

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Tuesday, February 6, 1962

From the Office of
Congressman Bob Dole
244 House Office Building
Washington 25, D. C.

Statement by Congressman Bob Dole (R-Kansas):

"The ~~new~~ Administration's blueprint for the regimentation of American agriculture has now been introduced in the House of Representatives as H.R. 10010--a 106 page document which spells out in horrifying detail a program of harsh production controls, coupled with fines and jail sentences for farmers who run afoul of its provisions.

The measure tells farmers flatly that the alternative to this federal strait-jacket is no federal price support assistance at all.

Apparently this Administration has decided farmers are becoming an increasingly smaller minority in the United States. If farmers ^{refuse to} accept the production and marketing controls set forth in the new farm bill they would be denied future assistance under federal price support programs, while if farmers bow to this pressure and accept the program, they run the risk of fines or imprisonment for violating its many technical provisions. *The family size jail would replace the family size farm.*

The wheat section of the bill, would for example, subject farmers to four specific penalties ranging from liability under civil action to "a fine of not more than \$10,000 or imprisonment of not more than ten years, or both". Under the bill, wheat growers and dairy producers would be singled out for such harsher fines and penalties than could be assessed against producers of other commodities.

The bill specifies "the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this (wheat) subtitle including but not limited to regulations governing the acquisition, disposition, or handling of marketing certificates". It further provides that any person who violates "any regulation governing the acquisition, disposition or handling of marketing certificates shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than \$5,000 for each violation."

In other words, if a farmer should inadvertently violate a Secretarial regulation relating to marketing certificates published in the Federal Register, he could be subjected to a fine of not more than \$5,000 for each offense.

Never before has the federal government sought to impose such penalties upon American farmers."

The wheat program which would be submitted to farmers for their approval in a referendum is outlined in the bill but it leaves much to be answered. Although the producer would receive from 75 to 90 per cent of parity for wheat consumed as food in the domestic market, wheat moving into export and other uses would be supported at 0 to 90 per cent of parity. *..... A*

national wheat allotment would be set and it would be perhaps 20 per cent below the present allotment of 55 million acres. If growers turned down this entire package in a referendum, all price supports on wheat would be terminated and, to make the price situation even more chaotic, the government would be empowered to dump 200 million bushels of wheat into the market place each year.

For producers of grain sorghums and other feed grains, the alternative choice is equally disastrous. If growers refused to approve a program calling for mandatory controls on all feed grains, price supports would cease and the government could dump up to 10 million tons of feed grain into the market place each year.

American farmers deserve a farm program which offers them a better choice than complete regimentation or disaster in the market place.

Apparently this Administration is determined to impose its "solution" upon farmers. The Kennedy-Freeman farm bill contemplates a so-called land use adjustment program which would have the effect of drastically reducing the number of farms and farmers over a period of years. Should Congress enact this legislative monstrosity, the liquidation of millions of small, family farm people, would undoubtedly be achieved in even less time than the Administration contemplates.