

From: "cfc@semo.net%inter2" <cfc@semo.net>
Subject: Farm Bill 2007 Official Comments - 12/22/2005 12:44 PM CST
Date Sent: 12/22/2005 12:44:02 CST
Date Received: 12/22/2005 12:45:11 CST

Email: cfc@semo.net
FirstName: Doug
LastName: Enyart
Address1: PO Box 176
Address2:
City: Piedmont
State: Missouri
zipcode: 63957

Question1: The greatest unintended consequence of all forest subsidy policies and programs is that we are sending the wrong message: that intentional forest management is not worth investing in unless government helps pay for it.

Question2: Let the market place take care of it. We have designed and developed a socioeconomic system based on capitalism. Interference in that system is the problem, not the solution. Our people have become complacent and lazy in all labor markets, and the market must adjust. Low paid workers in other countries gradually will become better paid, when more resource development and value added processing gravitates there in the market place. Our workers will become less demanding when they have no jobs due to being overpriced and under productive. The market adjusts, over time.

Question3: It is the wealthier and larger land owners who 'farm the system'. It has always been that way in all government subsidy programs. The family farm has become a megafarm with family members purposely distributing the ownership, on paper, to maximize the subsidy monies. Our economic system has changed. Every service and product business has developed in to ever larger businesses as natural growth in the marketplace. The family farm is a picture in history. A 'family' farming 320 acre farm for a living is a thing of the past. Small farms are 'hobby' farms owned by absentee land owners who have jobs in urban settings or teach school full time and farm part time. We cannot and should not 'save' the family farm as it is pictured from history. Airlines, banks, real estate firms, car manufactures, et cetera. All big, getting bigger, naturally in the market place.

Question4: Half of farm policy is paying to do exactly the opposite as the other half. A farmer gets subsidy to plant fescue to hold erosion on one field and his neighbor gets subsidy to kill fescue and plant trees. An NRCS employee writes an article for farmers describing how to shade and feed pigs in the woods while another employee writes an article telling farmers to fence cattle out of the woods. The entire concept of achieving environmental goals with a famr policy is and always has been absurd and a monumental waste of taxpayer dollars. Remember when farmers were paid to drain wetlands for farming? Now they are paid not too. It's endless.

Question5: Don't penalize rural residents by applying policies that work in urban environments.

Question6: Product development and marketing are business activities. The private sector can take care of these very well, if interference in the form of subsidizing the wealthy is removed.