under this competition. 1/

Number of Personnel. The period since 1963 has been one in which the number of people employed in the Department has increased, even though some form of ceiling has been in effect most of the time and there have been restrictions on filling of vacancies. In 1963, there were 112,488 employees; in 1964, 108,476; in 1965, 113,017; in 1966, 118,585, in 1967; 121,871; and in 1968, 122,715. 2/

1/ Public Papers of the Presidents, Lyndon B. Johnson, 1965, Vol. I, pp. 197-98, 596; Orville L. Freeman to the President, Apr. 28, 1967, Secretary's Files, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

2/ Statistical information for June 30 of each year furnished by U. S. Department of Agriculture, Office of Personnel.