

For Immediate Release
March 19, 1964

Congressman Bob Dole (R-Kansas) appearing before the House Rules Committee today stated "The action of the Majority party in efforts to ram the Wheat-Cotton bill through the House, without adequate hearings before the House Committee on Agriculture should shock the conscience of those who have loudly protested almost ^{identical} ~~identical~~ procedural maneuvering on the Civil Rights bill in the Senate. The Senate has consumed nearly 2 weeks in an effort to determine whether the Civil Rights measure shall be sent to the Senate Judiciary Committee for Hearings before it is taken up by the Senate.

Failure of the House of Representatives to follow normal procedure makes the House a mere "rubber stamp" for the Senate. There are marked differences between the Senate passed Wheat measure and the so called "Purcell Bill" considered briefly by the Wheat Subcommittee and moved on to the Subcommittee by an 8 to 5 vote "without reconsideration".

Why is it these differences have not been explained? What does this wheat bill do for the American wheat producer? What are the shortcomings and finally why the rush by the Administration, particularly Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, to avoid a wheat referendum this year. Too many farmers have been led to believe the wheat portion of the Wheat-Cotton package bill provides \$2.00 per bushel but as a matter of fact the farmer will receive \$2.00 for only 45% of his production, \$1.55 for 45% and \$1.30 for the remaining 10%. Diversion payments are at an all time low of between \$5.00 and \$6.00 per acre and the overall benefits amount to only about 72% of parity.

Another important question relates to the voluntary aspect of the pending wheat program. Under the present bill there is serious doubt whether the compulsory features of the bill rejected by the farmers last May 21 have been removed. It seems the only change has been from "statutory compulsion" to "economic compulsion" for under the pending program the non-complier will be literally forced into the program ~~and~~^{or}, in the alternative, receive only feed--not market price--for his wheat.

The Rules Committee has an opportunity to protect the rights of American farmers by either refusing to grant a Rule or by granting a Rule which will permit amendments and full debate on the floor.

Certainly there is no valid reason to deny the House an opportunity to work its will. Those of us from wheat producing areas consider this to be a serious matter, we believe the bill can be improved and in fact offered constructive amendments in the Wheat Subcommittee and the full committee in the "sham" hearings on Wheat: ?

The amendments were: