

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 | 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 |

July 17, 1965
Washington, D. C.

FOR RELEASE WEDNESDAY, JULY 21

"THE FARM BILL"

Congressman Bob Dole, a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, predicted a close vote in the House on the Administration's farm proposal. Success or failure of the Omnibus Farm Bill could well depend upon whether it is scheduled before or after House consideration of repeal of Section 14 (b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. Dole stated, "It is predictable that most Mid-West congressmen, Republicans as well as many Democrats, will vote against repeal of Section 14 (b) of the Taft-Hartley Act which now permits states to enact so-called Right-to-Work laws. It has already been called to my attention that, should labor leaders fail in the efforts to repeal 14 (b), many urban congressmen will be pressured to vote against the farm bill in retaliation. Obviously then the Omnibus Farm Bill stands a better chance of passage if it is considered in the House ahead of what promises to be a bitter fight on Section 14 (b)."

Congressman Dole stated that, in his opinion, the five Kansas Republican House members will be key factors in determining whether the farm bill passes or fails. Many urban congressmen are receiving literally hundreds of letters opposing the Wheat Section of the Omnibus Bill because large bakeries and bakery unions, opponents of the certificate plan, indicate it imposes a "tax" on bread and, therefore, is unfair to consumers, particularly those in lower income levels. Without question, the method of financing the wheat certificate plan could bring about efforts on the House floor to remove the Wheat Section from the Omnibus Bill or, in the alternative, to amend the Wheat Section and finance a portion of the proposed increased certificate value by payments from the U. S. Treasury. Payments from the Treasury of a portion of the proposed increase in certificate value would destroy "bread tax" arguments; however, the Administration opposes payments from the Treasury. Some say President Johnson might "veto" the Wheat Bill if such an amendment was adopted because of an increase in cost of approximately \$250 million.

"The Omnibus Bill," Dole stated, "has sections dealing with dairy, wool, cotton, wheat, feed grains, and cropland retirement; and this 'something

(more)

For Release July 21, 1965 * (cont)
(sent July 17, 1965)

-2-

for everybody' approach means congressmen must decide whether the "good" they may see in the bill outweighs its "bad" features. There is apparently something in the bill which every farm organization, whether it be the Farmers Union, the Farm Bureau, the Wheat Growers Association, the Grange, the National Farmers Organization, can support and, likewise, provisions these same organizations either oppose or have expressed no position on. If Congress were to act on the six different sections separately, the Dairy, Wool, Cropland Retirement, and Feed Grain sections, in my opinion, would pass with relative ease; while the Wheat and Cotton sections would be in serious trouble."

"It goes without saying the situation this year is far different than the one prevailing in April of 1964 when the Kansas House members voted against the Administration Wheat-Cotton proposal. We essentially believed that if the Wheat-Cotton Bill were defeated--and the cotton provision was particularly bad--that a new program could have been enacted. The makeup of this Congress, however, is entirely different. There are 37 fewer Republicans in the House, as well as fewer "independent" or "non-Administration" Democrats; so, in my opinion, the choice is whether or not Congress passes the Omnibus Bill, including the Wheat Certificate Plan, or whether there is another wheat referendum based on the mandatory Wheat Certificate Plan enacted in 1962. I do not believe this offers any real alternative to the farmer and doubt many wheat producers would want another wheat referendum this year as controversial as the one in 1963."

Dole concluded, "Of course, I do not know how members of the Kansas House delegation will vote, but know we are all interested in providing additional income to Kansas farmers and that all of us support an amendment which I offered in the Committee and will offer on the House floor to raise the resale price of surplus Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of wheat from 105% of support price plus reasonable carrying charges to 115%, or thereabouts, of support price plus reasonable carrying charges. The Kansas delegation feels very strongly that such an amendment should be adopted to give the market more flexibility, the farmer more income, and to prohibit the Secretary from depressing market prices by dumping surplus stocks on the market. This amendment would certainly not impair the program and would benefit both the cooperator and those who do not wish to participate in the program."