From: "dptrsn@grm.net%inter2" <dptrsn@grm.net>
Subject: Farm Bill 2007 Official Comments - 11/01/2005 09:46 PM CST
Date Sent: 11/01/2005 09:46:45 CST
Date Received: 11/01/2005 09:47:54 CST

Email: dptrsn@grm.net
FirstName: Doug
LastName: Peterson
Address1: 30311 East 310
Address2:
City: Ridgeway
State: Missouri
zipcode: 64481
Question1: The CRP has lead to a huge amount of investment in land by sources outside agriculture. In many counties in the US almost all of the CRP payments go to landowners who live hundreds of miles away in the city. CRP has caused as much erosion as it ever saved. Many counties have more acres of row crops now than they did before the CRP program began in the 1985 Farm Bill and they have tens of thousands of acres of CRP also. They enrolled the land in the CRP and just plowed up more. How did this reduce the cropland acres? How did this protect the soil resource? There was a rule in the 1985 Farm Bill called the Super Sod Buster rule. This rule prevented landowners who had CRP from Sodbusting and farming land that had not been cropped before. For some reason this was taken out of the either the 1990 or 1997 farm bill.
Why? The CRP could be a good program if it only allowed in the most enviromentally sensitive areas. Filter strips, buffers etc.. Entire fields should not be allowed to be placed into the program. Landowers who do not make a substantial part of there income from agriculture should not be allowed into the program.
Question2: Many countries would open trade if we did not subsidize our farmers so much. New Zealand is a country which eliminated almost all farm subsidies in the 80's and now they are one of the leading exporters of ag based commodities. They did this by developing new markets and even new products. The US farmer is one of the most inovative hard working people in the world. Get rid of the payments and restriction and let them find ways to market and grow the things that would allow them to make a profit and not have to rely on the government for a handout.
Question3: Many programs need to have the administration changed. For instance the crop insurance program needs to be handled completely by FSA. The private companies that handle it have no incentive to adiminister it correctly. There is a huge amount of fraud taking place out there. The government is making the payments but the private company that completes the claims just don't care and don't always check the validity of them.
They don't verify planting dates and showing yield losses is as easy as not turning in tickets.
Most farm programs that make direct subsidy payments should be eliminated. The laws of supply and demand should be allowed to work. The beef industry is basically free from direct subsidy payments. I realize that beef prices are effected by grain prices but for the most part the beef industry is controlled by supply and demand. When beef prices go up producers expand the herd to take advantage of the higher prices. When prices go down the herd contracts and everything starts all over again. Some people say we have to have a supply of grain on hand to keep food prices cheap. Beef is a much more perishible commodity than grain and there is never a shortage of beef. If there is money to be made by storing grain then someone will do it. I think the time for all of the price support type payments is over.

Question4: I think the only government payments made to landowner should be for conservation work they complete. This could be done in the form of Cost-share programs such as the EQIP.
Question5:
Question6: