

From: "Stephen.McLin@Schwab.com%inter2" <Stephen.McLin@Schwab.com>
Subject: Farm Bill 2007 Official Comments - 08/09/2005 05:41 PM CDT
Date Sent: 08/09/2005 05:41:55 CDT
Date Received: 08/09/2005 05:44:12 CDT

Email: Stephen.McLin@Schwab.com
FirstName: Steve
LastName: McLin
Address1: 2672 West Newell Avenue
Address2:
City: Walnut Creek
State: California
zipcode: 94595

Question1: The best way to avoid unintended consequences is to not tinker with the free market -- if there were no farm "policy," there will still be farmers in the future because this nation must eat, and thus there will always be a profit motive to grow food -- regardless of bogus subsidies and price supports.

Question2: A good start would be the end of ridiculous sugar price supports, benefiting the few at the expense of many -- not only all U.S. consumers, who pay artificially high prices for sugar products, but poor cane growers in other nations, who can't compete with our artificially priced products.

Question3: There sure as heck is no federal program to "enhance" my income -- so why should farmers be any different? If they can't make money, they'll do something else, and if food gets scarce enough, the price will rise to make it sensible for people to farm. It's really quite simple -- let the invisible hand do its work, which it will do much more efficiently than any pathetic government "farm policy" ever will.

Question4: I can't pretend to have an answer for that question.

Question5: It's sad, but if rural America withers because of advances in technology and the evolution of agriculture, then too bad. There's no reason for the Feds to prop up dying towns or communities just because folks get nostalgic about Little House O' The Prarie.

Question6: I have no comment on this, other than a suggestion that the less the farm bill does about anything (other than striking down price supports, subsidies, forced ad programs, paying to not grow crops, and all the other inane stuff), the better this nation will be.