

From: jeh7@ra.msstate.edu
Subject: Farm Bill 2007 Official Comments - 07/07/2005 07:58 PM CDT
Date Sent: 07/07/2005 07:58:06 CDT
Date Received: 07/07/2005 07:58:40 CDT

Email: jeh7@ra.msstate.edu

FirstName: John

LastName: Huston

Address1: 10344 Hwy 382

Address2:

City: Prairie

State: Mississippi

zipcode: 39756

Question1: solve the problem of GMO foods. Either prove to the european union and followers that GMO foods pose no threat, prove to the WTO that blocking GMO's is strictly an opportunity to block US goods or ban GMO's from US production. The fact is, all sales are consumer driven. Why produce a product that consumers don't want or won't purchase. GMO's increase production, but decrease value. Non-GMO's would be more costly to produce, but be more valuable due to decreased production resulting in decreased supplies as well as expanded markets creating increased demand. Non-GMO's might not be as efficient to produce, but may be more profitable. Bottom line, either prove that GMO's are harmless and create opportunities in all markets or ban GMO's world wide altogether. It is a shame when technology creates fear in consumers, like irradiated meat. It is safer, but the perception of radiation eliminates the opportunity for marketing.

Question2: The fact is, as industries grow, the big get bigger and eliminate opportunities for newcomers to develop. Look at automobile manufacturing. I might be the best automotive engineer ever with the most innovative ideas but I will never build my own car because the industry is too large. In fact, I am a cattle producer who was not born into or did not marry into the industry. I must pay as I go. I am profitable and very successful with 8 cows and manage 400 for another person. I have made many people many dollars in the cattle industry but the startup costs are too great for me to be large enough to live off of the profit. It's economies of scale. It is not just land, it is the \$40,000 pickup truck and the \$10,000 goose neck trailer, \$2.25 diesel and incredibly high fertilizer. It's un-affordable health care and \$60/barrell oil with record high steel prices. All of the equipment costs, land costs and operation expenses have inflated more rapidly than the value of the raw commodities of agriculture. Create a federal grant structure to replace the farm payments. A system where one must be a quality producer with production records and a proven track record to earn the subsidies rather than be awarded them based upon the amount of acreage that you own. There are a ton of producers that are horrible in production. We call them welfare farmers. They don't plant on time, they don't spray on time and they don't fertilize on time. They are late to harvest and result in huge losses and they don't care because they have the payments and the subsidized insurance to fall back on. They sub-consciously slack off because they know that the taxpayer will carry them. They inherited land, married into production or was wealthy enough from another industry to afford land and then reap the benefits of land ownership. If producers were required to earn the payments through good management practices you would see people getting out of agriculture in a hurry, creating opportunities for those of us who are good at it. I had all of my second cutting of hay in the barn by the 4th of July. Many producers in the area are still working on their first cutting. They don't try as hard. You gotta make hay when the sun shines. Farming is not a career of convenience. You must be prepared

for opportunities as they come along. With the payments as available as they are, what difference does it make if I don't get my seeds in the ground as early as I could have or spray on time.

Question3: A grant structure. As a cattle producer, I have no opportunity for assistance, I am at the mercy of the market. That's cool. But, I have friends that grow beans regardless of the market because they like growing beans, it is in their comfort zone. The payment structure with LDP's and historic yield creates a safety net. Yank the net. Create a grant system that pays support of a fixed dollar amount/acre of production, regardless of the crop or yield or price. It would be completely decoupled. Any acre in food or fibre production would earn the same dollar amount. Producers would then produce in response to marketing opportunities and supply/demand curves would be more realistic. If a producer wanted to raise watermelons, goats, catfish, wildlife habitat or trees, it wouldn't matter. The grants should be competitive to eliminate the welfare effect. Owning land should not create entitlement to government assistance.

Question4: create an equal system for grants that pay on a per acre basis. It must be competitive to ensure best management practices. This would leave the function of the land strictly up to the producer.

Question5: Increased subsidies for health care and other service industries. Rural America does not have the tax base to provide adequate health care or quality schools. Being rural is what it is. Dragging industry into rural America makes rural America less rural. There is not enough of an educated workforce in rural America to support much industry. It is not efficient to pay huge teacher and administrative salaries for schools that have a graduating class of 10 or 20 students. Nor is it economically feasible to ship those students to concentrated areas. Put the technology into rural schools for distance education. I can live in Ohio and get a degree from a college in California. Why can't I live in western Nebraska and get a quality high school education from a private school in New York or Boston. Current technology provides interactive video conferencing that allows students from around the world to complete courses and earn degrees from any university that they choose. Instead of rural schools hiring a competent faculty on all subjects, have facilitators that can observe the interactive classrooms to enforce penalties of cheating and make sure that the students are doing their own work.

Question6: These are consumer driven issues that should be supported by the industries that profit from the research. Why should the tax base support research that will improve industry. If industry is to benefit, let the industry fund it. The checkoff program for example.