

**BOB DOLE**  
1ST DISTRICT, KANSAS  
  
COMMITTEE:  
AGRICULTURE  
  
DISTRICT OFFICES:  
ROOMS 210-211  
FEDERAL BUILDING  
HUTCHINSON, KANSAS  
  
BOX 31  
RUSSELL, KANSAS

**Congress of the United States**  
**House of Representatives**  
**Washington, D. C.**

COUNTIES:		
BARBER	HODGEMAN	RAWLINS
BARTON	JEWELL	RENO
CHEYENNE	KEARNY	REPUBLIC
CLARK	KINGMAN	RICE
CLOUD	KIOWA	ROOKS
COMANCHE	LANE	RUSH
DECATUR	LINCOLN	RUSSELL
EDWARDS	LOGAN	SALINE
ELLIS	MEADE	SCOTT
ELLSWORTH	MITCHELL	SEWARD
FINNEY	MORTON	SHERIDAN
FORD	NESS	SHERMAN
GOVE	NORTON	SMITH
GRAHAM	OSBORNE	STAFFORD
GRANT	OTTAWA	STANTON
GRAY	PAWNEE	STEVENS
GREELEY	PHILLIPS	THOMAS
HAMILTON	PRATT	TREGO
HARPER		WALLACE
HASKELL		WICHITA

Room 244, Cannon House Office Building  
CA 4-3121, ext. 2715

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE  
July 29, 1963

Congressman Bob Dole (R-Kansas) released the text of a letter dated July 26 from the USDA in reply to his letter of June 21 in which he posed various questions to Secretary Freeman.

In his letter Dole had asked if the Administration favored and would encourage enactment of a voluntary wheat program for the 1964 crop. Congressman Dole also posed five questions--simplified as follows:

1. Would the USDA object to applying the so-called "Anfuso Amendment" (the history loss provision of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938) only in the event of marketing quotas?
2. Would the USDA object to deleting cross-compliance provisions from Conservation Reserve contracts?
3. Would there be cross-compliance between the present wheat program and the feed grain program?
4. Would USDA object to establishing CCC resale price at 115 percent of current support prices plus carrying charges?
5. Would USDA favor a limited emergency program under which wheat growers could receive payments in kind for voluntarily retiring from production a portion of their 1964 wheat allotment?

The reply is as follows:

July 26, 1963

Honorable Robert Dole  
House of Representatives

Dear Mr. Dole:

This is in response to your letter to the Secretary in which you raised a number of questions regarding the 1964 wheat and feed grains program.

Provisions of the 1964 feed grain program have been announced. Neither cross-compliance nor the "substitution provision" will be used for feed grains and wheat in 1964.

The President and the Secretary have indicated that the Department would consider wheat legislation which would improve farm income and reduce government stocks and costs.

The question of the so-called "Anfuso amendment" was answered in a letter to you from the General Counsel of this Department dated June 13. This provision must be applied whether wheat marketing quotas are in effect or whether they have been rejected by farmers in the referendum. The amendment was originally proposed and supported by wheat producers and wheat producer organizations from the Plain states.

Page 2

Dole Release (July 29, 1963)

The cross-compliance provisions of Conservation Reserve contracts were designed to protect farmers and the Government against the problems which would arise if a farmer were being paid to divert an acreage under a Conservation Reserve contract, and, at the same time, was planting an acreage of wheat or cotton, for example, in excess of his allotment. While this requirement was imposed at a time when marketing quotas for wheat and other crops had been in effect for several years, there is no indication in the legislative history that it was intended to be used only when marketing quotas were in effect.

Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, limits sales of wheat and other commodities for unrestricted use to not less than 105 percent of the support price plus reasonable carrying charges. For 1964 crop wheat, this will be approximately \$1.35, although changes in the parity price of wheat and in applicable carrying charges could change that figure somewhat. There appears to be little chance that there may be many sales from CCC stocks at that price.

In regard to your fifth question, concerning "a limited emergency program under which wheat growers could receive payments in kind for voluntarily retiring from production a portion of their wheat allotments," the Department could not comment on this question without seeing the actual proposal.

Finally, may I say that this Department has very real concern about the problems of the wheat farmers. We have proposed to the Congress major pieces of legislation relating to wheat. This legislation, passed by the Congress, was designed to present the wheat farmers with a supply management program that would increase their income, that would reduce the excess stocks of wheat on hand, and that would reduce the cost to the taxpayers of a supply management program for wheat. The wheat farmers were given an alternative program which would provide a minimum floor of supports to the wheat farmers.

The wheat farmers of the nation, casting one of the largest referendum votes in history, made a very clear choice. We have had very little indication from wheat farmers that they are pressing for any kind of new program.

Sincerely yours,

s/ Kenneth M. Birkhead

Kenneth M. Birkhead  
Assistant to the Secretary

Dole indicated he would contact the Department again for more specific answers. It is clear from their reply that the policy makers in the USDA are standing firm on their policy of no new wheat legislation this year.

#####