This press release is from the collections at the Robert J. Dole Archive and Special Collections, University of Kansas. Please contact us with any questions or comments: http://dolearchive.ku.edu/ask

BOB DOLE DISTRICT, KANSAS

N HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING AREA CODE 202 225-2715

COMMITTEES: AGRICULTURE RNMENT OPERATIONS ISTRICT OFFICE: FEDERAL BUILDING T BEND, KANSAS (7530 AREA CODE 316 SW 3-5623

> WASHINGTON, D.C. NOVEMBER 1, 1967

Congress of the United States House of Representatives Mashington, D.C. 20515

	COUNTIES:
BARTON	HODGEMAN
CHEYENNE	JEWELL,
CLARK	KEARNY
CLOUD	KIOWA
DECATUR	LANE
DWARDS	LINCOLN
ELLIS	LOGAN
ELLSWORTH	MEADE
FINNEY	MITCHELL
FORD	MORTON
SOVE	NESS
GRAHAM	NORTON
GRANT	OSBORNE
GRAY	OTTAWA
	PAWNEE
HA MILTON	PHILLIPS
HASKELL	PRATT

RAWLINS REPUBLIC ROOKS RUSH SLINE SCOTT SEWARD SHERIDAN SHERMAN SHITH STAFFORD STANTON STANTON STEVENS THOMAS TREGO WALLACE WICHITA

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Congressman Bob Dole, a Republican member of the Livestock and Grains Subcommittee, made this statement following the Subcommittee's action on the Administration's so-called "strategic grain reserve bill".

"The Administration measure was defeated because it was not, in fact, a reserve bill, but simply a device to further stabilize and manipulate the price farmers receive for their commodities. Had the Administration and some Democrat members of the Committee been willing to insulate the stocks acquired under the provisions of the reserve bill, it would have passed without difficulty. In my opinion, the 6 to 6 vote on the amendment offered by Congressman John Zwach of Minnesota indicated the Administration was not interested in a true reserve proposal. The Zwach Amendment would have prevented the release of any reserve stocks at less than 100 percent of parity. This amendment would insulate the stocks from the market, resulting in significant increases in the market prices. 6 Republicans voted for the Zwach Amendment, and significantly, 6 Democrats opposed it. This should leave no doubt as to which Party is interested in improving farm income.

"The cost of the Administration reserve proposal has been estimated at somewhere between \$300 million and \$1 billion. However, witnesses appearing for the Administration persist in telling members of the Subcommittee that they cannot estimate the cost or that it will cost as little as \$10 million the first year. This lack of candor by Administration witnesses is another indication that the Administration bill is nothing but a political gimmick designed for the sole purpose of bailing out Democrats in rural areas in the 1968 elections. This Administration, which has boasted for years about reducing surpluses and which has taken credit for saving the taxpayers millions of dollars in storage costs, now asks the Congress to give them specific authority to do what they have so loudly and continuously condemned.

"The American farmer knows firsthand how this Administration has controlled the market price he receives for his commodities by periodic 'dumping' of wheat and feed grains. The great majority of farmers are opposed to giving the Administration any further license to drive down market prices. The Administration grain reserve bill is not in the best interests of the American farmer or the nonfarmer taxpayer. Efforts by this Administration to push it through the Congress are another admission of failure and frustration and belated recognition by the Administration that its farm policies are highly unpopular in rural America."