

From: "gale@hlipublishing.com%inter2" <gale@hlipublishing.com>
Subject: Farm Bill 2007 Official Comments - 11/07/2005 02:47 PM CST
Date Sent: 11/07/2005 02:47:38 CST
Date Received: 11/07/2005 02:50:04 CST

Email: gale@hlipublishing.com

FirstName: Gale

LastName: McKinney

Address1: Box 211

Address2:

City: Fort Dodge

State: Iowa

zipcode: 50501

Question1: Sadly this problem should have been more aggressively pursued 20 to 30 years ago when an entire generation of farmers was lost.

Passing on tax benefits to farmer's who sell to a beginning farmer may have its merits, but how is the beginning farmer going to have an operation that is a going concern in today's climate. The people who crave the lifestyle and in the end isn't that what it is about, if financially it is an unsound decision, may need to satisfy that need through Acreage ownership.

Question2: If we are going to become more competitive world-wide it is reasonable to assume we have to be more efficient, which generally translate to price. If we can get beyond that, which I doubt we can, it is all about infrastructure.

Better rail, more accommodative rail. There is one for you, ask your grain dealers the headaches they have to put up with with Rail Systems. Broaden our shipping ports; way too much concentration out of the gulf.

Question3: If indeed as is pointed out in question (2) there is a huge demand in the worldwide market then why wouldn't we want to encourage production. However the increase in production is not from subsidization but rather from technology enhancements in Agriculture. Look at acres in production reports and in many instances we have less crop acres in production than we did in the seventies and we are producing 30 to 50 percent more crop. Come up with ways to limit the production acres and I bet Agriculture will find away to produce the same amount of product.

Some call for the end of subsidization and believe that supply and demand will solve the problem. A noble thought, however can we as a nation, even world live with the consequence. Subsidization has not brought about high incomes for farmers, what it has done is assure cheap food for grain based products and even somewhat with meats. Can we live with food prices 200 to 300 percent higher if we cut production? Doubt it. In the end subsidization is a world-wide way of life. Why penalize someone who has been able to survive farming and become a good business person. Subsidies have to be on acres and production and provide penalties in areas of poor conservation.

Make the process easier. The USDA should "shop their FSA offices and streamline the process.

Question4: Reward those who own the land. Many like to point out how the "land owner" is getting the benefit. Hogwash. As an example the owners of most Iowa land is still in the hands of farmers, albeit some of those are people who were fortunate enough to hang onto their land in the 70's and 80's and have had to rent it out to make the payments. So we take shots at them because land is now "artificially high". In 1978 I paid 105 an acre for cash rent, today my tenant pays me 100 an acre.

Provide land owners with conservation incentive programs that will

provide dollars to build and maintain wetlands and game preserves and then don't force them to have over 360 acres and I think you might see many more wildlife type farms.

Question5: Provide loans for Acreage Farms. This will move more people back to the rural setting. There has been a movement toward rural living in the last ten years and there are literally tens of thousands of people who would love to live on 40 to 200 acres, work in town and take care of their small farm. Most lending institutions will not provide as attractive of funding for an acreage as they do suburban housing.

This could be an excellent way to re-populate rural America. More people more money to pay for enhanced services.

A program which re-populates Rural America with city wage earners who do not have to make their living from agriculture but who simply love and embrace the lifestyle could be a very good thing.

Question6: Never should the farm program be one of equal provision. I would hope that our law makers and those they consult with would design programs on all the examples that are given above and utilize funding in those areas of most potential benefit for the highest number of people, consumer and farmer alike.