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

243 CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING AREA CODE 202 225-2715

COMMITTEE:

DISTRICT OFFICE: 210 FEDERAL BUILDING HUTCHINSON, KANSAS 67901

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

COUNTIES:
HODGEMAN
BARTON JEWELL
CHEYENNE KEARNY
CLARK KINGMAN
COMANCHE LANE
DECATUR LINCOLN
EDWARDS LOGAN
ELLIS MEADE
ELLIS MITCHELL
FINNEY MORTON
FORD NESS
GOVE NORTON
GRAHAM OSBORNE
GRANT OTTAWA
GRAY PAWNEE
GREELEY HILLIPS
HAMILTON
HARPER
HASKELL

HODGEMAN RAWLINS JEWELL RENO JEWELL KEARNY KINGMAN KIOWA LANE LINCOLN RENO REPUBLIC RICE ROOKS RUSH RUSSELL LOGAN SALINE MEADE SCOTT SCOTT SEWARD SHERIDAN SHERMAN SMITH STAFFORD STANTON MITCHELL MORTON NORTON OSBORNE OTTAWA STEVENS PHILLIPS PRATT THOMAS WALLACE

July 15, 1965 FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Congressman Bob Dole (R-Kans) stated today that he voted for HR 9811, the so-called Omnibus Farm Bill, which was passed by the committee this morning by a 2 to 13 vote.

Dole said the bill contains six different titles--dairy, wool, cotton, feed grains, wheat and a section dealing with cropland retirement. "In my opinion," Dole stated, "there is general support for the cropland retirement, the wool and dairy sections of the bill. The most controversy centers around the wheat and cotton secomnibus tions of the/bill."

Dole added that he had discussed during the committee meeting this morning the possibilities of raising the resale price of Commodity Credit stocks of wheat from the present 105% of the support price plus carrying charges to 115%, or even 110%, of the support price plus carrying charges, and that the committee chairman, Mr. Cooley, and the vice chairman, Mr. Poage, expressed a willingness to attempt to reach a compromise which could be supported when the omnibus bill reaches the House floor.

"In my opinion, wheat producers must have some protection against competition from the release of surplus stocks of wheat from the Commodity Credit Corporation. It is cyrstal clear that wheat farmers have been handicapped under the present unrealistic formula, which permits dumping of surplus stocks on the market. Under the present formula, the price buyers will pay for wheat under a certificate plan is not a free market price, but a government-manipulated price."

Dole concluded, "I supported the bill in committee on the basis an acceptable agreement of sale of Commodity stocks would be reached, but it will be difficult to sup-

port it on the floor of the House unless an amendment to raise the resale formula is adopted."

Page 2

To this I respectfully point out that the purpose of the oil import program is to protect our nation's security.

When the program was established in 1959, the President declared:

"The basis of the new program, like that for the voluntary program, is the certified requirements of our national security which make it necessary that we preserve to the greatest extent possible a vigorous, healthy petroleum industry in the United States."

The domestic industry is not vigorous and healthy, and oil imports should be reduced sufficiently to aid in restoring health and vigor to this vital industry.

Due to the alarming declines in exploratory drilling, this Nation in four of the past seven years, has found and developed less crude oil than we produced. This dangerous trend has developed during the Mandatory Oil Import Program which is certainly persuasive evidence that the import level is too high.

These experiences demonstrate to me that a reduction in imports from the Caribbean area is "required for the national security of the United States."

In my letter to Secretary Mann of May 29, I stated:

"In view of the recent negative attitude Venezuela has taken toward the United States in our attempts to stabilize conditions in the Dominican Republic, it would appear that this nation's 'oil diplomacy' policy in the Caribbean was of little or no help.

As to this, you replied:

"Like you, the Department regrets that Venezuela does not fully share our view of developments in the Dominican Republic. One of our greatest strengths as a nation, however, is that we do not require slavish agreement from our friends as a price for retaining our friendship. We do not seek satellites. Despite differences over the Dominican problem, the area of agreement between Venezuela and the United States on other topics is impressive. Venezuela gave us its full support during the Cuban crisis of 1963, and was our most active ally in obtaining political and economic sanctions against Cuba by the Organization of American States in 1964."

Mr. Secretary, are you suggesting that it is all right for Venezuela to require slavish adherence on the part of the United States to a no cut in imports policy as the price it exacts for siding with us on occasion in Latin American politics.

I do not advocate that the United States practice such a "slavish" policy. But I do advocate a reduction in imports from the Caribbean area for the purpose of helping to restore a healthy domestic oil producing industry in the interest of our nation's security. If we become dependent on unstable foreign sources for our oil, this nation will be unable to stop the spread of Communism in Latin America as well as the rest of the world.

I urge the Department of State to reconsider its position on oil imports with the important objective in mind of keeping the United States strong so that we will be in a position to help others remain free. I Would appreciate your further comments and particularly a statement as to the position the Department will take as a member of the interagency committee that has been established to review the oil import program.