

BOB DOLE
1ST DISTRICT, KANSAS
—
244 CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
CAPITOL 4-3121, EXT. 2715
—
COMMITTEE:
AGRICULTURE
—
DISTRICT OFFICE:
210 FEDERAL BUILDING
HUTCHINSON, KANSAS 67501

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

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

January 25, 1964
For Immediate Release

MIDWEST REPUBLICANS MEET ON WHEAT

Twenty-four Midwest Congressmen, representing wheat producing areas, met informally last Friday afternoon to discuss wheat legislation.

Congressman Bob Dole, a member of the Wheat Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee, who called the group together, stated: "The meeting was completely informal, and there was agreement wheat legislation was needed. Those present indicated support for a truly voluntary approach. In addition to the Kansas delegation (Congressman Wm. Avery, Joe Skubitz, Robert Ellsworth, Garner Shriver, and Dole), members of Congress from Iowa, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Utah, Colorado, Illinois, Ohio, Michigan, Montana, and Oklahoma were present."

Dole briefly outlined the so-called "Purcell Bill", now before the full House Agriculture Committee, and said that in its present form it provides only about 70 percent of parity, reduces diversion payments to \$5 - \$8 per acre, and permits substitution of wheat and feed grain acreage upon the Secretary's approval. He stated it failed to conform, even in a general way, to recommendations adopted by the National Wheat Growers Association at their meeting held in Amarillo, Texas, last month, or with the specific recommendations of any other farm organization.

Dole stated that opposition to the "Purcell Bill" has already been expressed to him by the Colorado and Oregon Wheat Growers Associations, representatives of the Farmers Union, and Farm Bureau representatives.

"There has been growing support on the House side for a real compromise, Dole stated, but Administration forces refuse to yield so far."

"The 25 Republicans discussed amendments to existing law which would greatly strengthen the farmer's income and still permit maximum freedom of operation. Some of the points discussed were as follows:

-2- January 25, 1964

1. Increase price support loans effective July 1, 1964.
2. Increase release price to 115% of loan price, plus carrying charges.
3. Authorize temporary acreage diversion payments for those in compliance this and subsequent years.
4. Repeal marketing quotas for 1965 and subsequent years, and also provide authority to permit those who overseed and overharvest to avoid and overharvest to avoid "loss of history" by storing under bond at their own expense.
5. Extend Conservation Reserve contracts which expired December 31, 1963, and those in subsequent years.
6. Repeal or suspend provisions requiring a referendum.

Dole added, "A careful analysis of the "Purcell Bill" makes it difficult to understand how those professing interest in the Kansas wheat farmer would support it. Some believe in the adage "something is better than nothing" but, in my opinion, a ^{more} reasonable and satisfactory compromise that will strengthen the farmers' income can ^{still} be achieved. The Purcell-McGovern type bills are called voluntary, hence, it is interesting to note that Dr. Walter W. Wilcox, Agricultural Specialist, Library of Congress, testified before our committee in support of the McGovern Bill:

"' Ineligibility for wheat certificates worth 70 cents per bushel on approximately 75 percent of a producer's marketings in recent years and ineligibility for wheat and feed grain price support loans, would be sufficient penalty to assure a high degree of voluntary participation."

"Dr. Wilcox, in my opinion, was simply and honestly stating that if someone puts a gun in your back you will "voluntarily" surrender your wallet. Secretary Freeman said as much when he testified on January 7 that those not participating would get only "feed price" for their wheat. While the non-complier should not benefit from a government program neither should he be penalized by a Secretary of Agriculture who could dump surplus commodity stocks on the market, thus keep the price down and force the farmer into a program. This is simply not the American way."