

## Agriculture by Robert L. Baker

### New farm bill means less food

*Continuation of the 1985 farm law will result in farm shutdowns and food control.*

Secretary of Agriculture Clayton Yeutter announced recently that the Bush administration would have its proposals for the 1990 Farm Bill ready for congressional consideration "shortly after the first of the year," since it was "close to finalizing" its views in areas such as price income supports and environmental considerations. Some administration spokesmen say that the 1985 law will be resubmitted to Congress, alterations, and Yeutter confirmed this, saying, "We will follow the techniques that were laid down in the 1985 farm bill, and adjust them as necessary to make the next bill more adaptable to the needs of the moment."

The "needs of the moment" for the Trilateral Commission-connected Bush administration, like the preceding Carter and Reagan administrations, is to restructure food production and processing into the control of a few international grain and food companies, to reduce strategic food reserves around the world, and to replace family farms with an American version of collectivized farming.

If you dare to pull back the curtain on the stage of food policy debate, you will see the ashen faces of the population control lobby pulling the strings implementing an agenda for world depopulation. Reduced food production is an efficient means to reduce population.

The 1985 Farm Bill established the 10 Year Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), which will lock 40 million acres of farmland out of food production by the end of 1990. Proposals for the 1990 bill by Sen. Wyche

Fowler (D-Ga.) would extend CRP to 65 million acres and will call for additional payments to extend the original 40 million acre enrollment period another five years. Other proposals would pay farmers increased incentives to plant trees on CRP acreage. Altogether, the end result is not to develop and improve land to make it more productive for future generations, but to turn it back into a state of wilderness which prohibits its ability to produce food. The end result is less food and the further shutdown of rural agro-industry.

Both Senate and House Agriculture Committees have discussed, and will continue to work toward, changes in legislation regarding agricultural chemicals, and issues related to groundwater pollution, food safety, exports, and alternative farming methods.

Yeutter underscored the rising power of environmental genocidalist organizations in a recent speech at the National Press Club. "Environmental considerations will clearly be at the fore much more than they have in the past," he said. These issues, which surfaced in the 1985 farm bill debates, "will emerge to an even greater degree this time around."

"Alternative" agriculture (as opposed to "conventional" farming) is also a hot issue expected to shape the farm bill and future agricultural policy to encourage farmers to reduce the use of fertilizer and chemicals. Yeutter and many Senate staffers believe research and development programs will get a boost in the 1990 Farm Bill. The centerpiece of the debate may be

a bill introduced by Rep. Jim Jontz, (D-Ind.), known as the Sustainable Agricultural Adjustment Act.

This bill provides farmers with incentives to rotate crops and thereby "reduce the need for fertilizer dependence to maintain productivity." Rotating more farmland into grass crops reduces the number of acres devoted to grain production. Only cattle can utilize grass. With cattle prices below the cost necessary to maintain a profit, a prudent farmer wouldn't buy cattle to lose money. The net result: reduced grain production and no increase in meat production.

Some policymakers have suggested that the crop base formula be redesigned to permit farmers greater flexibility in deciding which crops to plant yet still be able to qualify for the farm program. They argue that current requirements coerce producers into growing crops that result in surpluses, and greater flexibility would allow farmers to respond to the "market forces"—the international grain cartels.

Decoupling, unlinking farm support payments from farm production, is being promoted by Sen. Rudy Boschwitz (R-Minn.) The goal of this proposal is to make farmers' planting decisions entirely neutral from the government farm program. The farmer could grow whatever he wants—or nothing at all—and still get government "exit payments." A transitional exit payment would start out at the level of the current deficiency payment in the first year, and be reduced by 10% a year for the next five years.

According to the National Farmers Union, the president of Cargill and his vice president for public affairs have strongly endorsed the decoupling of farm programs and farm payments, and all Cargill officials see it as a transitional step to a totally free market.