

From: "walkinbarg@pdi.net%inter2" <walkinbarg@pdi.net>
Subject: Farm Bill 2007 Official Comments - 12/01/2005 09:58 PM CST
Date Sent: 12/01/2005 09:58:30 CST
Date Received: 12/01/2005 09:59:31 CST

Email: walkinbarg@pdi.net

FirstName: Roscoe

LastName: Grimes

Address1: RR #2 Box 46

Address2:

City: Pond Creek

State: Oklahoma

zipcode: 73766

Question1: I was a begining farmer in 1977. Subsidy benefits were far more lucritive in the 50's and 60's than in the 70's, 80's, and 90's.

The main differance between now and then is our input costs, cost of living and health care. Reducing land prices would basically destroy all I have worked for, for the past 28 years.

If the 2007 farm bill wants to address farming and the entry of new farmers, set the target price of our commodities at a profitable level.

When a person can make a living for a family on minimum wage but not on the farm, it just seems obvious to farmers why our kids go to the city rather than return to the farm. Make farming profitable and the younger folks will want to farm! When was the last cost of living increase made for farmers?, Who pays for our retirement?, Who pays my benefit package? Tell me about my 401k!

Question2: If our inputs were set at the same \$ level and the playing field leveled where as an American farmer it cost me the same as it does a Brazilian, Somolian, ect., and the bilateral agreements and trade negotiations guaranteed my crops imported into their country rather than the U.S. just importing theirs while mine is held in storage for a ready supply if the foriegn crops failed, trade would take care of itself.

Our next farm bill needs to address the needs of real family farms, not address issues that guarantee johnny America has more disposable income to buy more imported goods from his local shopping mall!

Our next farm bill needs to address real issues with the American farmers not the needs of some "poor" farmer in Brazil. How many tax dollars does someone in Samolia pay to our IRS each year, yet at the WTO our sec of ag and Pascal Lamey would have me go hungry, go out of business for a foreign farmer. See question number one. Which is more important young farmers or rich farmers in a foreign country.

Question3: If the \$250,000 cap were actually enforced, the big land gobbling corporations that are pulling down in excess of \$1 million for each of their shareholders, would actually have to farm like the rest of us.

Why is USDA concerned that they stabilize my income. Wheat farmers are below the poverty level now enhancing our standard of living with off farm jobs?? Why can not the next farm bill ensure that established farmers who have been pushed to the brink of foreclosure, by high priced fuel, high interest, high priced fertilizer, high priced health care and insurance enjoy some of the same benefits that our city counterparts take for granted?

Question4: The Great Plains contracts from the 80's was a wonderful program. We need a program like it that will continue to have cost share assistance with waterways, terraces, reservoirs, and idle land that is CRP class. A mandatory summer fallow program with the right incentives would do more for the land than I can explain.

Question5: If the focus and emphasis was on making our farm commodities valuable enough to entice young farmers to stay on the farm, rural development would not be an issue.

Question6: The next farm bill should have nothing to do with research and development. Our government has spent millions and millions of \$ and about the time a development is to be released, a major corporation donates a big chunk of money to the university and then they own the genetics. Then farmers pay through the nose for those government sponsored genetics owned by the corporation.